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Abstract

A COMPARISON OF TEACHERS' PERCEPTIONS OF FEMALE VERSUS MALE PRINCIPALS' LEADER BEHAVIOR AND ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE IN ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

by

Diana Rhea Hodges Rogers

The purpose of this study was to determine if the leader behavior of the principal and the organizational climate of the school were perceived differently by teachers in elementary schools with female principals when compared to elementary schools with male principals. It also sought to determine if significant differences existed between female and male teachers' perceptions of both female and male principals.

A total of 217 subjects responded. Ten female and 10 male principals were evaluated by 119 female teachers and 98 male teachers using the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire, Form XII (LBDQ) and the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire, Form IV (OCDQ).

No significant differences were found in total leader behaviors or organizational climate profiles. No significant differences were found in leader behavior dimensions of demanding reconciliation, tolerance of uncertainty, initiation of structure, tolerance of freedom, role retention, consideration, production emphasis, predictive accuracy, or integration. Significant differences were found between female and male principals in Dimension 1 (representation), Dimension 4 (persuasiveness), and Dimension 12 (superior orientation). No significant differences were found in organizational climate dimensions of disengagement, hindrance, production emphasis, or thrust. Significant differences were found between female and male principals in Dimension 3 (esprit), Dimension 4 (intimacy), Dimension 5 (aloofness), and Dimension 7 (consideration).

In addition, significant differences were found between female and male teachers' perceptions of female principals in leader behavior Dimension 1 (representation), Dimension 4 (persuasiveness) and Dimension 5 (initiation of structure). Significant differences were found in organizational climate Dimension 3 (esprit) and Dimension 7 (thrust). No significant differences were found in female and male teachers' perceptions of male principals on either the LBDQ or OCDQ.

In comparing female and male principals, it was found that:
(1) Female principals acted and spoke more representative of the group.
(2) Female principals used persuasion and argument more effectively and exhibited stronger convictions. (3) Female principals maintained more
cordial relations with superiors, had more influence with them, and were striving for higher status.

In comparing school climates, it was found that: (1) Morale was extremely higher in schools with female principals. (2) Intimacy was considerably higher in schools with female principals. (3) Female principals were more aloof. They preferred to "go by the book" and to be guided by rules and policies rather than to deal in an informal face-to-face situation. (4) Female principals were more considerate and tried to do things for teachers in human terms.

In comparing female and male teachers' perceptions of female principals, it was found that female principals were perceived as more representative, more persuasive and to exhibit greater initiation of structure by female teachers than by male teachers. Female teachers perceived higher morale in schools with female principals than did male teachers. Female teachers perceived greater thrust from female principals than did male teachers. Recommendations based on the findings were given.
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Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

Public education suffers from a limited supply of women who actively seek administrative positions. This shortage is caused both by sex-role stereotyping and sex discrimination.\(^1\) Women and minority men lag behind white males in educational attainment, opportunities for employment and advancement, work experience, and earnings.\(^2\) Title VII of the Civil Rights Act, passed July 2, 1964, prohibits discrimination based on race, color, religion, national origin, or sex. Employers may not discriminate in (1) hiring or firing, (2) wages or terms of employment, (3) classifying, assigning or promoting, or (4) training or retraining.\(^3\)

Teaching became a woman's profession due to the prevailing view of the female role during the nineteenth century. Both Horace Mann and Henry Barnard advocated hiring female teachers. By 1900, women constituted 70 percent of the teaching force nationwide. Implications for women can be drawn if one views these beliefs. The stereotyped female was gentle, religious, mannerly, and contented in managing and instructing young children. Both females and society in general believed that females were suited to governing children, whereas the governance of

---

\(^1\) Ellen Kimmel, Dorothy Harlow, and Mary Topping, "Special Programs to Promote Women into Educational Administration," Phi Delta Kappan, LX (April, 1979), 586-589.


adults was reserved for males. Secondly, there was a limited supply of males willing to teach. Hiring females was economical for school districts since females were paid much less than males. Thirdly, submission was a cardinal virtue for the nineteenth century female. Women were obedient, passive, and good followers needed for school bureaucracies with hierarchial structures.

Very little change has occurred in society's view of women. Passage of the Civil Rights Act has not insured equality. Opportunity for employment and advancement for women has not kept up with increasing preparation for employment. The number of women working outside the home has almost tripled in the past thirty years. In 1950, 17.3 million women were employed in salaried jobs; by 1980, the number had risen to 43.5 million. Yet, although women constitute 42 percent of this country's labor force, they make only 57 cents for every dollar earned by a male. On a nationwide basis, women hold only one in ten top school administrative jobs, including those of superintendent, assistant superintendent, principal, and assistant principal. Women have gained only 1 percent in overall representation in top school jobs since 1972. Women make up only 13 percent of school administrators although 70 percent of the teaching force are females. Men are predominant at all levels

4Dorothy S. Russell, "Women's Entry Into Teaching: Myths and Realities," Kappa Delta Pi Record, XVI (December, 1979), 41-43.

5Ibid.


of administration; therefore, they possess greater power, status, and monetary rewards.⁹

Although women are still underrepresented in advanced graduate preparation programs, the proportion of females is increasing. Approximately 50.7 percent of fall 1979 college and university students were women. This represents an increase of 3.8 percent over 1978.¹⁰

Between 1972 and 1977 more than 7,700 educational administration doctorates were awarded, 15 percent of them to females. In the academic year 1976-77 nearly 1,500 doctorates were conferred, 22 percent upon women. The proportion of female doctoral students is increasing while the proportion of female administrators is decreasing.¹¹ A vicious cycle seems to affect females and minorities. Individuals with administrative experience are considered first for administrative positions.¹² Females do not have as much administrative experience. Therefore, they do not fare as well as males in competition for jobs.¹³

Women constitute 75 percent of the teachers in Tennessee, yet they constitute only 15 percent of the administrators. These are concentrated in principalships rather than superintendencies or assistant


¹¹Martha M. McCarthy, George Kuh, and Joan Beckman, "Characteristics and Attitudes of Doctoral Students in Educational Administration," Phi Delta Kappan, LXI (November, 1979), 200-203.


¹³McCarthy, p. 201.
superintendencies. Within principalships they tend to be elementary principals. Only 3 percent of secondary schools and 3 percent of grades one through twelve schools have women principals. Schools they lead tend to be small and rural. In comparison with other states, the percentage of females in administration in Tennessee tends to be average.\textsuperscript{14}

Because women professionals in education have undergone the same training as their male counterparts, such bias is not a rational use of human potential.\textsuperscript{15} In order to utilize our valuable human resources in providing appropriate leadership, school districts must know if females as well as males exhibit effective leadership behaviors and are capable of maintaining suitable organizational climate.

The Problem

The Statement of the Problem

The problem of this study was to determine if the leader behavior of the principal and the organizational climate of the school are perceived differently by teachers in elementary schools with female principals when compared to elementary schools with male principals.

The Significance of the Study

The study was significant for the following reasons:

1. The results of this study may increase the acceptance of the fact that females exhibit effective leader behaviors. Patricia Mitchell reported that female principals are more effective in terms of emotional

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{14}Norma T. Mertz, "Update for Tennessee," \textit{Phi Delta Kappan}, LXI (October, 1979), 147.
  \item \textsuperscript{15}Kimmel, p. 586.
\end{itemize}
balance, administrative planning and accomplishment.\textsuperscript{16} Thurman Pate found that female principals scored higher on the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ), the Index of Self-Concept as a Communicator (ISCC), and the Principal's Self-Evaluator (PSE).\textsuperscript{17} Mae Rogers found that female principals scored high in both Initiating Structure and Consideration on the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire.\textsuperscript{18} Betty O'Quill concluded that sex of the leader does not seem to be a critical factor in leadership.\textsuperscript{19}

2. The results of this study may increase the acceptance of the fact that females are capable of maintaining suitable organizational climate. Jessie Kobayashi concluded that schools with female principals and male principals are perceived by teachers not to be significantly different in organizational climate.\textsuperscript{20} Affective behaviors of the principal were found to have a meaningful impact upon the psychological

\textsuperscript{16}Patricia Turner Mitchell, "Organizational Climates of Elementary Schools and Teachers' Perceptions of Principals' Effectiveness," Dissertation Abstracts International, XXXIX (March-April, 1979), 5241-42A.

\textsuperscript{17}Thurman Pate, "The Relationship of the Elementary Principals' Leadership Style to His Self-Concept of His Ability to Communicate and His Knowledge of His Job," Dissertation Abstracts International, XXXIX (May-June, 1979), 6445A.

\textsuperscript{18}Mae Rogers, "A Descriptive Study of Leadership Effectiveness of Male and Female Elementary School Principals Based Upon Self-Perception and the Perception of Their Teachers," Dissertation Abstracts International, XXXIX (May-June, 1979), 6408A.

\textsuperscript{19}Betty Brumbelow O'Quinn, "Perceived Teacher Satisfaction with Selected Leadership Behavior of Female as Compared with Male Principals in Selected Georgia Elementary Schools," Dissertation Abstracts International, XXXIX (January-February, 1979), 3959-60A.

climate of schools by Donald Crist\textsuperscript{21} and Velma Sims\textsuperscript{22} Nattanipha Cooparat\textsuperscript{23} and Stephen Davis\textsuperscript{24} reported that observed behaviors of elementary principals did have a relationship to the organizational climate and openness of the system. Carolyn Bukhair found that the organizational climate is independent of the leadership behavior of the principal.\textsuperscript{25}

3. The results of this study may call attention to sex-role stereotyping and sex discrimination in filling administrative positions on the part of superintendents and boards of education. "The distribution of employment by sex for school staff reveals a strong dominance of traditional sex roles."\textsuperscript{26} In a teacher opinion poll conducted by the National Education Association, neither male nor female teachers significantly identified any areas of discrimination against male teachers. However, both male and female teachers agreed that female

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item Donald Henry Crist, "An Analysis of Organizational Climate and Principal Leader Behavior in Class III Secondary Schools of Nebraska," Dissertation Abstracts International, XXXVIII (May-June, 1978), 7045A.
\item Velma Sims, "An Analysis of the Leadership Behavior of Elementary Principals and the Organizational Climate in the Omaha Suburban Area Council of Schools," Dissertation Abstracts International, XXXIX (May-June, 1979), 6536A.
\item Stephen Davis, "The Relationship of Principal's and Teachers' Attitudes Toward Education, Perceptions of the School Organizational Climate, and Perceptions of the Principal's Leader Behavior," Dissertation Abstracts International, XL (July-August, 1979), 42-43A.
\item LeCoultre, p. 11.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
teachers may be discriminated against in promotion and employment in supervisory and administrative positions. Stereotyping exists; women who are certified still prefer elementary positions. Superintendents are reluctant to recommend women as secondary principals. Special training is needed to enable women to cross sex-role barriers and overcome role conflicts between achievement and femininity.

The results of this study may encourage women to enter advanced graduate preparation programs and to actively seek administrative positions. College men and women both plan for occupations that offer leadership opportunities, high income, prestige and independence. However, men stress leadership and income more than women do. Women choose jobs that involve helping others, verbal and aesthetic fields and those that include personal contact.

Women and minority men are moving rapidly to get the education required for professional careers. Opportunity for employment and advancement for women has not kept up with increasing preparation. Women are paid less than men with comparable education and experience at every age and degree level, in most fields, and with most types of employers. Their unemployment rates are two to five times higher than those of men.


28Russell, pp. 41-42.


Even though women are recruited more vigorously as part of affirmative action programs, the pool of women qualified to enter leadership positions will continue to be insufficient until more women think of themselves as leaders and undertake the additional formal and psychological preparation as required.\textsuperscript{32}

\textbf{Limitations}

The following limitations were imposed on this study:

1. The aspects of the principal's leader behavior were limited to those measured by the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ, Form XII) (See Appendix E).

2. The aspects of the organizational climate were limited to those measured by the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire (OCDQ, Form IV) (See Appendix F).

3. No attempt was made to determine a cause-effect relationship for the perceptions of those surveyed.

4. The participants in the study were limited to randomly selected, administrators and teachers in public elementary schools in the thirteen school districts of the Upper East Tennessee Educational Cooperative.

5. The study was limited to the period April, 1980.

\textbf{Assumptions}

The following assumptions were considered to be present in this study:

1. The decline in the number of females hired for administrative positions is due to sex-role stereotyping and sex discrimination.

\textsuperscript{32}Kimmel, p. 586.
2. The responses to the questionnaires were based on the participants' true feelings.

3. Teacher sex bias may have influenced the participants' responses.

**Definitions of Terms**

For the purpose of this study, the following definitions were used:

**Leader Behavior.** This term refers to the specific behaviors exhibited by the chief administrator in the school. Specific behaviors determine the administrator's leadership style.

**Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire, Form XII (LBDQ).** This instrument was used to assess the teachers' perceptions of the leader behavior of the chief administrator or principal in the schools.

**Organizational Climate.** The climate of the school refers to the "feel" or personality of the school.

**Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire, Form IV (OCDQ).** This instrument was used to assess the teachers' perceptions of the climate of their school.

**Elementary School.** An elementary school is a public school having some combination of kindergarten through grade eight.

**Principal.** The principal is the certificated administrator or leader assigned to a public elementary school.

**Teachers.** Teachers are the full-time certificated professionals assigned to a public elementary school whose primary task is the instruction of students.

The following terms refer to the dimensions of the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ, Form XII) (See Appendix E):
**Representation.** This dimension refers to behavior exhibited by the principal in which he/she speaks and acts as representative of the group.

**Demanding Reconciliation.** This dimension refers to behavior exhibited by the principal in which he/she reconciles conflicting organizational demands and reduces disorder to the system.

**Tolerance of Uncertainty.** This dimension refers to behavior exhibited by the principal in which he/she is able to tolerate uncertainty and postponement without anxiety or upset.

**Persuasiveness.** This dimension refers to behavior exhibited by the principal in which he/she uses persuasion and argument effectively; he/she exhibits strong convictions.

**Initiation of Structure.** This dimension refers to behavior exhibited by the principal in which he/she clearly defines his/her own role and lets followers know what is expected.

**Tolerance of Freedom.** This dimension refers to behavior exhibited by the principal in which he/she allows followers scope for initiative, decision and action.

**Role Retention.** This dimension refers to behavior exhibited by the principal in which he/she actively exercises leadership role rather than surrendering leadership to others.

**Consideration.** This dimension refers to behavior exhibited by the principal in which he/she regards the comfort, well-being, status and contributions of followers.

**Production Emphasis.** This dimension refers to behavior exhibited by the principal in which he/she applies pressure for productive output.

**Predictive Accuracy.** This dimension refers to behavior exhibited
by the principal in which he/she demonstrates foresight and ability
to predict outcomes accurately.

Integration. This dimension refers to behavior exhibited by the
principal in which he/she maintains a closely knit organization; he/she
resolves intermember conflicts.

Superior Orientation. This dimension refers to behavior exhibited
by the principal in which he/she maintains cordial relations with superiors;
he/she has influence with them; he/she is striving for higher status. 33

The following terms refer to the dimensions of the Organizational
Climate Description Questionnaire (OCDQ, Form IV) (See Appendix F):

Disengagement. This dimension refers to the teachers' tendency
to be not with it, going through the motions, and not in gear with respect
to the task at hand.

Hindrance. This dimension refers to the teachers' feeling that the
principal burdens them with routine duties or unnecessary busywork.

Esprit. This dimension refers to morale. The teachers feel that
their social needs are being satisfied and they enjoy a sense of
accomplishment in their jobs.

Intimacy. This dimension refers to the teachers' enjoyment of
friendly social relations with each other.

Aloofness. This dimension refers to the behavior by the principal
which is characterized as formal and impersonal. The principal goes by
the book and prefers to be guided by rules and policies rather than to
deal in an informal face-to-face situation.

33Ralph M. Stogdill, "Manual for the Leader Behavior Description
Questionnaire, Form XII, An Experimental Revision," (Columbus, Ohio:
The Ohio State University, 1963). (Mimeographed.)
Production Emphasis. This dimension refers to behavior by the principal which is characterized by close supervision of the staff. He/she is highly directive. His/her communication tends to go in only one direction, and he/she is not sensitive to feedback from the staff.

Thrust. This dimension refers to behavior by the principal which is characterized by his/her effort in trying to move the organization. The principal attempts to motivate the teachers through the example which he/she personally sets.

Consideration. This dimension refers to behavior by the principal which is characterized by an inclination to treat the teachers humanly, to try to do a little something extra for them in human terms.

Research Hypotheses

The research hypotheses, stated in the declarative format, pertain to a comparison of the leader behavior of the principal, female versus male, as measured by the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire, Form XII (See Appendix E), and within the dimensions of the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire. In addition, the hypotheses pertain to a comparison of the school's organizational climate in schools administered by female versus male principals, as measured by the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire, Form IV (See Appendix F), and within the dimensions of the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire. The comparative dimensions tested by the hypotheses are illustrated in Figure 1.

---

The following hypotheses were considered to be relevant to this study:

**Hypothesis 1.** There will be a significant difference in the mean score of leadership behaviors exhibited by female principals when compared to the mean score of leadership behaviors exhibited by male principals, as perceived by teachers and measured by the LBDQ.

**Hypothesis 2.** There will be a significant difference in the mean score of the organizational climate between those schools administered by

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Female Principals</th>
<th>Versus</th>
<th>Male Principals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leader Behaviors</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>Leader Behaviors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representation</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>Representation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demanding Reconciliation</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>Demanding Reconciliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolerance of Uncertainty</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>Tolerance of Uncertainty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persuasiveness</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>Persuasiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiation of Structure</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>Initiation of Structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolerance of Freedom</td>
<td>(8)</td>
<td>Tolerance of Freedom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Retention</td>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>Role Retention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consideration</td>
<td>(10)</td>
<td>Consideration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production Emphasis</td>
<td>(11)</td>
<td>Production Emphasis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predictive Accuracy</td>
<td>(12)</td>
<td>Predictive Accuracy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration</td>
<td>(13)</td>
<td>Integration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superior Orientation</td>
<td>(14)</td>
<td>Superior Orientation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Climate</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>Organizational Climate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disengagement</td>
<td>(15)</td>
<td>Disengagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindrance</td>
<td>(16)</td>
<td>Hindrance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esprit</td>
<td>(17)</td>
<td>Esprit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimacy</td>
<td>(18)</td>
<td>Intimacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aloofness</td>
<td>(19)</td>
<td>Aloofness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production Emphasis</td>
<td>(20)</td>
<td>Production Emphasis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thrust</td>
<td>(21)</td>
<td>Thrust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consideration</td>
<td>(22)</td>
<td>Consideration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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female principals in comparison to those schools administered by males, as perceived by teachers and measured by the OCDQ.

Hypothesis 3. There will be a significant difference in the mean score in representation in schools with female principals when compared to the mean score in representation in schools with male principals, as perceived by teachers and measured by the LBDQ.

Hypothesis 4. There will be a significant difference in the mean score in demanding reconciliation in schools with female principals when compared to the mean score in demanding reconciliation in schools with male principals, as perceived by teachers and measured by the LBDQ.

Hypothesis 5. There will be a significant difference in the mean score in tolerance of uncertainty in schools with female principals when compared to the mean score in tolerance of uncertainty in schools with male principals, as perceived by teachers and measured by the LBDQ.

Hypothesis 6. There will be a significant difference in the mean score in persuasiveness in schools with female principals when compared to the mean score in persuasiveness in schools with male principals, as perceived by teachers and measured by the LBDQ.

Hypothesis 7. There will be a significant difference in the mean score in initiation of structure in schools with female principals when compared to the mean score in initiation of structure in schools with male principals, as perceived by teachers and measured by the LBDQ.

Hypothesis 8. There will be a significant difference in the mean score in tolerance of freedom in schools with female principals when compared to the mean score in tolerance of freedom in schools with male principals, as perceived by teachers and measured by the LBDQ.
Hypothesis 9. There will be a significant difference in the mean score in role retention in schools with female principals when compared to the mean score in role retention in schools with male principals, as perceived by teachers and measured by the LBDQ.

Hypothesis 10. There will be a significant difference in the mean score in consideration in schools with female principals when compared to the mean score in consideration in schools with male principals, as perceived by teachers and measured by the LBDQ.

Hypothesis 11. There will be a significant difference in the mean score in production emphasis in schools with female principals when compared to the mean score in production emphasis in schools with male principals, as perceived by teachers and measured by the LBDQ.

Hypothesis 12. There will be a significant difference in the mean score in predictive accuracy in schools with female principals when compared to the mean score in predictive accuracy in schools with male principals, as perceived by teachers and measured by the LBDQ.

Hypothesis 13. There will be a significant difference in the mean score in integration in schools with female principals when compared to the mean score in integration in schools with male principals, as perceived by teachers and measured by the LBDQ.

Hypothesis 14. There will be a significant difference in the mean score in superior orientation in schools with female principals when compared to the mean score in superior orientation in schools with male principals, as perceived by teachers and measured by the LBDQ.

Hypothesis 15. There will be a significant difference in the mean score in disengagement in schools administered by female and male principals, as perceived by teachers and measured by the OCDQ.
Hypothesis 16. There will be a significant difference in the mean score in hindrance in schools administered by female and male principals, as perceived by teachers and measured by the OCDQ.

Hypothesis 17. There will be a significant difference in the mean score in esprit in schools administered by female and male principals, as perceived by teachers and measured by the OCDQ.

Hypothesis 18. There will be a significant difference in the mean score in intimacy in schools administered by female and male principals, as perceived by teachers and measured by the OCDQ.

Hypothesis 19. There will be a significant difference in the mean score in aloofness exhibited by female and male principals, as perceived by teachers and measured by the OCDQ.

Hypothesis 20. There will be a significant difference in the mean score in production emphasis exhibited by female and male principals, as perceived by teachers and measured by the OCDQ.

Hypothesis 21. There will be a significant difference in the mean score in thrust exhibited by female and male principals, as perceived by teachers and measured by the OCDQ.

Hypothesis 22. There will be a significant difference in the mean score in consideration exhibited by female and male principals, as perceived by teachers and measured by the OCDQ.

Procedures of the Study

The computer services of East Tennessee State University were used to search dissertation abstracts and ERIC documents. The search revealed very few studies of females' leadership behaviors as they relate to the
school's organizational climate. A thorough review of the literature was conducted. Permission to collect data was secured from the Institutional Review Board of East Tennessee State University.

The population for the study was the public elementary schools in the thirteen school districts of the Upper East Tennessee Educational Cooperative, the chief administrator in those schools and all full-time certificated teachers in those schools. The stratified random sample consisted of twenty elementary schools, ten schools administered by females and ten schools administered by males, randomly selected from the population.

The instruments chosen for the study included Halpin's Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire, Form XII (LBDQ) (See Appendix E) and Halpin and Croft's Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire, Form IV (OCDQ) (See Appendix F). Data concerning sex of the respondent was also obtained.

An introductory letter was sent to the superintendents in the thirteen school districts requesting permission to use selected schools in each district. A form letter was enclosed for use by the superintendents in granting permission. A telephone call was made to the principal in each of the selected schools explaining the purpose of the study and the procedures for collecting the data. A letter was sent to each principal confirming the date and time for administering the questionnaires. The instruments were administered in a group situation at the school site by the researcher or her representative. Some instruments were explained in a group situation and collected later from the respondents by the researcher or her representative. The questionnaires were administered to those teachers who volunteered to participate. No attempt was made
to collect responses from a teacher who was absent on the day of the administration of the questionnaires.

The data were collected and analyzed to test the hypotheses at the .05 level of significance. The t-test for independent samples was employed to test for significant differences between the two groups. In addition to data for the hypotheses, teachers' perceptions were analyzed according to sex of the respondent.

Organization of the Study

The study was organized into five chapters:

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

Chapter II contains the review of the literature and research related to the problem statement. Chapter II is divided into two sections. The first section contains a review of the literature and research regarding leadership, how leaders behave and the role of the female in the work force and in leadership positions. The second section contains a review of the literature and research on organizational climate.

Chapter III contains the methods and procedures used in the study.

Chapter IV contains the data collected. The analysis of the data and the findings are presented.

Chapter V presents the conclusions and recommendations of the study. A general summary of the overall study is presented.
Chapter II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE AND RELATED RESEARCH

The literature and research related to the study of leadership, to females in the work force and in leadership positions, and to organizational climate are reviewed in this chapter. The first section includes a review of the literature and research regarding leadership, how leaders behave, and the role of the female in the work force and in leadership positions. The second section includes a review of the literature and research on organizational climate.

Leadership

"The administrator uses theory as a basis for deriving answers or approaches to specific situations."\(^1\) The literature abounds with concern for leadership and how leaders behave. In spite of the ever growing discourse, however, the study of leadership remains erratic.\(^2\)

Underlying leadership research is the explicit assumption that leadership is related to organizational performance. Through analysis of appropriate leadership styles, behaviors or characteristics, the belief has been that more effective leaders can be selected or trained

---


with a consequent increase in organizational effectiveness. This thesis was expressed by General Omar N. Bradley in this manner:

Leadership is an intangible that involves a constant interplay between the leader and the led. When this interplay is successful, great accomplishments are possible. The greatness of a leader is measured by the achievement of the led.

**Historical Perspectives of Leadership**

Leadership theory is embedded in organizational theory. Max Weber's bureaucratic organization with an emphasis on efficiency and productivity was characterized by a division of labor, functional specialization, hierarchy of authority, a system of rules and procedures, and a pattern for selection and assignment of individuals to various positions based on technical competence. Frederick W. Taylor, father of the Scientific Management theory of administration, stressed worker efficiency with time and motion studies. Weber, Taylor, and Henri Fayol viewed leaders as efficiency experts. Fayol's major contribution was to identify management as a separate set of skills, or functions, performed

---


by supervisors in organizations. He delineated the difference between technical and managerial skills. Managerial skills included forecasting, planning, organizing, commanding, coordinating and controlling. Luther Gulick and L. Urwick saw the leader as an organizational engineer.

The Human Relations movement influenced management from 1935 to 1950. The focus was on relationships between workers as organizational members. Chester I. Barnard in *Functions of the Executive* emphasized hiring the person suited for the job. Barnard placed great emphasis on leadership. He recognized leadership as being influenced by the individual, the followers, and the conditions. He suggested that group organization is founded on a system of stable expectations which gives predictability to the behavior of the member. Mary Parker Follett saw the leader as a "social engineer." Elton Mayo stressed the importance of human relations in leadership activity. Herbert A. Simon emphasized administrative behavior and created the concept of the "administrative man." Simon's major contribution was elaboration of the nature and importance of decision making in the administrative process.

The post 1950 era represents a synthesizing or blending of scientific management and human relations theories of management. Management continued to be considered as the supervisory tasks of planning, organizing, staffing,

---


9Knezevich, p. 79.


directing, and controlling, but the behavioral aspects of these functions received the most consideration. Management became popularly accepted as "getting work accomplished through others."  

The social process of administration was represented in the work of Jacob W. Getzels and E. G. Guba. Getzels and Guba conceived of administration as a "hierarchy of subordinate-superordinate relationships within a social system which is the locus for allocating and integrating roles and facilities in order to achieve the goals of the social system."  

The significance of the Getzels-Guba model is that it emphasizes administrative relations as a function of interaction between the nomothetic (institutional) dimension and the ideographic (personal) dimension. Chris Argyris concluded that the individual actualizes himself through the organization and simultaneously the organization actualizes itself through the individual.  

The other major influence on management has been the quantitative approaches. The same emphasis as Taylor's scientific management was felt, but more sophisticated tools were available. The systems approach emphasizes "the importance of whole units, the relationship of the part to this whole, and the relationship of the system to different systems or wholes."  

Recent views on the management process challenge the traditional view that management is an art learned through experience. The steps involved in contingency methodology include the following:

---

14 Knezevich, p. 144.  15 Ibid., p. 145.  16 Carlisle, p. 42.  
17 Ibid., p. 144.  18 Ibid., pp. 45-46.
1. The effective manager uses the tools of organizational concepts, planning systems, operations-research techniques, and other "principles."

2. The effective manager can predict the outcome with the use of any one of the tools of management.

3. The effective manager can classify and analyze the variables related to the particular situation.

4. The effective manager can match particular concepts or techniques with the needs of specific situations.

A parallel exists between the historical perspective of administration and school leadership. Through World War I there was concern for the selection of administrators. The duties of a superintendent were to organize and direct the work of the schools, serve as executive officer of the school board, supervise instruction, lead the staff and serve as arbitrator between the staff and board. From 1918 to 1948 emphasis was placed on specification of standards and qualifications for positions of leadership. From 1948 to 1958, the focus was on a search for new ways of understanding the job of the administrator and to determine the qualifications and criteria for selection. The experimental use of psychological tests, the study of leadership, and the use of the critical incident technique were employed. Emphasis shifted from traits of leaders to the behavior of leaders in school situations.\(^{19}\)

The Study of Leadership

Attempts to develop a theory of leadership have included identification and measurement of the traits of leaders, leadership styles and

\(^{19}\) Carlisle, pp. 45-56.

situational variables which combine in different ways and call for different leadership behavior. Attempts to develop a theory of leadership are outnumbered only by attempts to define it. Early attempts to define leadership focused on group processes. The leader was viewed as a focus of group change, activity, and process. Leadership was the ability to enforce compliance. Warren G. Bennis defined it as the "process by which one induces a subordinate to behave in a desired manner." Niccolo Machiavelli in 1515 in The Prince pictured man as rebellious, aggressive, selfish, greedy, and uncooperative, and therefore to be controlled by whatever means available to those who want to gain and maintain power or who have the responsibility to maintain order.

Still others defined leadership as the exercise of influence or effect on the behaviors of group members. Ralph M. Stogdill defined it as "the process of influencing the activities of an organized group in the efforts toward goal setting or goal achievement." Urwich believed that the leader was the "personal representative of common purpose." Similar views were expressed by Andrew W. Halpin, James Winer, and John K. Hemphill. James Lipham defined leadership as "the initiation of a new structure or procedure for accomplishing or changing an organization's goals or objectives."

---

23 Knezevich, p. 79.
24 Stogdill, Handbook of Leadership, pp. 10-12.
The role of leadership has been evaluated as indispensable to the solution of a mutual problem because of the relation between the leadership act and the process of mutual problem solving. Leadership can be regarded as a differentiated role, a position emerging from group interaction. Roles were defined in terms of expectations that group members develop in regard to themselves and other group members. Other theorists have viewed leadership not as position or role but as a process of originating and maintaining role structure. Stogdill defined it as "the initiation and maintenance of structure in expectation and interaction."^27

James MacGregor Burns went beyond the traditional conceptions of leadership to leaders "inducing followers to act for certain goals that represent the values and motivations, wants and needs, aspirations and expectations of both leaders and followers." To Burns, leadership was a relationship between leaders and followers. It was a process of raising the consciousness of followers, a consciousness of what their values, priorities and needs are. Burns defined leadership in these terms:

Leadership over human beings is exercised when persons with certain motives and purposes mobilize, in competition or conflict with others; institutional, political, psychological and other resources so as to arouse, engage and satisfy the motives of followers.\(^29\)


\(^{28}\)Donald W. Robinson, "Can Educators Learn from Burns' Leadership Tome?" Phi Delta Kappan, LXI (October, 1979), 137.

The study of leadership can be traced to 1939 when Kurt Lewin, Ronald Lippitt and Ralph White presented their classic study concerning leadership styles. In 1959 Bennis summarized the progress to date:

As we survey the path leadership theory has taken, we spot the wreckage of "trait theory," "the great man" theory and the "situational critique," leadership styles, functional leadership and leaderless leadership; to say nothing of bureaucratic leadership, charismatic leadership, democratic-autocratic-laissez-faire leadership, group-centered leadership, reality-centered leadership and leadership by objective.

Since then, the study of leadership has included contingency models, transactional models and the path-goal models of leadership.

The Traits Theory of Leadership

The first major approach to the study of leadership was the traits approach. The traits theorists recognized leadership as a group phenomenon but regarded it as a one-way influence process. The Great Man Theories reinforced the concept that the leader was a person endowed with unique and superior qualities. Barnard explained leadership as early as 1926 in terms of personality and character.

The traits theorists assumed that leaders were different, and that there must be some deeper personality which causes people to

---


32 Stogdill, Handbook of Leadership, p. 17.
become leaders. Stogdill's review of leadership between 1904 and 1970 showed certain personality traits stressed for success.33

Research on personality traits began during World War I with attempts to screen out men who might not adjust to military life. The success achieved by military psychologists in devising tests of intelligence for use in the selection, classification, and assignment of military personnel did much to popularize the tests. Biographies were produced of geniuses who were found to excel in traits such as fortitude, persistence and moral integrity. Intelligence was believed to be related to physical stature. Genius was thought to be intellectual superiority as well as superiority in personality traits. Stogdill (1948) found that leaders were differentiated from followers in capacity, achievement, responsibility, participation and status. Stogdill and others (1971) surveyed research conducted between 1948 and 1969 and suggested a different classification—self-oriented, task-oriented and socially-oriented. Self-oriented traits included such traits as physical, intellectual and personality. Task-oriented traits included achievement drive, initiative and persistence. Socially-oriented traits included cooperativeness, tact and sociability.34

Stogdill concluded that personality is an important factor in the emergence and acceptance of leadership. Groups that are homogeneous as to the personality composition of the members tend to be better satisfied and are more effective under a leader with a similar set of personality traits.


However, members tend to differ in personality, expectations and demands that they make upon the leader.\(^{35}\)

Stogdill believed that one trait that is necessary for a leader to possess is verbalism, letting followers know that he/she is working for the welfare of the group and that he/she identifies with the purpose of the organization. B. M. Bass (1954) found that the member of a group who talks the most tends to emerge as a leader. Consideration was also found to be a strong trait of a leader.\(^{36}\) David C. Bowers and Stanley E. Seashore (1966) proposed four dimensions of leadership: support, interaction facilitation, goal emphasis and work facilitation.\(^{37}\) Halpin concluded that leaders do have traits which separate them from followers, but what traits set leaders apart will vary with the situation. Halpin used two specific areas to measure leader behavior: initiating structure and consideration. Halpin did not consider these traits but rather descriptions of the behavior of the leader.\(^{38}\) Stogdill concurred in his statement that a person does not become a leader by virtue of possession of traits, but the pattern of personality characteristics of the leader must bear some relevant relationship to the characteristics, activities, and goals of followers. To Stogdill, leadership was a working relationship among members of a group, in which the leader acquires status through


\(^{36}\)Ibid., p. 99.


active participation and demonstration of his capacity for carrying cooperative tasks through to completion.\textsuperscript{39}

**Styles of Leadership**

A leadership style is a particular behavior emphasized by the leader to motivate the group to accomplish the goals and objectives of the organization. One of the first and most influential studies on leadership styles was conducted in 1938 by Lewin, Lippitt, and White. They identified the leadership styles as democratic, authoritarian and laissez-faire. Under democratic leadership, group members exhibited higher degrees of initiative, morale, cohesiveness, freedom of action and work quality. Under autocratic leadership, members were more productive, more dependent, less creative, exhibited lower morale, became more frustrated, and exhibited hostility and aggression. Under laissez-faire leadership, there was less work and poorer work accomplished; group members asked for more guidance and frequently showed discontent.\textsuperscript{40}

Several authors have conceptualized leadership style in terms of the authority and discretion that subordinates are permitted based on the research of Lewin, Lippitt, and White. A. Lowin (1968) reviewed several studies that examined the effects of leadership styles which varied in terms of their participativeness. F. Heller and G. Yukl (1969) described leadership behavior as being either controlized or participative. Fred Fiedler (1967) analyzed leadership styles in terms of the least-preferred

\textsuperscript{39}Stogdill, *Handbook of Leadership*, pp. 63-64.

\textsuperscript{40}E. Mark Hanson, *Educational Administration and Organizational Behavior* (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1979), pp. 239-240.
Fiedler identified two styles, "relationship-motivated" or "task-motivated." The relationship-motivated leader seeks to maintain good interpersonal relationships with his/her subordinates. The task-motivated leader obtains personal satisfaction from accomplishing objectives in an effective and efficient manner.

Jack Gibb identified and described two ideal types of leadership style used by school administrators, depending on how an individual feels about himself/herself and about others. He described the authoritarian, paternalistic, conservative leader as defensive. This style was based on fear and distrust, persuasion and control. The second type he identified as participatory exemplified by high trust and confidence in people.

Douglas McGregor described two types of leadership, Theory X and Theory Y. How a leader views subordinates determine if he/she is a Theory X or Theory Y leader. If the leader views man as indolent, lacking ambition, disliking responsibility, self-centered, indifferent to organizational needs, resistant to change and not very bright, he/she will react more authoritarian. This type of leader possesses a philosophy of direction and control. A Theory Y leader views man as motivated, possessing self-initiative and responsibility, and responsive to organizational needs and goals. Theory Y leaders rely on self-control and self-direction.

Another popular classification of leadership styles is the nomothetic,
ideographic, and transactional. The nomothetic leader holds a classical view of leadership. He/she emphasizes the requirements of the organization. The ideographic leader emphasizes the personal dimension of subordinate behavior, with sensitivity to the needs of the group members. The transactional leader recognizes the need to vary the nomothetic and ideographic styles depending on the situation. Erwin Rausch based his Linking Elements concept on the belief that the level of performance of an organization, to the extent to which it can be influenced by the leader, depends on the skills with which the leader can balance the needs and characteristics of the organization. The Linking Elements concept was based on five assumptions:

1. Leader actions are shaped by the environment, the people, and the leader's characteristics.

2. A leader cannot motivate others, but can only create an environment in which others can find motivation.

3. Decision-making and communication skills are required for all activities.

4. A major determinant of success for an organization is the extent to which organizational needs are aligned with employee needs and characteristics.

5. A comprehensive concept must consider the findings and conclusions of prominent researchers and theorists.

Rensis Likert's System 4 is a participative-group system of leadership. The concern was not for leader behaviors but rather concern was shown for outcomes both of the behavior of the leader and of other

---

45. Hanson, p. 242.

organizational conditions. Likert concluded that effective leaders tend to have relationships with their subordinates that are supportive and enhance the employee's sense of personal worth and importance. In addition, effective leaders use group supervision and decision-making and tend to set high performance goals.47

Jane Srygley Mouton and Robert R. Blake used a two-dimensional approach for portraying different leadership styles. Their Management Grid with five styles identified was based on different blends of a leader's concern for people and concern for production. The lower-left corner of the grid represents a minimum concern for both people and production. The upper-left corner shows a minimum concern for production and a maximum concern for people. The two remaining corners represent a maximum concern for production/minimum concern for people and maximum concern for both people and production. Mouton and Blake considered the ideal leader as one who shows maximum concern for both production and people.48

Halpin and Winer identified two dimensions in an effort to explain effective leadership. They concluded that an effective leader would score high on both initiating structure and consideration. Edwin Fleishman, in a review of research, found that "high-structure/high consideration pattern optimizes effectiveness, whereas low-consideration/low structure pattern appears the least desirable."49


48 Carlisle, Management: Concepts and Situations, p. 473.

49 Hanson, pp. 244-245.
Robert J. House and Gary Dessler identified four leadership styles: directive, supportive, achievement-oriented, and participative. A directive leader gives structure to the work situation by establishing specific expectations for the subordinates concerning task accomplishment. A supportive leader has friendly relationships and shows concern for subordinates. He/she is supportive and exhibits trust. Achievement-oriented leaders stress productivity. He/she sets challenging goals and emphasizes excellence. A participative leader consults with subordinates and considers their views in decision-making. Robert Tannenbaum and Warren Schmidt classified leaders as "boss-centered" or "subordinate-centered."  

Still other researchers and theorists classified leaders as effective and ineffective. Such was the classification presented by Ralph Kimbrough in the report on the Tennessee Project supported by the W. K. Kellogg Foundation and the University of Tennessee. The research was based on the assumption that there are certain behavioral characteristics which differentiate effective and ineffective leaders.  

Situational-Behavioral Approaches to Leadership

Situational-Behavioral approaches to the study of leadership are based on the following generalizations:

1. Educational leaders are perceived to possess unique leader behavior orientation.

---

50 Hanson, p. 256.

2. Preferences and expectations for leader behaviors vary.

3. The leader's perceptions of his own behavior differ from other's perceptions.

4. Confidence in leadership, satisfaction, effectiveness, and attitudes toward the work situation are influenced by incongruence in expectations for leader behavior.

5. The effectiveness of leaders may be compromised in interpersonal relationships by misperceptions and the existence of value differences.

6. Relational studies indicate that leader behavior is related to many organizational variables.

7. Situational factors influence leader behavior.  

The Situational Approach concentrates on sociological variables inherent in specific groups and situations. Leadership is the product of relationships in social and group situations. Leadership in varying situations may show dissimilar characteristics. The study of group characteristics, organizational relationships and roles characterize the Situational Approach.

Daniel Griffiths defined leadership or administrative behavior as the "behavior of human beings in a social organization. Concern was shown for the dynamics of human activity rather than the mechanics of organization." Stogdill believed that "leadership is entirely situational in origin and that no personal characteristics are predictive.

---
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of leadership." Stogdill concluded that situational factors play a very significant role in the emergence of leaders and in leadership performance. However, Stogdill also indicated that different leadership skills and traits are required in different situations. This approach stressed the influence of individual differences, attributing all variance between persons to fortuitous demands of the environment. Bass concluded that leadership occurs whenever one person's behavior causes any behavior of another. Leadership may be defined simply as a "directed social force." Situational influences on leader behavior included the following: (1) variables related to group characteristics including size, viscosity, homogeneity, flexibility, stability, permeability, polarization, autonomy, intimacy and control; (2) variables in work situations including worker personality, obviousness of solutions to problems, cooperation required, nature of the task roles, the group's attitude toward leaders; (3) variables characterizing high production including morale, satisfaction, and work attitude; (4) variables related to leader behavior as affected by size, type, and location; (5) variables related to conflicts stemming from
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differing expectations; (6) variables related to staff acceptance of administrative leadership.59

The Behavioral Approach to the study of leadership focuses upon observed behavior rather than a capacity for leadership. It does not assume that leader behavior in one situation will carry over into other situations. The Behavioral Approach does not emphasize that leader behavior is determined innately or situationally. Whereas the Situational Approach focuses on relationships and variables in social and environmental situations, the Behavioral Approach focuses on the search for significant behavioral dimensions to be used in describing and delineating leader behavior.60

Leader Behavior Dimensions of Leadership

An organization's performance is believed to be related to the effectiveness of the leader's behavior. One of the recurring problems in the study of leadership is that of achieving an objective portrait of how the leader behaves.61 John K. Hemphill and Alvin E. Coons defined leadership as "the behavior of an individual when he is directing the activities of a group toward a shared goal." Leader behavior includes


behavior having a positive and social content as implied by "directing a group." It does not involve behavior serving individual goal attainment.

Halpin referred to leader behavior as "an individual's perceptions, feelings, attitudes, thoughts and verbalizations as well as overt actions." Halpin saw administration as human activity which involves four components: (1) the task, (2) the formal organization, (3) the work group, and (4) the leader. The leader is one member of the organization charged with responsibility for the organization's accomplishment. Halpin sought to discover the relationship between descriptions of what the leader does and independent evaluations of the effectiveness of his/her leadership. Halpin concluded that a leader's beliefs about how he/she should behave as a leader are not highly associated with his/her behavior as described by his/her followers.

Halpin distinguished between leader behavior and leadership. To him, leadership refers to an attribute or inherent characteristic of behavior. It suggests that individuals differ in their capacity or potential for leadership and that this potential is determined by intrinsic factors
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in the individual. Therefore, Halpin felt that there would be little justification for devoting time to training for leadership. Leader behavior focuses upon observable behavior rather than upon a capacity inferred from the behavior. With the attention focused upon behavior rather than capacity, there is greater possibilities of training individuals to be leaders.

Analyses of leadership have frequently presumed that leadership style or leader behavior was an independent variable that could be selected or influenced at will to conform to what research defined as leadership. Some theorists assumed that once persons knew what leader behavior would increase effectiveness, that behavior could be implemented. Such was the theory of Likert (1961), McGregor (1966), Getzels and Guba (1957) and Bass (1960). If leader behavior is thought to be a dependent variable, situational factors and individual differences are independent variables. There is a strong a priori basis for believing that the way a leader behaves is a function both of properties of the situation and of relatively stable properties of the person such as his characteristics, beliefs, and attitudes.

Utilizing the behavior approach to the study of leadership, scholars at the Personnel Research Board of the Ohio State University isolated
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two dimensions for describing leader behavior. Initiating structure refers to the leader's behavior in delineating the relationships between himself/herself and the members of the group and endeavoring to establish well-defined patterns of organization, channels of communication and methods of procedure. Consideration refers to behavior indicative of friendship, mutual trust, respect and warmth in the relationship between the leader and the members of the staff.\textsuperscript{70}

Hemphill and Halpin found that high scores on initiation structure and consideration are associated with the effectiveness of the educational administrator.\textsuperscript{71} R. T. Sharpe (1956) reported that teachers and staff members perceived principals to deviate less from the ideal norms than did the principals themselves. M. Seeman (1957, 1960) wrote that the evaluations of school principals' leader effectiveness are positively related to teacher descriptions of structure, consideration, communication, and willingness to change. T. B. Greenfield and J. H. M. Andrews (1961) found that both consideration and initiating structure of teachers as described by pupils are positively and significantly related to pupil scores in academic subjects. B. T. Keeler and Andrews (1963) also concluded that the leader behavior of the teacher influences pupil achievement; leader behavior of the principal also exerts a significant effect on pupil


performance. Arlene Gilligan reported that principals who score high in initiating structure and consideration on the LBDQ scored a significantly higher level of analytic style. R. G. Fast (1964) found that the actual consideration and initiating structure scores of principals were positively related to teacher satisfaction, but ideal scores were not. Stogdill (1965) concluded that the leader's consideration tends to be associated with group drive and freedom of action. Leader structure of expectations tends to be associated with group cohesiveness and support of the organization. Abraham Korman (1966) reviewed the investigations utilizing measures of consideration and initiating structure as predictors of effectiveness of group performance and concluded that "very little is known as to how these variables may predict work group performance."

Leadership depends on followership and that is a function of cooperation or mutuality with the leader rather than forcible domination and coercion by the leader. Distinction can be made between superordination and leadership. Both entail behavior that "initiate new structure in interaction." However, the source of superordination lies in vested authority while the source of leadership lies in entrusted authority. The relationship between subordinate and superordinate is compulsory; the relationship
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between follower and leader is voluntary. Entrusted authority is advantageous to group work performance.

If leadership grows out of an interaction process in which one member of the group is granted the right to initiate and maintain such structure as may be necessary for the accomplishment of group goals, then the followers play a large part in defining the leadership structure of the group, and their roles and desires are legitimate concerns to the group and the leader. The criterion for identifying a leader is not the degree of leader effectiveness. If the leader is chosen by mutual consent, this tends to legitimate the leadership role for the group. If the leader is appointed, such appointment legitimates the leadership role for the organization. By legitimation is meant a set of expectations bearing on the role that sanctions the continued structuring of group member expectations by the leader.

More Recent Approaches to Leadership

More recent approaches to leadership have been based on the view that there are many more contingencies and many more causes and effects which must be considered if one is to understand leadership. Such theories included a Contingency Model developed by Fiedler; a Path-Goal Model,
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Fred Fiedler’s Contingency Model presented in 1967 defined leadership effectiveness as group performance. Emphasis was placed on the importance of the situation in leadership effectiveness. Fiedler maintained that a leader’s style ranges from highly task-oriented to highly relationship-oriented. Effectiveness depends on the interaction of the leader’s style and the favorableness of the situation. The favorableness of the situation is determined by the nature and quality of leader-member relationships, the amount of power in the leader’s formal position and the amount of structure in the task. The emphasis in Fiedler’s theory was that when the situation is either highly favorable or highly unfavorable for the leader, the more effective leadership style will be a task-oriented one. A highly relationship-oriented style is called for when the situation tends to be neither favorable nor unfavorable. 

Fiedler was concerned with performance and productivity. Task-motivated leaders tell people what to do and how to do the job. The leader’s primary goal is accomplishment. A secondary goal is concern for subordinates’ feelings and satisfactions. Just as Abraham Maslow, Fiedler saw a hierarchy of needs. He felt that a leader must have control and influence and assurance
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that the task will get done before he/she can be concerned with the feelings of subordinates. The relationship-motivated leader shares leadership responsibility with group members and involves them in planning and execution of the task. Close personal relationships would be high on the hierarchy of needs.\textsuperscript{83}

While leader personality was one factor of effectiveness, the other factor was the situation. Fiedler visualized eight types of work group situations, varying in degree as to how favorable each was to the leader when he/she attempted to have influence on the group.\textsuperscript{84} Fiedler was concerned with the way in which one of the leader's personal attributes affects the performance of the group or organization. The personality variable used by Fiedler to characterize differences among leaders is the Least Preferred Co-Worker (LPC). He examined the relationship between the leader's LPC score and objective criteria of group performance.\textsuperscript{85} He felt that leaders should be trained in how to change their leadership situations rather than their personalities. Fiedler concluded that the most important of the three situational variables is leader-member relations; the next important is the structure of the task, and the least important is formal authority. Fiedler felt it would be better to adjust the situation to the person rather than hire a person to fit the situation.\textsuperscript{86} Thus Fiedler's leadership model relates the two styles of leadership to situations
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that are differentiated on the basis of how favorable the leader-member relations are, the task structure of the group and how much power the leader possesses.  

Evans (1968, 1970) used the Ohio State studies' dimensions of initiating structure and consideration to measure the performance ratings of subordinates and found that three kinds of leader actions will increase productivity. If the leader acts in a supportive way and provides initiation of structure in a way that clarifies the paths people can use to achieve their goals, and lets them know that payoffs are contingent on their performing in a certain way, then motivation and productivity will both increase.  

Tannenbaum and Schmidt reacted to the view that democratic leadership produced both better human satisfaction and better productivity. They viewed leadership using a situational approach. Seven leadership styles were arranged on a continuum from what they called "boss-centered leadership" to "subordinate-centered leadership." Their theme was that a wide range of factors determine the appropriate style of leadership. The factors included characteristics of the leader, characteristics of the subordinate, and characteristics of the situation. These fifteen factors influenced the choice of one of seven leadership styles. The factors served as a checklist to be used by the leader to diagnose a situation and choose the appropriate leadership style. There was no implication in the Tannenbaum and Schmidt model that either end of the continuum is
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more effective than the other. The situation determined subordinate power and influence in decisions. They implied that leaders need to learn a wider range of leadership styles. Another implication was that neither the leader nor the subordinate has complete control. The continuum included a range of possible leadership behaviors available to the leader. Each action was related to the degree of authority used by the leader and the amount of freedom available to the subordinate. The following were the behavior points arranged on the continuum:

1. The manager makes the decision and announces it. The leader provides no opportunity for members to participate in the decision-making process.

2. The manager "sells" his decision. The leader persuades followers to accept the decision.

3. The manager presents his/her ideas, invites questions. The leader explains his/her thinking and intentions.

4. The manager presents a tentative decision subject to change. The subordinates can exert some influence on the decision.

5. The manager presents the problem, gets suggestions, and then makes the decision. The subordinates get the first chance to suggest solutions.

6. The manager permits the group to make decisions within prescribed limits. The leader has no more authority than any other group member.

In 1973, Tannenbaum and Schmidt updated their theory to include subsequent societal changes and new management concepts to incorporate recent behavioral science findings and the contributions of open-systems theory.
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In 1957 certain psychologists (Evans, Georgopoulos, and Vroom) were concerned with the cognitive or reasoning processes subordinates might go through in response to the behavior of leaders. This view held that individuals act to a large extent on a rational basis. The Path-Goal Theory of leadership held that leaders must, if subordinates are to know the "ground rules," help people see various instrument payoffs, and be consistent in applying rewards. Leaders must help members see "paths" or payoffs. The Path-Goal Theory held that instrument payoffs and their relation to basic payoffs were the paths to the goal of need fulfillment. Leaders help set instrument payoffs in the form of incentives and help subordinates attain their basic goals. 93

Path-Goal Theory considered the Expectancy Theory of behavior which held that:

1. Human beings are reasonable, at least from their point of view.

2. There are two kinds of payoffs. Basic payoffs satisfy basic needs—physiological, security, social needs, self-esteem, self-actualization. Instrumental payoffs are rewards such as money, job transfer, promotion.

3. Payoffs have different values to individuals.

4. Individuals choose an action or make the effort that will yield the greater payoffs.

Expectancy Theory had value in the study of leadership because it identified the key mental processes in the minds of subordinates which must be influenced if leaders are to influence workers' motivations. Vroom suggested that:
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In order for participative leadership to affect motivation for effective performance, it would not only have to be a source of satisfaction, but would also have to affect the probability that an individual would be able to attain further satisfaction from performing well in his job.94

The Vroom-Yetton theory of leadership related leadership style to the particular problem to be solved. An assumption was made that the properties of the problem established the desired degree of participation determined by the following variables:

1. The importance of the quality of the decision.

2. The extent to which the leader possesses sufficient information and expertise to make a high quality decision by himself/herself.

3. The extent to which subordinates, taken collectively, have the necessary information to make a high quality decision.

4. The extent to which the problem is structured.

5. The extent to which acceptance on the part of subordinates is critical to the effective implementation of the decision.

6. The prior probability that the leader's autocratic decision will be accepted by subordinates.

7. The extent to which subordinates are motivated to attain the organization's goals.

8. The extent to which subordinates are likely to be in disagreement over preferred solutions.95

The Vroom-Yetton Model contained five types of leadership. Through autocratic processes "the manager solves the problem by himself/herself using whatever information is available," or he/she "obtains any necessary information from subordinates before making a decision." Through
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consultative processes, "he/she shares the problem with relevant subordinates to obtain ideas and suggestions at a group meeting." Through group processes, the "manager's role is that of chairperson of a group meeting aimed at reaching consensus on the action to be taken."96

Robert A. House and others developed the path-goal theory of leadership which emphasized the leader's role in maximizing motivation to achieve individual and group goals. The functions of a leader were as follows:

1. Recognize and/or arouse subordinate needs for outcomes over which the leader has some control.
2. Increase personal payoffs to subordinates for work-goal attainment.
3. Make the paths to payoffs easier to travel by coaching and directing.
4. Help subordinates clarify expectancies.
5. Reduce frustrating barriers.
6. Increase the opportunity for personal satisfaction.97

House (1971) extended the Path-Goal theory by including four types of leader behavior. According to House and House and Mitchell (1974), leadership was more than initiating structure and consideration. They saw four types of leader behavior affecting three kinds of subordinate attitudes or expectations. The four leader behaviors included directive leadership, supportive leadership, participative leadership, and achievement leadership. These four leader behaviors affected the following subordinate attitudes or expectations: satisfaction, expectation that effort will
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result in effective performance since performance is the path to reward, and subordinate acceptance of the leader. 98

Barry C. Jentz characterized leadership as personal change in a professional setting. Jentz defined leadership as "interaction, internal processes and interpersonal behavior." 99 The mode of leadership accompanying a time of abundance can be called "additive." The central idea of leadership was one of adding resources which would produce change or improve individual and institutional performance. Many of the skills leaders develop are based on the additive mode. In a period of decline, however, one must examine old and develop appropriate styles. 100

To judge one's effectiveness as a leader, he/she must redefine the old criteria of "being liked" as conflict or resistance. The leader must accept his/her separateness and honor that of others. "Being right" must be redefined as knowledge acquired through interaction. "Being in control" must be redefined as responsibility, taking responsibility for self but not for thoughts and feelings of others, or for forces over which one can have no control. "Being invulnerable" must be redefined as caring. "Being rational" must be redefined as possessing information that is shared. 101 Jentz concluded:

That which terrifies or disgusts us about ourselves, that from which we long to free ourselves--those ambivalences,
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inner conflicts, feelings we think we should not have, those vulnerabilities, in short—are what we have to face and welcome into full participation in ourselves. Acknowledged, accepted, welcomed, those same vulnerabilities provide the basis for new self-respect and courage. When we do that, we are in a position to construct a new way of offering leadership.102

John Miner argued that the concept of leadership itself has outlived its usefulness. Miner argued for abandoning leadership in favor of a theory of control. He believed that self-control is not adequate because it relies on remnants of early parental training. Miner suggested external control in the forms of (1) hierarchic or administrative, (2) professional or ideological, (3) group and (4) task. Hierarchic control involved work control by those at hierarchial levels, through the use of positive and negative sanctions which does not preclude shared decisions. The managerial style was one of initiating structure and autocratic approach. The motivational basis was the motivation to manage, a composite of varying mixes of favorable attitudes toward authority, a desire to compete, a desire to exercise power, assertiveness, a desire to hold a distinct position and a sense of responsibility, a desire to take charge and manage. The primary problem was the tendency for upward communication to be distorted so as to serve the insecurities and ambitions at lower levels. Professional or ideological control relied on the values, norms, ethical precepts and codes of the group. The leadership style emphasized the use of expert power, expertise and professional accomplishment. The major problem with this type of leader was that the professional identification may be too weak, causing the person to leave the profession. Group control involved decisions made by consensus.
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Participative management offered group control as an alternative to hierarchic control. Leadership style was employee-centered. Task control involved setting a pace or push for work through job enlargement or enrichment.\textsuperscript{103}

Development of leadership theory since 1975 has been creative yet fragmented and incomplete. Such approaches have appeared as the path-goal work presented by John E. Sheridan, H. Kirk Downey and John Slocum and contingency views; information-processing theory and cognitive style presented by Bayard E. Wynne and Philip L. Hunsaker; theories of social structure and influence processes such as that developed by Gerald R. Salancik; A. G. Jago and Victor Vroom's behavioral decision theory; and Harrison G. Graen and James F. Cashman's vertical dyad linkage model closely related to role theory.\textsuperscript{104} Burns referred to failure to develop a complete theory in that the:

Crisis of leadership today is the mediocrity or irresponsibility of so many of the men and women in power, but leadership rarely rises to the full need for it. The fundamental crisis underlying mediocrity is intellectual. We know far too little about leadership. We fail to grasp the essence of leadership that is relevant to the modern age and hence we cannot agree even on the standards by which to measure, recruit or reject it. Leadership is one of the most observed and least understood phenomena on earth.\textsuperscript{105}

\textbf{Women in the Work Force}

"Women's experience can be seen as a document of oppression. They
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have been systematically excluded from institutional and economic life and this exclusion is still going on." The definition of women's work changed in the 1800's due to the Industrial Revolution. Working women became those who earned money for their labor. They were usually either school teachers, seamstresses, domestic or factory operatives, with teaching being the most respectable job for them. Women workers were treated paternalistic and lectured on the importance of honesty, cleanliness, frugality and punctuality. Women posed little threat for men's jobs; major occupations were sex-segregated with women hired for the least skilled jobs labeled "Female Only." Not until the late 1800's did male unions and middle-class women's organizations begin to acknowledge the plight of the working woman. Discrimination against women continued into the twentieth century. Women were still poorly paid, segregated in "female" jobs, and treated as temporary workers. Work shifted from domestic and factory work to occupations such as secretary, file clerk, saleswoman, waitress and hairdresser. When women were hired into offices, clerical work was restructured, and its status declined. Women were offered and accepted lower pay than men. They were assigned the more routine, less responsible jobs, while male clerks were promoted to managerial positions.107

Much of the work women do today outside their homes deflates their self-images. According to studies conducted by the Department of Labor, the majority of the worst white-collar jobs are held by women. Women are
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over represented on assembly lines. Yet they derive the same satisfaction
as men do from the intrinsic rewards of work, when they are available. Women are motivated by a new set of aspirations and needs in their efforts for equality. Women desire economic independence, psychological rewards, and are motivated by new social and economic realities.

One of the major barriers to the full participation of women in the labor force has been the perpetuation of myths and generalizations about women. Occupational stereotyping occurs when a large majority of those in an occupation are of one sex, and when there is an associated normative expectation. Characteristics necessary for success in a sex-typed occupation become those associated with either a male or female stereotype. The tendency has been for women to be excluded from "non-feminine" pursuits or those involving supervision of employees. The results of these practices are to crowd women into a limited number of jobs where the pressure of excess supply lowers wages. Women become secretaries, school teachers, waitresses and nurses; men become plumbers, doctors, engineers and school administrators. Such a division of labor becomes self-perpetuating since each sex is socialized, trained and counseled into certain jobs.

D. Broverman (1972) found evidence of persistent and pervasive stereotypes in our culture across groups varying in age, sex, marital
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status and education. Male stereotypes include descriptors such as independent, objective, active, competitive, logical, skilled in business, worldly, adventurous, able to make decisions easily, self-confident, and acting as a leader. Females were passive, noncompetitive, dependent, subjective, illogical, gentle, sensitive, tactful, religious, neat and quiet. J. Spence, R. Helmreich and J. Stapp (1974) found that when women describe themselves according to society's sex-role expectations, they include many negative aspects of femininity which may lower their own self-esteem. Natalie Porter, Florence Geis and Joyce Walstedt found that both males and females tend to label man as the leader of the group. Shirley Summers and Sara Kiesler found that both men and women attribute the man's success to ability; the woman's success to "trying harder."

Researchers in psychology have acknowledged that the vast range of differences between the sexes reflects social influences, but have also concluded that neurological constitutions also influence behavior. Monte Buchsbaum concluded that women are more sensitive to visual stimuli, sounds and touch, but may be less able to handle heavy stress. Eleanor Maccaby and Carol Jacklin found that females have greater verbal ability and that males excel in visual-spatial, mathematical ability and are more aggressive. Sandra Witelson concluded that any differences between males and females should not keep females from entering professions because the difference is in the number of individuals with skills in certain


spheres of activity, not in the level of skill possible in the highly skilled individual. 113

The Bureau of Labor Statistics has consistently underestimated the growth of the female work force. Its 1976 projection for female participation for 1980 has already been exceeded. 114 In 1970 there were 29 million females employed, representing 38 percent of the total labor force. By 1975, there were 34 million females employed, representing 40 percent of the labor force. In 1976, females represented 41 percent of the labor force. Characteristics of the labor force have shown severe occupational segregation. Despite efforts toward equality, "traditionally female" occupations still persist.

Changes shown in representation of women within the total work force from 1970 to 1975 have been attributed to the following occurrences:

1. The number of women working increased. The growth rate was 13 percent as compared to 5 percent for males.
2. Growth in the service industry has resulted in greater employment for women.
3. Economic events have sharply reduced available jobs.
4. Pressure from women's movement and federal non-discrimination laws and regulations have increased female participation. 115

Despite the fact that legislation has been directed toward the elimination of discrimination in employment, the relative employment

status of women has shown little improvement in some respects and has deteriorated in some ways. De facto occupational segregation still restricts women. Underemployment is more characteristic of the female than of the male. Forty percent of employed women are still concentrated in ten traditional fields—secretarial, retail trade, salesworker, bookkeeper, private household worker, elementary school teacher, waitress, typist, cashier, sewer and nurse. In these ten fields, women comprise 80 percent of the workers. Even in "female" occupations, there is lack of promotional opportunities.

A view of overall trends in the nation's occupations has shown that occupational segregation may be easing. The rate of growth of female workers in "male" occupations has been greater than in women's employment as a whole. Women moving into male intensive jobs earn more money, but not as much as the male doing identical work. For better educated females, the proportion of females entering male intensive professions has increased only slightly. In 1970, only 10 percent of women professionals worked in the corporate sector; 90 percent were nurses, health care, social workers, and teachers. There was also an imbalance in managerial and administrative occupations. Among males, 76 percent of the managerial positions were in the corporate sector compared to less than 60 percent for females. Over 40 percent of female managers and administrators were employed in schools and colleges, real estate, hotels and motels, religious


and welfare agencies and government offices. In 1975, there was a favorable change in the representation of women in professional and technical jobs in the corporate sector. Representation in professional roles in other parts of the economy seems to have remained steady.\textsuperscript{119}

Attempts have been made to legislate equality of opportunities for minorities and women. In February, 1963, President John Kennedy sent a message to Congress announcing his intention to recommend legislation to eliminate racial discrimination and to assure civil rights for Negros. The bill infuriated women because it prohibited discrimination on the grounds of "color, creed, or national origin" but omitted "sex."\textsuperscript{120} A southern congressman, in an attempt to defeat the equal employment provisions, added prohibition of sex discrimination. He felt that the provisions would make the law unenforceable and defeat it. However, from emphasis on racial equality, it opened the door to sex equality. Title VII of the Civil Rights Act "prohibits discrimination in employment based on sex, race, color, religion, and national origin."\textsuperscript{121}

The Equal Pay Act of 1963 prohibited discrimination on the basis of sex "by paying wages to employees at a rate less than the rate at which he pays wages to employees of the opposite sex for equal work performed under similar working conditions."\textsuperscript{122} Additional relevant legislation
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includes the Civil Rights Act of 1964, Title VI which prohibited sex
discrimination in educational programs receiving federal funds. Executive
Order No. 11246 of 1965 prohibited discrimination on the basis of race,
color, religion and national origin by institutions with federal contracts
of $10,000 or more and required contractors to take affirmative action to
ensure non-discriminatory employment practices. Executive Order No. 11375
of 1967 added sex discrimination to Executive Order No. 11246. The
Comprehensive Health Manpower Training Act and Nurse Training Amendments
Act of 1971 amended Title VI and Title VII of the Public Service Act,
affecting individuals in federally assisted health personnel training
programs. Order No. 4 of 1971 revised Executive Order No. 11375 and
required that affirmative action plans be submitted to the Department of
Labor for federal contracts of $50,000 or more with fifty or more
employees. The 1972 Educational Amendments to the Equal Pay Act of 1963,
known as the Higher Education Act, prohibited sex discrimination in
salaries and fringe benefits of educational institutions. The 1972 Equal
Rights Amendments were ratified by thirty-two states. Federal enactment
of the Act requires enactment by three more states. The Women's
Educational Equity Act of 1974 established a Council on Women's Educa-
tional Programs in the Office of Education directed toward the elimination
of sex bias in education. The 1975 Title IX prohibited sex discrimination
in educational programs and activities.123

Equal employment opportunity legislation is important with affirmative
action programs that require employers to take the initiative in recruiting
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and promoting women in all types of work, and eliminating discriminatory practices. Programs must be designed to cope with social and institutional sexism as well as individual prejudice. Laws help protect women against overt acts of discrimination, but laws do not eliminate customary patterns of behavior and cultural stereotypes. There is an urgent need to accomplish the following:

1. To change the cultural and societal stereotypes about females.
2. To achieve mobility and earnings parity between the sexes.
3. To advance opportunities for women.
4. To respect individual choice by females to work in the labor force or to work in the home.
5. To redesign jobs for all workers to make them more intrinsically rewarding.\textsuperscript{124}

**Women in Education and Leadership Positions**

"Americans sometimes behave as if there were two distinct American school systems: the one the man's world of politics and financing; the other the woman's world of the classroom, teaching, and the child."\textsuperscript{125}

When the first schools were established, females taught young boys; males taught more advanced levels. Females were discriminated against in educational opportunity. The seventeenth century "dame school" excluded
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girls. In the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, girls were trained separately but not equally.  

The popular view has been that administration is a man's job, requiring physical strength. This closes leadership positions to females. It has produced biases favorable to male coaches receiving principalships and superintendencies. Traditionally, when an administrator is needed, the practice is to look for a man rather than a person.  

Boards of education display a distinct preference for men, not only at the secondary level, but also at the elementary level. 

Sex bias and stereotyping in filling administrative positions has not been supported by research. In 1972, the New York State Fleischman Commission studying secondary school administrators concluded that "nothing in our studies has convinced us that males are inherently superior to females as educational administrators." Hemphill found that women principals scored higher on knowledge of teaching methods and techniques and that female principals tended to be more concerned with objectives, pupil participation, and evaluation of learning. Women principals were found to ask subordinates for information to a greater degree than men. Men made more concluding decisions, followed preestablished structures and took a greater number of terminal actions. Hemphill concluded that when evaluated by superiors and by teachers, it was found that both groups

127 Ibid., p. 12.
128 Hemphill, Griffiths and Frederiksen, Administrative Performance and Personality, p. 332.
129 LeCoultre, p. 11.
were somewhat negative toward male principals and generally positive toward women principals. Hulda Grobman and Vyncie A. Hines found that male principals were described as "undemocratic" and female principals as "democratic." Teachers expressed greater satisfaction with the human relations which exist in schools administered by democratic leaders. A Department of Labor survey indicated that at least three-fourths of both men and women respondents who had worked for women held favorable views of women super-

Visors. Verla Schuttlesworth found that women faculty members hold positive attitudes toward women administrators, rated their performance as satisfactory and perceive them as highly competent. Schuttlesworth concluded that both male and female faculty serving under women leaders are not sex-biased in their preference for an administrator. In general, however, men tend to hold less favorable attitudes toward women in administration than do women. Since men are predominate on school boards and as public school officials, their attitudes appear to be a significant factor in perpetuating the male sex bias in administrative appointments. 

Majorie Huserik concluded that the low incidence of females serving in educational leadership positions is due both to internal and external factors as a result of social and cultural forces. The majority of female administrators have not actively pursued their positions, nor have they

---

130 Hemphill, Griffiths and Frederiksen, Administrative Performance and Personality, pp. 333-334.

131 Special Task Force to the Secretary of HEW, Work in America, p. 60.

aspired toward top positions. Women administrators reported negative sex-biased attitudes of superiors as the major deterrent to their opportunity for promotions.\textsuperscript{133} The usual excuse for failure to advance women are these: lack of females certified, qualified, and available for appointment; lack of females aspiring to leadership positions; role conflict creating lack of time for females to devote to leadership positions. Virginia L. Wylie found that professional women are quickly forced to become good organizers and to solve their problems creatively. As a result, women have developed an excellent potential for leadership.\textsuperscript{134}

The presence of women in leadership positions in education despite legislative efforts against discrimination is a well-known struggle against the odds of a decreasing number of available positions. During the last decade, women made virtually no gains in administration in higher education; an already small number of principalships continued to decline; and women superintendents now make up only 1 percent of the total.\textsuperscript{135} The following statement was presented in the federal government publication, The Condition of Education, 1977:

The distribution of employment by sex for school staff reveals a strong dominance of traditional sex roles. Administrative positions are held predominately by males; teaching positions by females.\textsuperscript{136}


\textsuperscript{135} Anne Lewis, "Women in the CCSSO, and How It Happened," Phi Delta Kappan, LX (March, 1980), 479-480.

\textsuperscript{136} LeCoulter, p. ll.
The same sentiment was expressed concerning the plight of women educators in Tennessee: "Females are expected to be good privates; they're rewarded sometimes with promotions to sergeants; but rarely are they even considered for general." ¹³⁷

The percentage of women in educational administration has declined. A disturbing fifty-year trend can be seen in the report presented by the National Association of Elementary School Principals in 1978. Every ten years, the typical elementary school principal is less likely to be a female. Similar findings were reported in 1978 in studies concerning the secondary school principalship. These comparisons are presented in Table 1: ¹³⁸

Table 1
Comparison by Sex of the Principal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although no comparable data on the relative proportions of males and females in the principalship before 1928 are available, previous information

¹³⁷ LeCoultre, p. 10.

shows that the first principalships were held entirely by men. Large numbers of women became principals in the late nineteenth century. In the early twentieth century, females held the majority of the nation's principalships. In 1928, 55 percent of the elementary school principals were females. In 1948, only 49 percent were females; in 1958, 38 percent of the principals were females. In 1968, the percentage of female elementary principals had declined to 22 percent. By 1978, only 18 percent of the elementary principals were females. In addition, women are more likely to be principals in small schools. In schools with enrollment less than one hundred students, approximately one-third of the principals are females. Only slightly over one-fifth of the schools enrolling one thousand or more students are headed by female administrators.139

In education, power is in administration. Women are the majority of the public elementary school teachers and hold more than half of the secondary teaching positions. Men are predominant at all administrative levels and hold greater power, status and monetary rewards.140 In Tennessee, men hold 96 percent of the superintendencies and 97 percent of the secondary principalships. Males also hold 79 percent of the elementary principalships.141 The conclusion made by the NAESP is that "unless concerted affirmative action programs are set in motion, the principalship will become even more the sole preserve of the white male."142

The assumption has been that the early training of females fails to develop, or actually inhibits managerial motivation. This was expressed

139Zakariya and Pharis, pp. 4-5, 57. 140LeCoulbre, p. 10. 141Ibid.
142Zakariya and Pharis, p. 103.
by John B. Miner in reference to the culture-based differences in child-rearing practices applied to males and females existing in this society: "It seems not at all unlikely that females may be imbued with the motivation to manage to a considerably lesser extent, and thus prove to be lacking in one of the crucial ingredients for managerial success."\[^{143}\] In studies conducted in schools, one clearly significant difference appeared between males and females. The authority figure characteristic favored females. Miner implied that those women who are in leadership roles have motivational capacity as well as men. In addition, females scored higher in conscientiousness or sense of responsibility. Therefore, in the field of education, sex differences are clearly lacking in motives to manage. Based on research, it appeared that women possess the motivation needed for managerial success. A sizeable number of potential female leaders exists. Miner concluded that females represent a valuable source of unrealized managerial talent.\[^{144}\]

Paula F. Silver defined leadership as a "position of influence at or near the top of an organizational hierarchy." Leaders have influence by virtue of status authority, expertise, power, and/or control of resources.\[^{145}\] In an effort to understand the decrease in the number of females in leadership positions in education, Silver examined the stages in a career in education and the factors influencing women at each stage. First, in teacher training, the social structure of the institution supports and reinforces the "hidden curriculum" of male dominance. Second, in the teaching experience, supervisory positions are overwhelmingly and

\[^{143}\text{Miner, Motivation to Manage, p. 150.}\]
\[^{144}\text{Ibid., pp. 157-166.}\]
\[^{145}\text{Silver, Women in Educational Leadership: A Trend Discussion, p. 7.}\]
increasingly held by men. Third, during graduate training, females are again in the minority and are often discriminated against in recommendations for jobs. Fourth, entry-level leadership positions isolate female principals from the teaching staff, and they may be even further isolated amidst a group of male administrators. Fifth, in higher levels of leadership, females are in the minority. The increase of females serving on boards of education may even further decrease the proportion of females in the superintendency. M. S. Horner (1971) implied that tradition-oriented females on school boards may have deep-seated biases against other females, against professional women who defy the norms. Success beyond the entry level for females in leadership positions appeared to depend on public political factors. It depended on an individual's previous outstanding performance, a broad base of visibility, and a constituency that was willing to accept female leadership.\textsuperscript{146}

Organizational Climate

Underlying the study of educational administration is the basic assumption that schools are formal organizations with rules, roles, an hierarchy of authority, reward system, forms of compliance, coordination activities, and communication patterns. "Schools are unique social organisms whose behavior must be better understood if the practice of administration is to be improved."\textsuperscript{147}

\textsuperscript{146} Silver, Women in Educational Leadership: A Trend Discussion, pp. 6-16.

Organizational behavior is a function of a dynamic interrelationship between the needs of the individual and the needs of the organization. This thesis was the basis of the Getzels-Guba Model and more recent theories of leadership. Argyris felt that the needs of the individual cannot be totally congruent with the demands of the organization. Argyris suggested that it is important to develop an interpersonal atmosphere in the organization to permit ease of conflict by developing an atmosphere of trust, openness, and low thrust. Amatai Etzioni in his "compliance theory" contended that the "fit" between individual needs and organizational demands depends to a large extent upon how the organization attracts participants and keeps them involved.\textsuperscript{148}

Effective leadership depends upon a multitude of conditions. The leader's behavior should be based upon an accurate diagnosis of the reality of the situation. Argyris called this type of leadership "reality-centered" leadership. The principal as the leader of the educational organization must first diagnose what is reality, keeping in mind that individuals see reality through their own set of values and beliefs. Reality diagnosis requires self-awareness as well as the awareness of others.\textsuperscript{149}

"Efforts to utilize in schools the development of systems thinking from management and the behavioral sciences have intensified an awareness of the inadequacy of our data base for educational decision making."\textsuperscript{150}


\textsuperscript{149} Halpin, \textit{Theory and Research in Administration}, p. 205.

Utilized as objective data which can be fed back to the participants as a process of maintaining organizational health, a school's organizational climate profile can help the faculty and principal perceive and solve problems.\textsuperscript{151} One such use of the assessment of organizational climate was demonstrated in the work of J. Foster Watkins and Allen D. Cleveland. They used the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire as an informational retrieval-feedback procedure with an elementary school faculty in its program of professional development. The perceptions concerning organizational climate of the teachers and principal were congruent in the instance as opposed to the principal's viewing the school through "rose colored glasses."\textsuperscript{152}

In 1958, Argyris used the term organizational climate in a discussion of research concerning human behavior in a bank setting. He identified the following variables: (1) formal organizational variables such as policies, practices and job descriptions; (2) personal variables such as needs, abilities, values, self-concept and defenses; (3) informal variables arising out of attempts to adapt to the form organization; and (4) organization climate. Organizational climate was defined in terms of interaction among persons in the organization.\textsuperscript{153}

Subsequent definitions of organizational climate have not significantly deviated from the model presented by Daniel Katz and Robert Kahn:

The climate or culture of the system reflects both the norms and the values of the formal system and the reinterpretation of the informal system. Organizational climate reflects the history of the internal and external struggles,

\textsuperscript{151}\textsuperscript{151}Owens, p. 194.  \textsuperscript{152}\textsuperscript{152}Watkins and Cleveland, p. 31.

the types of people the organization attracts, its work processes and physical layout, the modes of communication, and the exercise of authority within the system. Just as a society has a cultural heritage, a social organism possesses distinctive patterns of collective feeling and beliefs passed along to new group members.\footnote{154}

Norman Frederickson (1968) described climate as "a set of conditions that tends to produce a common understanding on the part of the members as to what kinds of behaviors are acceptable and appropriate."\footnote{155}

Harry Stack Sullivan developed the theory that an individual's personality is the result of his pattern of accommodation with people who are significant to him. This accommodation is strongly influenced by the social setting. Personality is, therefore, a consistent way of reacting to interpersonal situations.\footnote{156} Halpin made the analogy that "personality is to the individual what organizational climate is to the organization."\footnote{157}

Every school is unique. What makes one different is the organizational climate, or the atmosphere or tone of the organization.\footnote{158} Organizational climate refers to the feeling which exists in a given school and the variability in this feeling as one moves from school to school.\footnote{159} Richard C. Lonsdale defined it as "the global assessment of the interaction

\footnote{154}Thomas, p. 444.  \footnote{155}Ibid., p. 445.  


\footnote{157}Halpin, Theory and Research in Administration, p. 131.


\footnote{159}Sergiovanni and Starratt, Emerging Patterns of Supervision: Human Perspectives, p. 98.
between the task-achievement dimension and the needs-satisfaction dimension within the organization, or of the extent of the task-needs integration.\textsuperscript{160}

School climate is closely associated with morale. Geoffrey Coverdale (1975) defined morale as the mental or emotional attitudes of teachers toward components of their jobs.\textsuperscript{161} C. J. Murname and J. L. Phillips (1977) found that the attitudes teachers bring to their school are reflected in their perception of school climate.\textsuperscript{162} Andrew Halpin and Don Croft, the recognized pioneers in the field of organizational climate, were dissatisfied with the concept of morale and its inadequacy as a criterion of measurement of a school's organizational climate.\textsuperscript{163}

Each teacher's perception of the school's climate is influenced by the individual's own set of personal values and needs. Eldon J. Null found that teachers with a particular pattern of personality traits will perceive the dimensions of organizational climate in a unique way.\textsuperscript{164} Halpin and Croft maintained that a faculty's consensus in its perceptions of the school's climate can be used as an index of what is "out there."\textsuperscript{165}

Halpin and Croft suggested that there may be a relationship between the "political flavor" of a community and the organizational climate of the school.\textsuperscript{166} Studies show a steady increase in negative feelings


\textsuperscript{161}Kalis, p. 89.  \textsuperscript{162}Ibid., p. 96.

\textsuperscript{163}John C. Walden, Thomas N. Taylor and J. Foster Watkins, "Organizational Climate Changes Over Time," The Educational Forum, XL (November, 1975), 87.

\textsuperscript{164}Null, p. 15.  \textsuperscript{165}Halpin, Theory and Research in Administration, p. 147.

\textsuperscript{166}Walden, Taylor and Watkins, p. 91.
and perceptions of the school climate with the increase of teaching experience. Untenured teachers hold a more positive attitude toward the school's climate. An open climate has been significantly related to teacher attrition, high socio-economic settings, and the amount of education received by the community. Watkins (1968) found that size affects climate. There is a tendency for larger schools to be closed. Halpin and Croft felt the open climate signifies a healthy situation, whereas the closed climate signifies an unhealthy one. Eldon J. Null (1967) stated that a more negatively viewed climate might be beneficial in order for the staff and principal to reach their goals and objectives.

In an effort to assess the school's climate, Halpin and Croft developed the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire. Items were assigned to eight subtests, four of which pertain to characteristics of the faculty group as a group and four to characteristics of the principal as a leader. From scores on the eight subtests, they constructed a school profile which depicts the school's organizational climate. By analyzing the profile for a given school, the quality of its climate can be estimated.

The Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire was developed within a theoretical framework influenced by studies of leader behavior. The two basic assumptions were:

1. How the leader really behaves is less important than how the members of the group perceive him/her to behave. Perception of leader behavior will determine the behavior of group members and provide a measure of organizational climate.

---

167Kalix, p. 95. 168Ibid., p. 90. 169Ibid., p. 96. 170Halpin, Theory and Research in Administration, p. 133.
2. An essential determinant of a school's effectiveness is the principal's ability to create a "climate" in which acts of leadership can be consummated.\footnote{Thomas, "The Organizational Climate of Schools," p. 446.}

Halpin and Croft identified six organizational climates and arranged them along a continuum defined at one end as "open" and at the other end as "closed." Characteristics of each climate are presented in Figure 2:\footnote{Owens, Organizational Behavior in Schools, pp. 178-183.}

\begin{figure}
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline
\textbf{Open End} & \textbf{Autonomous} & \textbf{Controlled} \\
\hline
High esprit & High esprit & High esprit \\
Low disengagement & High intimacy & Low disengagement \\
Low hindrance & Low disengagement & High production \\
Average aloofness & Low hindrance & emphasis \\
Average intimacy & High aloofness & Low consideration \\
High consideration & Low production & High thrust \\
Average thrust & emphasis & Average aloofness \\
Low production & Average consideration & High hindrance \\
emphasis & Average thrust & Low intimacy \\
\hline
\textbf{Closed End} & \textbf{Paternal} & \textbf{Closed} \\
\hline
High disengagement & High production & High disengagement \\
Low hindrance & emphasis & High hindrance \\
High intimacy & High disengagement & Average intimacy \\
Average esprit & Low hindrance & Low esprit \\
High consideration & Low intimacy & Low thrust \\
Low aloofness & Low esprit & High aloofness \\
Low production & Average thrust & High production \\
emphasis & Low aloofness & emphasis \\
Average thrust & High consideration & Low consideration \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\caption{Organizational Climates}
\end{figure}
John C. Walden used the terms open tendencies and closed tendencies. The three climates—open, autonomous, and controlled—were assumed to represent varying degrees of openness. The three climates—familiar, paternal, and closed—were assumed to represent varying degrees of closed tendencies.173

Halpin and Croft maintained that a given climate would tend toward maintaining itself. A faculty operating in an atmosphere in the open climate would tend to become more open and the closed would become more closed. Walden, Taylor and Watkins compared schools in 1971 with 1966 and found that this theory could not be supported by their research findings. In 1966, the schools were more open than closed. In 1971, the schools shifted toward the closed end. They concluded that this was the result of desegregation.174

Other attempts to measure organizational climate were developed by T. Thomas and R. C. Slater and George G. Stern and Carl R. Steinhoff. Thomas and Slater (1972) created a four factor solution to measure organizational climate, two of which related to the principal's behavior and two to the staff's behavior. Supportiveness was a measure of the principal's behavior in which he/she was concerned with the teachers' welfare. The principal was visible, approachable, and open. He/she was involved in the operation of the school and committed to it. His/her support was reflected in teacher involvement and satisfaction. Operations emphasis was a measure of the leader's behavior in which he/she was authoritarian and made decisions without staff involvement. Intimacy referred to a measure of social cohesiveness among teachers. Disaffiliation

173 Walden, Taylor and Watkins, p. 89. 174 Ibid., p. 91.
referred to a measure of social cohesiveness among teachers. Disaffiliation referred to a lack of cohesive professional relationships displayed in the form of group discord. Stern and Steinhoff developed the Organizational Climate Index (OCI) which measures development press and control press. Development press was the capacity of the organizational environment to support, satisfy and reward self-actualizing behavior. Control press referred to those environment characteristics which inhibit or restrict personal expressiveness.

The principal is the manager of the educational organization, the school unit. To him/her is charged the responsibility of not only managing in the sense of productive output but also in working with individuals in the context of a social environment. The social organization is influenced from within and without by social, cultural, political and economic forces. The principal's behavior, in its effect upon the organizational climate of the school, should be construed as a necessary but not a sufficient condition which determines school climate. "Organizational climate is an elusive and intangible concept and yet it is one which may offer the educator a means of better understanding the operation of schools."

Summary

The literature and research related to leadership and the role of the

---

175 Thomas, "The Organizational Climate of Schools," p. 449.

176 Owens, Organizational Behavior in Schools, p. 184.

177 Halpin, Theory and Research in Administration, p. 199.

178 Thomas, "The Organizational Climate of Schools," p. 441.
female in the work force and in leadership positions were reviewed in the first section. Leadership is an elusive concept, difficult both to define and to understand. The literature and research related to leadership included the historical perspectives of leadership and the study of leadership including the "traits theory," styles of leadership, situational-behavioral approaches, leader behavior dimensions of leadership, and more recent approaches to the study of leadership.

The history of women in the work force is a story of oppression based on sex-role stereotyping and sex discrimination regardless of legislative enactments prohibiting discrimination in employment and promotion. The role of women in education has been that of teaching compared to the role of the male as that of managing. Even though more women are seeking additional training and certification, their number in leadership positions in education is decreasing. Research findings do not support the idea that males are more effective than females as educational administrators.

The last section of the chapter was devoted to an exploration of organizational climate. Organizational climate is a function of the interrelationship between the needs of the organization and the needs of the individual. Interaction between the principal and the staff and interaction among the staff are the bases for the personality or climate of the school. A healthy climate is one conducive to dynamic leadership which results in actualization of both organizational and individual needs and goals.
Chapter III

METHODOLOGY AND PROCEDURES

A description of the study, a description of the population and sample, methods and procedures followed to collect the data, instruments used, hypotheses tested, and methods for analyzing the data collected are presented in this chapter.

Description of the Study

This study was a descriptive study, utilizing the questionnaire method of collecting data. The research investigated the leader behavior of female elementary school principals as compared to the leader behavior of male elementary school principals and the organizational climates of those schools. The data collected represented the perceptions of teachers in selected elementary schools in the thirteen school districts served by the Upper East Tennessee Educational Cooperative.

Procedures

Population

Population for this study came from the 12 public elementary schools in the thirteen school districts of Upper East Tennessee as identified in the Directory of Public Schools, 1979-1980, published by the Tennessee State Department of Education. All elementary schools containing some combination of grades kindergarten through grade eight, the chief administrator and all full-time certificated teachers in those schools comprised the population. The schools comprising the population are as
follows: (1) 00-08, kindergarten through grade eight; (2) 00-06, kindergarten through grade six; (3) 00-05, kindergarten through grade five; (4) 01-08, grades one through eight; (5) 01-06, grades one through six; (6) 01-07, grades one through seven; (7) 03-06, grades three through six; (8) 00-02, kindergarten through grade two. Excluded from the population were elementary schools designated as follows: (1) 00-00, kindergarten; (2) 00-33, special education school with kindergarten; (3) 33-33, special education school; (4) 00-12, elementary-secondary school; (5) 05-08, 06-09, 07-09, middle school; and (6) 07-10, junior high school.

The school districts from which the population was drawn were located in the First Congressional District of Tennessee. County school districts included Carter, Greene, Hawkins, Johnson, Sullivan, Unicoi and Washington. City school districts included Bristol, Elizabethton, Greeneville, Johnson City, Kingsport and Rogersville.

The elementary schools in the population were administered by 101 male principals and 23 female principals—81 percent being administered by males as compared to 19 percent being administered by females. Among county districts, 86 percent of the schools had male principals as compared to 14 percent with female principals. Among city districts, females held 31 percent of the principalships while males occupied 69 percent of the positions.

Among the schools in the population, 82 percent, or 1,650, teachers were assigned to male principals whereas 18 percent, or 418, teachers were assigned to female principals. Male principals averaged eighteen teachers assigned to them, from a low of three staff members to a high of forty-four. Female principals also averaged eighteen teachers assigned to them, from a low of two staff members to a high of thirty-six.
Selection of Sample

The number of schools in the study was twenty (ten administered by males and ten administered by females). Using the State Department's Directory of Public Schools for 1979-1980, all elementary schools in the population administered by females were numbered consecutively as one group and all elementary schools in the population administered by males were numbered consecutively as another group. Through the use of a table of random numbers, ten schools from each group were selected.

Methodology

Permission to collect data for the research project was secured from the Institutional Review Board of East Tennessee State University. An introductory letter was sent to the superintendents of the thirteen school districts in the population asking for permission to use randomly selected schools in each of the thirteen districts. (See Appendix A) A return form letter was enclosed for use by the superintendents in granting permission to contact the principals in the selected schools. (See Appendix B) After receiving permission to contact the principals, a telephone call was made to the principals explaining the purpose of the study and the procedures for collecting the data. Each principal was asked to grant permission to administer the questionnaires at a group faculty meeting at an appointed time and date or to distribute the questionnaires to the teachers and collect the instruments at a later date. The respondents were those teachers present the day scheduled for the administration or distribution of the questionnaires who chose to participate in the study. No attempt was made to administer the questionnaires to any
teacher absent that day. A confirming letter was sent to the principals. (See Appendix C) After the administration of the questionnaires, a letter of appreciation was sent to each participating school. (See Appendix D)

Instruments Used

Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire; Form XII (LBDQ)

The Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire was the instrument used to assess the teachers’ perceptions of the leader behavior of the principal. (See Appendix E)

The Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire was developed at a time when little existed in the way of leadership theory. Prior research had been primarily concerned with attempts to identify the traits of leaders. Neither theory nor research provided good clues as to dimensions of leader behavior that might be related to follower behavior or group performance.¹

The LBDQ was devised by the Personnel Research Board at the Ohio State University. The original instrument was constructed by Hemphill and Coons. Halpin and Winer later identified initiation of structure and consideration as two fundamental dimensions of leader behavior. By measuring the behavior of leaders on these two dimensions, they established the reliability of determining by objective means how specific leaders differ in leadership style, and whether these differences are related significantly to independent criteria of the leader's effectiveness and efficiency. The LBDQ describes the behavior of the leader as he operates in a given situation, but does not measure the capacity for leadership.²

Stogdill felt that two factors were not sufficient to describe all the complexities of leader behavior. Using theory and research as his basis, Stogdill suggested the following patterns of behavior involved in leadership as defined in Definitions of Terms in Chapter I: (1) representation, (2) demand reconciliation, (3) tolerance of uncertainty, (4) persuasiveness, (5) initiation of structure, (6) tolerance of freedom, (7) role retention, (8) consideration, (9) production emphasis, (10) predictive accuracy, (11) integration, (12) superior orientation.\(^3\)

The LBDQ, Form XII was based on the original LBDQ instrument. Form XII represents the fourth revision of the questionnaire. The LBDQ, Form XII consists of 100 short, descriptive statement of ways in which leaders may behave. The members of a leader's group indicate the frequency with which he/she engages in each form of behavior by circling one of five adverbs: always, often, occasionally, seldom, or never.

"Validity represents the extent to which an instrument measures what it is supposed to measure."\(^4\) Stogdill (1969) portrayed the behaviors represented by the items in the respective subscales and concluded that the LBDQ is a valid instrument. In addition, studies by Day (1969), Hastings (1964), Brown (1966), Morsink (1966), Rooker (1968), Kelley (1968), Streufert, Streufert and Castore (1968), Wall (1970), and Schott (1970) support the validity of the LBDQ.\(^5\)

---

\(^3\)Stogdill, *Handbook of Leadership*, p. 143.


The Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire, Form IV (OCDQ), developed by Halpin and Croft in 1963, was the instrument used to assess the teachers' perceptions of the climate of their school. (See Appendix F) The purpose of the questionnaire is to secure a description of the different ways in which teachers interact among themselves and with the principal. The OCDQ is composed of sixty-four Likert-type items to which the respondent describes occurrences using the following adverbs: rarely occurs, sometimes occurs, often occurs, or very frequently occurs.

The sixty-four items in the OCDQ were assigned to eight subtests. Four of the subtests (disengagement, hindrance, esprit, and intimacy) pertain to characteristics of the faculty group as a group; the other four (aloofness, production emphasis, thrust, and consideration) are characteristics of the principal as a leader. From scores on the eight subtests, Halpin and Croft constructed a profile which depicts the school's organizational climate. The six climates are arranged on a continuum from open to closed.  

1. The Open Climate depicts a situation in which the members enjoy extremely high esprit. The staff works well together without bickering and griping. They are not burdened by routine reports. The principal facilitates the teachers' accomplishment of tasks. Teachers enjoy high job satisfaction, morale, and pride in being associated with the school. The principal behaves in a genuine manner by working hard himself/herself and by helping the teachers. He/she is flexible and has integrity. Rules and regulations provide subtle direction and control for the teachers. He/she does not have to emphasize production; teachers produce easily and freely. He/she lets appropriate leadership emerge from the staff. He/she is in full control, and clearly provides leadership for the staff.

---

6 Halpin, Research on Administration, p. 133. 7 Ibid., pp. 174-181.
2. The Autonomous Climate depicts a situation in which the teachers have almost complete freedom for satisfying their social needs. Scores lean toward social-needs satisfaction rather than toward task-achievement. The teachers work well together and accomplish the tasks of the organization. Teachers are not hindered by administrative paper work. The principal has set up procedures and regulations to facilitate teachers' tasks. The morale is high, but not as high as in the Open Climate. The principal remains aloof from the teachers by running the organization in a businesslike manner. He/she does not force the teachers to produce. He/she is considerate. He/she provides thrust by the example of working hard himself/herself. He/she is genuine and flexible and looks out for the personal welfare of the teachers.

3. The Controlled Climate is marked by a press for achievement at the expense of social-needs satisfaction. Everyone works hard, and there is little time for friendly relations. The climate stresses task-achievement. Since morale is high, the climate is more open than closed. Teachers are task oriented and do not differ with the principal's directives. There is an excessive amount of paper work and busy work. Teachers work by themselves and establish very few friendly relationships. Esprit is slightly above average. Job satisfaction results from accomplishment. The principal is dominating and directive. He/she is somewhat aloof; he/she prefers to publish directives to indicate how each procedure is to be followed. He/she cares little about how others feel. He/she does not satisfy the group's social needs. He/she personally sees that everything runs smoothly. He/she delegates few responsibilities. Leadership comes from the principal rather than from the group.

4. The Familiar Climate depicts the friendly manner of both the principal and the teachers. Social-needs satisfaction is high. Little is done to control or direct the group's activities toward goal achievement. Teachers are disengaged and accomplish little in a task-oriented situation because the principal exerts little control in directing the activities. Too many people try to tell others how to accomplish tasks. Teachers are not burdened with routine reports. Personal friendships portray one big happy family. Morale, or job satisfaction, is average. The principal is one of the group. Few rules and regulations are established. No one works to full capacity. Little is done to evaluate or direct teachers. The principal is regarded as a good guy/gal who looks after the teachers.
5. The **Paternal Climate** is characterized by ineffective attempts to control the teachers. The principal's behavior is nongenuine and nonmotivating. The teachers do not work well together. The principal does a great deal of the busywork himself/herself. The teachers do not enjoy friendly relationships. There is inadequate satisfaction in respect to both task-accomplishment and social-needs. The principal tells others how to do tasks. He/she must know everything that is going on. He/she sets up schedules personally. The school is the principal's main concern. He/she is considerate in order to satisfy his/her own social needs. He/she does not motivate because he/she does not provide an example.

6. The **Closed Climate** is characterized by little satisfaction in respect to either task-achievement or social needs. The principal does not direct the activities of the teachers, nor does he/she feel concerned about their personal welfare. The teachers do not work well together. Job satisfaction and morale are low. The principal is aloof and impersonal. He/she emphasizes production and sets up rules and regulations about how things should be done. He/she does not provide adequate leadership. He/she is not viewed as genuine.

The reliability and validity of the OCDQ by Halpin and Croft have been verified by their own follow-up studies as well as by those of other researchers. Andrews (1965) concluded that "the subtests of the OCDQ provided reasonably valid measures of important aspects of the school principal leadership, in the perspective of interaction with the staff."\(^8\) Carl G. Roseveare (1965) reported "that the subtest thrust was a valid measure and that the subtest esprit seemed to have validity."\(^9\) Robert D. Stansbury (1968) stated that the questionnaire items grouped themselves


\(^9\) Carl George Roseveare, "The Validity of Selected Subtests of the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire," Dissertation Abstracts International, XXV (April, 1965), 7051A.
as well as they did for Halpin and Croft except for the subtests thrust and consideration and that analysis of school subtest scores suggested six organizational climate groupings. Stansbury concluded that the OCDQ is a viable instrument. Aldona S. Vanderlain's (1968) cross-validation showed that the pattern of intercorrelations among the subtests was essentially the same as the original study. Andrew E. Hayes (1972), under the direction of Andrew Halpin, reported that "the maximum-likelihood factor-solution which was obtained from the Halpin-Croft data provided strong support for the dimensions of climate described by Halpin and Croft." Hayes reported that the OCDQ will measure all the dimensions which were identified by Halpin and Croft except aloofness.

**Hypotheses of the Study**

The following hypotheses stated in the null format were tested at the .05 level of significance:

**Hypothesis 1.** There will be no significant difference in the mean score of leadership behaviors exhibited by female principals when compared to the mean score of leadership behaviors exhibited by male principals, as perceived by teachers and measured by the LBDQ.

---


12 Andrew Eugene Hayes, "A Reappraisal of the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire," Dissertation Abstracts International, XXXIII (March-April, 1973), 4730A.
Hypothesis 2. There will be no significant difference in the mean score of organizational climate between those schools administered by female principals in comparison to those schools administered by males, as perceived by teachers and measured by the OCDQ.

Hypothesis 3. There will be no significant difference in the mean score in representation in schools with female principals when compared to the mean score in representation in schools with male principals, as perceived by teachers and measured by the LBDQ.

Hypothesis 4. There will be no significant difference in the mean score in demanding reconciliation in schools with female principals when compared to the mean score in demanding reconciliation in schools with male principals, as perceived by teachers and measured by the LBDQ.

Hypothesis 5. There will be no significant difference in the mean score in tolerance of uncertainty in schools with female principals when compared to the mean score in tolerance of uncertainty in schools with male principals, as perceived by teachers and measured by the LBDQ.

Hypothesis 6. There will be no significant difference in the mean score in persuasiveness in schools with female principals when compared to the mean score in persuasiveness in schools with male principals, as perceived by teachers and measured by the LBDQ.

Hypothesis 7. There will be no significant difference in the mean score in initiation of structure in schools with female principals when compared to the mean score in initiation of structure in schools with male principals, as perceived by teachers and measured by the LBDQ.

Hypothesis 8. There will be no significant difference in the mean score in tolerance of freedom in schools with female principals when
compared to the mean score in tolerance of freedom in schools with male principals, as perceived by teachers and measured by the LBDQ.

Hypothesis 9. There will be no significant difference in the mean score in role retention in schools with female principals when compared to the mean score in role retention in schools with male principals, as perceived by teachers and measured by the LBDQ.

Hypothesis 10. There will be no significant difference in the mean score in consideration in schools with female principals when compared to the mean score in consideration in schools with male principals, as perceived by teachers and measured by the LBDQ.

Hypothesis 11. There will be no significant difference in the mean score in production emphasis in schools with female principals when compared to the mean score in production emphasis in schools with male principals, as perceived by teachers and measured by the LBDQ.

Hypothesis 12. There will be no significant difference in the mean score in predictive accuracy in schools with female principals when compared to the mean score in predictive accuracy in schools with male principals, as perceived by teachers and measured by the LBDQ.

Hypothesis 13. There will be no significant difference in the mean score in integration in schools with female principals when compared to the mean score in integration in schools with male principals, as perceived by teachers and measured by the LBDQ.

Hypothesis 14. There will be no significant difference in the mean score in superior orientation in schools with female principals when compared to the mean score in superior orientation in schools with male principals, as perceived by teachers and measured by the LBDQ.
Hypothesis 15. There will be no significant difference in the mean score in disengagement in schools administered by female and male principals, as perceived by teachers and measured by the OCDQ.

Hypothesis 16. There will be no significant difference in the mean score in hindrance in schools administered by female and male principals, as perceived by teachers and measured by the OCDQ.

Hypothesis 17. There will be no significant difference in the mean score in esprit in schools administered by female and male principals, as perceived by teachers and measured by the OCDQ.

Hypothesis 18. There will be no significant difference in the mean score in intimacy in schools administered by female and male principals, as perceived by teachers and measured by the OCDQ.

Hypothesis 19. There will be no significant difference in the mean score in aloofness exhibited by female and male principals, as perceived by teachers and measured by the OCDQ.

Hypothesis 20. There will be no significant difference in the mean score in production emphasis exhibited by female and male principals, as perceived by teachers and measured by the OCDQ.

Hypothesis 21. There will be no significant difference in the mean score in thrust exhibited by female and male principals, as perceived by teachers and measured by the OCDQ.

Hypothesis 22. There will be no significant difference in the mean score in consideration exhibited by female and male principals, as perceived by teachers and measured by the OCDQ.

Analysis of the Data

Data collected were keypunched at the Computer Center at East
Tennessee State University. Punched cards containing data concerning the Organizational Climate of the schools in the study were analyzed by Dr. Andrew Hayes at the University of North Carolina. The output from the program contained the following types of information:

1. School means normatively standardized were computed for each of the eight subtests of the OCDQ. Raw scores were computed for each respondent within a school and means were computed for the raw scores. The raw scores were then standardized using the means and standard deviations from the original sample of seventy-one elementary schools in Halpin and Croft's study. The resulting standardized scores were converted to create an expected mean of 50 with a standard deviation of 10.

2. An openness score was computed from the normatively standardized school means simply by computing the sum of esprit and thrust score and subtracting the disengagement score (ESP + THR - DIS).

3. Climate profile scores were the double-standardized school means. This profile was used to compare with the prototypic profiles to determine which climate the school is most like. The scores which compose the climate profile can be used to determine the "amount" of each of the dimensions of climate which is present in the school.

4. Climate similarity scores indicated which prototypic profile the climate profile was most like, or most unlike. They were computed by summing the absolute value of the differences between profile scores and each prototypic profile. Six scores resulted, one for each climate type. The climate of the school was indicated by the relative size of these scores with the lowest score indicating the most likely climate type for the school. If a school is to be assigned a climate type, one of the similarity scores must be small enough to say that the profile is like one of the prototypic profiles. A maximum score size for classification purposes should be about 45.

5. Double standardized scores were presented for each respondent to the questionnaire, which were standardized with respect to both the original Halpin-Croft data sample and the subtests within a school. The scores are for the individual what the climate profile is for the school.

---

6. Climate similarity scores for the individuals resulted from comparing the individual's double standardized profile of scores to each of the prototypic profiles. The process is the same as for the school climate similarity scores.

7. Raw scores represented the means of the responses to the items which compose each subtest of the OCDQ. Each item response was assigned a value of one through four by the researcher. To each item response a numerical value of five was added. The resulting subtest mean had a value from six through nine. These means were multiplied by ten and all further decimal values were rounded and dropped. A subtest mean of 7.86 would be printed as 79. For purposes of interpretation, a raw score of 60 would correspond to a response of 1 on all subtest items (rarely occurs), etc.

Punched cards containing the double standardized scores and the raw scores were analyzed at the Computer Center at East Tennessee State University. Double standardized scores were analyzed to test Hypothesis 2. Raw scores were analyzed to test Hypotheses 15 through 22. Punched cards containing data concerning the principal's leader behavior were analyzed at the Computer Center at East Tennessee State University to test Hypothesis 1 and Hypotheses 3 through 14. The t-test for independent samples was utilized to test differences in perceptions between the two groups for both the LBDQ and OCDQ. The statistical test for differences in means was utilized and tested at the .05 level of significance using a two-tailed test. In addition to the analysis of the data to test the hypotheses, an analysis was presented for the teachers' perceptions according to sex of the respondent for both the principal's leader behavior and organizational climate.
Chapter IV

ANALYSIS OF DATA

The purpose of this study was to compare teachers' perceptions of the principal's leader behavior and the school's organizational climate in elementary schools. The principal's leader behavior was defined as the specific behaviors exhibited by the chief administrator in the school which determine his/her leadership style. The dimensions of the principal's leader behavior included representation, demanding reconciliation, tolerance of uncertainty, persuasiveness, initiation of structure, tolerance of freedom, role retention, consideration, production emphasis, predictive accuracy, integration, and superior orientation. Organizational climate was defined as the "feel" or personality of the school. It included the study of interaction between the principal and the teaching staff and among the teaching staff. Staff behaviors were characterized by the terms disengagement, hindrance, esprit, and intimacy. The principal's leader behaviors were characterized by the terms aloofness, production emphasis, thrust, and consideration.

Analysis of the data collected and analysis of the sample are presented in this chapter. Statistics showing the comparison of the principal's leader behavior in schools administered by female principals and schools administered by male principals are included in the first section, while data concerning the comparison of organizational climate between schools administered by female principals and schools administered by male principals are presented in section two. Data concerning the comparison of specific leader behaviors demonstrated by female and male principals are reported.
in the third section. Section four contains data pertaining to the comparison of specific principal and staff behaviors which determine the organizational climate in schools administered by female principals and in schools administered by male principals.

In addition to analysis of data to test the hypotheses, analysis of data according to sex of the respondent is presented. Data concerning teachers' perceptions of specific leader behaviors exhibited by female principals are presented for female and male teachers in section five. Data relating to teachers' perceptions of specific leader behaviors exhibited by male principals are presented for female and male teachers in section six. Data concerning teachers' perceptions of specific dimensions of organizational climate are presented for female and male teachers working with female principals in section seven and for female and male teachers working with male principals in section eight.

Analysis of the Sample

The sample included 172 teachers assigned to female principals and 170 teachers assigned to male principals. Respondents included 119 teachers assigned to female principals, which represented a participation rate of 69 percent—103 female teachers and 16 male teachers. Ninety-eight teachers assigned to male principals responded, which represented a participation rate of 58 percent—83 female teachers and 15 male teachers. The participation rate for the entire sample was 63 percent. The 217 respondents represented 63 percent of the 342 teachers assigned to the 20 schools in the sample. Of the total respondents, 186 or 86 percent were females and 31 or 14 percent were males, which is representative of
state and national averages of female and male teachers assigned to elementary schools. Data describing the sample are presented in Table 2.

**Table 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex of Principal</th>
<th>Total Number Teachers Selected for Sample</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Females</td>
<td>Males</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Section One: Leader Behaviors**

Null Hypothesis 1 stated that there will be no significant difference in the mean score of leadership behaviors exhibited by female principals when compared to the mean score of leadership behaviors exhibited by male principals, as perceived by teachers and measured by the LBDQ. Analysis of the data revealed no significant difference in teachers' perceptions of leader behaviors of female principals when compared to the leader behaviors of male principals, as evidenced by a mean score of 43.86 for female principals with a standard deviation of 7.14 and a mean score of 42.07 for male principals with a standard deviation of 7.07. Statistical analysis indicated a t-value for leader behaviors of 1.85 with a probability of 0.066, which is near significance at .05. Based on the statistical analysis of the data, $H_{01}$ failed to be rejected. Data for $H_{01}$ are presented in Table 3.
Table 3

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEADER BEHAVIORS</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female Principals</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>43.86</td>
<td>7.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Principals</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>42.07</td>
<td>7.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ t = 1.85 \quad df = 215 \quad P > .05 \]

Section Two: Organizational Climate Profiles

Null Hypothesis 2 stated that there will be no significant difference in the mean score of the organizational climate between those schools administered by female principals in comparison to those schools administered by males, as perceived by teachers and measured by the OCDQ. Analysis of the data revealed no significant difference in teachers' perceptions of school climate in schools administered by females in comparison to those administered by males, as evidenced by a mean score of 395.95 with a standard deviation of 0.37 for female principals and a mean score of 396.00 with a standard deviation of 0.80 for male principals. Statistical treatment of the data resulted in a t-value of -0.58 and a probability of 0.564. Therefore, \( H_02 \) failed to be rejected, meaning that teachers did not perceive female principals to differ significantly from male principals on total climate dimensions. Data for \( H_02 \) are presented in Table 4.
Table 4

Means, Standard Deviations, and t-value of Mean Differences in Organizational Climate Scores Measured by the OCDQ and Reported by Sex of the Principal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE PROFILES</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female Principals</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>395.95</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Principals</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>396.00</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ t = -0.58 \quad df = 215 \quad P > .05 \]

In analyzing the data for H₀₂ concerning Organizational Climate Profiles, raw scores were computed for each respondent and means were computed for the raw scores. The raw means were then standardized using the means and standard deviations from Halpin and Croft's original sample of seventy-one elementary schools. The resulting standardized scores were converted to have an expected mean of 50 and standard deviation of 10. The scores for each subtest were standardized a second time and compared with the Open Climate score for that subtest. The absolute differences between the teacher's standard score and Halpin and Croft's Open Climate score were totaled to indicate to what degree each of the teachers was congruent with the prototypic profile of the Open Climate. The same procedure was used to compare with the Closed Climate. The teachers' numerical differences were placed on a continuum, then dichotomized: those similar to Open Climate and those less similar to Open Climate.¹

The scores which compose the profile were used to determine the "amount" of each of the dimensions of climate which is present in the school. Organizational Climate Profiles for the eight dimensions of the OCDQ for female and male principals are presented in Graph 1.

Graph 1
Organizational Climate Profiles

---

2Letter from Dr. Andrew E. Hayes, OCDQ Scoring Service, University of North Carolina, March, 1980.
Section Three: Leader Behavior Dimensions

Null Hypothesis 3 stated that there will be no significant difference in the mean score in representation in schools with female principals when compared to the mean score in representation in schools with male principals, as perceived by teachers and measured by the LBDQ. Analysis of the data revealed a significant difference in representation exhibited by female and male principals, as evidenced by a mean score of 4.01 with a standard deviation of 0.78 for female principals and a mean score of 3.75 with a standard deviation of 0.69 for male principals. Statistical treatment of the data produced a t-value of 2.62 and a probability of 0.009. Therefore, H₀₃ was rejected at the .05 level of significance, meaning that female principals were perceived by teachers to speak and act as representative of the group to a significantly greater extent than did male principals. Data for H₀₃ are presented in Table 5.

Table 5

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>s</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>DIM 1: REPRESENTATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Principals</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>0.009*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Principals</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DIM 2: DEMANDING RECONCILIATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Principals</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Principals</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIM 3: TOLERANCE OF UNCERTAINTY</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>s</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female Principals</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Principals</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| DIM 4: PERSUASIVENESS           |    |     |     |         |     |
| Female Principals               | 119| 3.74| 0.76| 2.60    | 0.010*|
| Male Principals                 | 98 | 3.47| 0.78|         |      |

| DIM 5: INITIATION OF STRUCTURE  |    |     |     |         |     |
| Female Principals               | 119| 3.87| 0.70| 1.32    | 0.190|
| Male Principals                 | 98 | 3.75| 0.63|         |      |

| DIM 6: TOLERANCE OF FREEDOM     |    |     |     |         |     |
| Female Principals               | 119| 3.75| 0.66| 1.03    | 0.306|
| Male Principals                 | 98 | 3.65| 0.77|         |      |

| DIM 7: ROLE RETENTION           |    |     |     |         |     |
| Female Principals               | 119| 3.90| 0.75| 1.74    | 0.083|
| Male Principals                 | 98 | 3.73| 0.65|         |      |

| DIM 8: CONSIDERATION            |    |     |     |         |     |
| Female Principals               | 119| 3.65| 0.81| 1.53    | 0.128|
| Male Principals                 | 98 | 3.47| 0.88|         |      |

| DIM 9: PRODUCTION EMPHASIS      |    |     |     |         |     |
| Female Principals               | 119| 3.28| 0.63| 0.66    | 0.510|
| Male Principals                 | 98 | 3.23| 0.63|         |      |

| DIM 10: PREDICTIVE ACCURACY     |    |     |     |         |     |
| Female Principals               | 119| 3.53| 0.70| 1.34    | 0.183|
| Male Principals                 | 98 | 3.41| 0.66|         |      |

| DIM 11: INTEGRATION             |    |     |     |         |     |
| Female Principals               | 119| 3.45| 0.95| 1.13    | 0.260|
| Male Principals                 | 98 | 3.31| 0.93|         |      |
Null Hypothesis 4 stated that there will be no significant difference in the mean score in demanding reconciliation in schools with female principals when compared to the mean score in demanding reconciliation in schools with male principals, as perceived by teachers and measured by the LBDQ. Analysis of the data resulted in no significant difference in the leader behavior demanding reconciliation between female and male principals, as evidenced by a mean score of 3.67 with a standard deviation of 0.91 for female principals and a mean score of 3.58 with a standard deviation of 0.87 for male principals. Statistical treatment of the data yielded a t-value of 0.71 and a probability of 0.476. Failure to reject $H_{04}$ was based on the data presented in Table 5.

Null Hypothesis 5 stated that there will be no significant difference in the mean score in tolerance of uncertainty in schools with female principals when compared to the mean score in tolerance of uncertainty in schools with male principals, as perceived by teachers and measured by the LBDQ. Analysis of the data resulted in no significant difference in the leader behavior tolerance of uncertainty between female and male principals, as evidenced by a mean score of 3.40 with a standard deviation of 0.73.
for female principals and a mean score of 3.36 with a standard deviation of 0.82 for male principals. Statistical treatment of the data produced a t-value of 0.38 and a probability of 0.703. Failure to reject $H_0^6$ was based on the data presented in Table 5.

Null Hypothesis 6 stated that there will be no significant difference in the mean score in persuasiveness in schools with female principals when compared to the mean score in persuasiveness in schools with male principals, as perceived by teachers and measured by the LBDQ. Analysis of the data resulted in a significant difference in the leader behavior persuasiveness between female and male principals, as evidenced by a mean score of 3.74 and a standard deviation of 0.76 for female principals and a mean score of 3.47 with a standard deviation of 0.78 for male principals. Statistical treatment of the data produced a t-value of 2.60 and a probability of 0.010. Therefore, $H_0^6$ was rejected, meaning that female principals were perceived by teachers to use persuasion and argument more effectively and to exhibit strong convictions to a significantly greater extent than were male principals. Data for $H_0^6$ are presented in Table 5.

Null Hypothesis 7 stated that there will be no significant difference in the mean score in initiation of structure in schools with female principals when compared to the mean score in initiation of structure in schools with male principals, as perceived by teachers and measured by the LBDQ. Analysis of the data resulted in no significant difference in the leader behavior initiation of structure between female and male principals, as evidenced by a mean score of 3.87 with a standard deviation of 0.70 for female principals and a mean score of 3.75 and a standard deviation of 0.63 for male principals. Statistical treatment of the data produced a t-value of 1.32 and a probability
of 0.190. Failure to reject $H_0^7$ was based on the data presented in Table 5.

Null Hypothesis 8 stated that there will be no significant difference in the mean score in tolerance of freedom in schools with female principals when compared to the mean score in tolerance of freedom in schools with male principals, as perceived by teachers and measured by the LBDQ. Analysis of the data resulted in no significant difference in the leader behavior tolerance of freedom between female and male principals, as evidenced by a mean score of 3.75 and a standard deviation of 0.66 for female principals and a mean score of 3.65 and a standard deviation of 0.77 for male principals. Statistical treatment of the data produced a t-value of 1.03 and a probability of 0.306. Failure to reject $H_0^8$ was based on the data presented in Table 5.

Null Hypothesis 9 stated that there will be no significant difference in the mean score in role retention in schools with female principals when compared to the mean score in role retention in schools with male principals, as perceived by teachers and measured by the LBDQ. Analysis of the data resulted in no significant difference in the leader behavior role retention between female and male principals, as evidenced by a mean score of 3.90 with a standard deviation of 0.75 for female principals and a mean score of 3.73 and standard deviation of 0.65 for male principals. Statistical treatment of the data produced a t-value of 1.74 and a probability of 0.083, which is near significance at the .05 level. However, $H_0^9$ failed to be rejected. Data for $H_0^9$ are presented in Table 5.

Null Hypothesis 10 stated that there will be no significant difference in the mean score in consideration in schools with female principals when
compared to the mean score in consideration in schools with male principals, as perceived by teachers and measured by the LBDQ. Analysis of the data resulted in no significant difference in the leader behavior consideration exhibited by female and male principals, as evidenced by a mean score of 3.65 with a standard deviation of 0.81 for female principals and a mean score of 3.47 and standard deviation of 0.88 for male principals. Statistical treatment of the data produced a t-value of 1.53 and a probability of 0.128. Failure to reject $H_0$ was based on the data presented in Table 5.

**Null Hypothesis 11** stated that there will be no significant difference in the mean score in production emphasis in schools with female principals when compared to the mean score in production emphasis in schools with male principals, as perceived by teachers and measured by the LBDQ. Analysis of the data resulted in no significant difference in the leader behavior production emphasis exhibited by female and male principals, as evidenced by a mean score of 3.28 and standard deviation of 0.63 for female principals and a mean score of 3.23 and standard deviation of 0.63 for male principals. Statistical treatment of the data produced a t-value of 0.66 and a probability of 0.510. Failure to reject $H_{11}$ was based on the data presented in Table 5.

**Null Hypothesis 12** stated that there will be no significant difference in the mean score in predictive accuracy in schools with female principals when compared to the mean score in predictive accuracy in schools with male principals, as perceived by teachers and measured by the LBDQ. Analysis of the data resulted in no significant difference in the leader behavior predictive accuracy exhibited by female and male principals, as evidenced by a mean score of 3.53 and standard deviation of 0.70 for female principals.
and a mean score of 3.41 with a standard deviation of 0.66 for male principals. Statistical treatment of the data produced a t-value of 1.34 and a probability of 0.183. Failure to reject $H_{o12}$ was based on the data presented in Table 5.

Null Hypothesis 13 stated that there will be no significant difference in the mean score in integration in schools with female principals when compared to the mean score in integration in schools with male principals, as perceived by teachers and measured by the LBDQ. Analysis of the data resulted in no significant difference in the leader behavior integration exhibited by female and male principals, as evidenced by a mean score of 3.45 with a standard deviation of 0.95 for female principals and a mean score of 3.31 and standard deviation of 0.93 for male principals. Statistical treatment of the data produced a t-value of 1.13 and a probability of 0.260. Failure to reject $H_{o13}$ was based on the data presented in Table 5.

Null Hypothesis 14 stated that there will be no significant difference in superior orientation in schools with female principals when compared to the mean score in superior orientation in schools with male principals, as perceived by teachers and measured by the LBDQ. Analysis of the data resulted in a significant difference in the leader behavior superior orientation exhibited by female and male principals, as evidenced by a mean score of 3.61 and standard deviation of 0.60 for female principals and a mean score of 3.37 with a standard deviation of 0.61 for male principals. Statistical treatment of the data produced a t-value of 2.92 and a probability of 0.004, which is significant below the :05 level of significance. Therefore, $H_{o14}$ was rejected, meaning that female principals
were perceived by teachers to maintain cordial relations with superiors, to have influence with superiors, and to strive for higher status to a significantly greater extent than were male principals. Data for $H_{014}$ are presented in Table 5.

Section Four: Organizational Climate Dimensions

Null Hypothesis 15 stated that there will be no significant difference in the mean score in disengagement in schools administered by female and male principals, as perceived by teachers and measured by the OCDQ. Analysis of the data resulted in no significant difference in disengagement in schools administered by female and male principals, as evidenced by a mean score of 66.95 with a standard deviation of 4.74 for schools with female principals and a mean score of 67.40 with a standard deviation of 4.07 for schools with male principals. Statistical treatment of the data produced a $t$-value of $-0.74$ and a probability of $0.461$. Failure to reject $H_{015}$ was based on the data presented in Table 6.

Table 6

| Means, Standard Deviations, and $t$-value of Mean Differences in Organizational Climate Scores Measured by the OCDQ and Reported by Sex of the Principal |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | $N$ | $\bar{X}$ | $s$ | $t$-value | $P$ |
| DIM 1: DISENGAGEMENT | | | | | |
| Female Principals | 119 | 66.95 | 4.74 | $-0.74$ | 0.461 |
| Male Principals | 98 | 67.40 | 4.07 | | |

were perceived by teachers to maintain cordial relations with superiors, to have influence with superiors, and to strive for higher status to a significantly greater extent than were male principals. Data for $H_{014}$ are presented in Table 5.
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Null Hypothesis 15 stated that there will be no significant difference in the mean score in disengagement in schools administered by female and male principals, as perceived by teachers and measured by the OCDQ. Analysis of the data resulted in no significant difference in disengagement in schools administered by female and male principals, as evidenced by a mean score of 66.95 with a standard deviation of 4.74 for schools with female principals and a mean score of 67.40 with a standard deviation of 4.07 for schools with male principals. Statistical treatment of the data produced a $t$-value of $-0.74$ and a probability of $0.461$. Failure to reject $H_{015}$ was based on the data presented in Table 6.

Table 6

| Means, Standard Deviations, and $t$-value of Mean Differences in Organizational Climate Scores Measured by the OCDQ and Reported by Sex of the Principal |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | $N$ | $\bar{X}$ | $s$ | $t$-value | $P$ |
| DIM 1: DISENGAGEMENT | | | | | |
| Female Principals | 119 | 66.95 | 4.74 | $-0.74$ | 0.461 |
| Male Principals | 98 | 67.40 | 4.07 | | |
Table 6 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th></th>
<th>s</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DIM 2: HINDRANCE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Principals</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>71.23</td>
<td>6.46</td>
<td>-0.64</td>
<td>0.525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Principals</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>71.73</td>
<td>5.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIM 3: ESPRIT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Principals</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>79.08</td>
<td>5.65</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Principals</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>75.89</td>
<td>5.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIM 4: INTIMACY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Principals</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>73.24</td>
<td>5.85</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>0.003*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Principals</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>71.02</td>
<td>4.91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIM 5: ALOOFNESS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Principals</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>72.14</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Principals</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>70.57</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIM 6: PRODUCTION EMPHASIS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Principals</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>72.70</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>0.053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Principals</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>71.44</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIM 7: THRUST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Principals</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>78.69</td>
<td>7.98</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>0.068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Principals</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>76.70</td>
<td>7.87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIM 8: CONSIDERATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Principals</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>72.13</td>
<td>7.54</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>0.002*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Principals</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>69.18</td>
<td>6.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

df = 215      *P < .05

Null Hypothesis 16 stated that there will be no significant difference in the mean score in hindrance in schools administered by female and male...
principals, as perceived by teachers and measured by the OCDQ. Analysis of the data resulted in no significant difference in hindrance in schools administered by female and male principals, as evidenced by a mean score of 71.23 with a standard deviation of 6.46 for schools with female principals and a mean score of 71.73 with a standard deviation of 5.30 for schools with male principals. Statistical treatment of the data produced a t-value of -0.64 and a probability of 0.525. Failure to reject $H_{016}$ was based on the data presented in Table 6.

Null Hypothesis 17 stated that there will be no significant difference in the mean score in esprit in schools administered by female and male principals, as perceived by teachers and measured by the OCDQ. Analysis of the data resulted in a significant difference in esprit in schools administered by female and male principals, as evidenced by a mean score of 79.08 with a standard deviation of 5.65 for schools with female principals and a mean score of 75.89 with a standard deviation of 5.05 for schools with male principals. Statistical treatment of the data produced a t-value of 4.35 and a probability of 0.000. Therefore, $H_{017}$ was rejected, meaning that teachers feel that their social needs are being satisfied and they enjoy a sense of accomplishment in their jobs to a significantly greater extent in schools with female principals. Data for $H_{017}$ are presented in Table 6.

Null Hypothesis 18 stated that there will be no significant difference in the mean score in intimacy in schools administered by female and male principals, as perceived by teachers and measured by the OCDQ. Analysis of the data resulted in a significant difference in intimacy in schools administered by female and male principals, as evidenced by a mean score
of 73.2 with a standard deviation of 5.85 for schools with female principals and a mean score of 71.02 with a standard deviation of 4.91 for schools with male principals. Statistical treatment of the data produced a t-value of 2.98 and a probability of 0.003. Therefore, \( H_{018} \) was rejected, meaning that teachers perceived significantly higher intimacy or social relations in schools with female principals than in schools with male principals. Data for \( H_{018} \) are presented in Table 6.

Null Hypothesis 19 stated that there will be no significant difference in the mean score in aloofness exhibited by female and male principals, as perceived by teachers and measured by the OCDQ. Analysis of the data resulted in a significant difference in the leader behavior aloofness exhibited by female and male principals, as evidenced by a mean score of 72.41 with a standard deviation of 3.75 for female principals and a mean score of 70.57 with a standard deviation of 3.84 for male principals. Statistical treatment of the data produced a t-value of 3.56 and a probability of 0.000. Therefore, \( H_{019} \) was rejected, meaning that teachers perceived female principals to behave in a formal and impersonal manner. They perceived female principals to "go by the book" and prefer to be guided by rules and policies to a significantly greater extent than did male principals. Data for \( H_{019} \) are presented in Table 6.

Null Hypothesis 20 stated that there will be no significant difference in the mean score in production emphasis exhibited by female and male principals, as perceived by teachers and measured by the OCDQ. Analysis of the data resulted in no significant difference in the leader behavior production emphasis exhibited by female and male principals, as evidenced by a mean score of 72.70 with a standard deviation of 4.92 for female
principals and a mean score of 71.44 with a standard deviation of 4.51 for male principals. Statistical treatment of the data produced a t-value of 1.95 and a probability of 0.053, which is near the .05 level of significance. Failure to reject \( H_{o20} \) was based on data presented in Table 6.

Null Hypothesis 21 stated that there will be no significant difference in the mean score in thrust exhibited by female and male principals, as perceived by teachers and measured by the OCDQ. Analysis of the data resulted in no significant difference in the leader behavior thrust exhibited by female and male principals, as evidenced by a mean score of 78.69 with a standard deviation of 7.98 for female principals and a mean score of 76.70 with a standard deviation of 7.87 for male principals. Statistical treatment of the data produced a t-value of 1.83 and a probability of 0.068, which is near the .05 level of significance. Failure to reject \( H_{o21} \) was based on the data presented in Table 6.

Null Hypothesis 22 stated that there will be no significant difference in the mean score in consideration exhibited by female and male principals, as perceived by teachers and measured by the OCDQ. Analysis of the data resulted in a significant difference in the leader behavior consideration exhibited by female and male principals, as evidenced by a mean score of 72.13 with a standard deviation of 7.54 for female principals and a mean score of 69.18 with a standard deviation of 6.05 for male principals. Statistical treatment of the data produced a t-value of 3.19 and a probability of 0.002. Therefore, \( H_{o22} \) was rejected, meaning that teachers perceived female principals to be considerate, to try to do a little something extra for them in human terms to a significantly greater extent. Data for \( H_{o22} \) are presented in Table 6.
Section Five: Comparison of Female and Male Teachers' Perceptions of Female Principals' Leader Behaviors

Analysis of the data concerning a comparison of female and male teachers' perceptions of female principals' leader behaviors is presented in this section. No significant difference in perceptions of total leader behaviors was found as presented in Table 7.

Table 7

Means, Standard Deviations, and t-value of Mean Differences in Leader Behavior Scores for Female Principals Reported by Sex of the Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEADER BEHAVIORS</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>s</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female Teachers</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>44.29</td>
<td>6.97</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>0.098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Teachers</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>41.12</td>
<td>7.84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIM 1: REPRESENTATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Teachers</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>0.018*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Teachers</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIM 2: DEMANDING RECONCILIATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Teachers</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Teachers</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIM 3: TOLERANCE OF UNCERTAINTY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Teachers</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>0.288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Teachers</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIM 4: PERSUASIVENESS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Teachers</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>0.041*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Teachers</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIM</th>
<th>INITIATION OF STRUCTURE</th>
<th>TOLERANCE OF FREEDOM</th>
<th>ROLE RETENTION</th>
<th>CONSIDERATION</th>
<th>PRODUCTION EMPHASIS</th>
<th>PREDICTIVE ACCURACY</th>
<th>INTEGRATION</th>
<th>SUPERIOR ORIENTATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female Teachers</td>
<td>Male Teachers</td>
<td>Female Teachers</td>
<td>Male Teachers</td>
<td>Female Teachers</td>
<td>Male Teachers</td>
<td>Female Teachers</td>
<td>Male Teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>t-value</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>t-value</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIM 5</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>0.041*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIM 6</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.464</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIM 7</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.427</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIM 8</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>0.203</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIM 9</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>0.264</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIM 10</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>0.172</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIM 11</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.527</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIM 12</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>0.099</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

df = 117  *P < .05
Analysis of the data resulted in a mean score of 44.29 with a standard deviation of 6.97 for female teachers and a mean score of 41.12 with a standard deviation of 7.84 for male teachers. Statistical treatment of the data yielded a t-value of 1.67 with a probability of 0.098. Therefore, at the .05 level of significance, female and male teachers did not significantly differ in their perceptions of leader behaviors of female principals. In addition, no significant differences were found between female and male teachers' perceptions of female principals in the leader behaviors of demanding reconciliation, tolerance of uncertainty, tolerance of freedom, role retention, consideration, production emphasis, predictive accuracy, integration, or superior orientation.

Dimensions on which there were significant differences between female and male teachers' perceptions of the leader behaviors of female principals included representation, persuasiveness, and initiation of structure. Analysis of the data for representation resulted in a mean score for female teachers of 4.08 with a standard deviation of 0.72 and a mean score for male teachers of 3.59 with a standard deviation of 0.98. Statistical treatment yielded a t-value of 2.39 and a probability of 0.018. Analysis of the data for persuasiveness resulted in a mean score of 3.80 with a standard deviation of 0.74 for female teachers and a mean score of 3.38 with a standard deviation of 0.82 for male teachers. Statistical treatment yielded a t-value of 2.07 with a probability of 0.041. Analysis of the data for initiation of structure resulted in a mean score of 3.92 with a standard deviation of 0.65 for female teachers and a mean score of 3.54 with a standard deviation of 0.87 for male teachers. Statistical treatment yielded a t-value of 2.07 with a probability of 0.041. Therefore, there
were significant differences in the perceptions of female and male teachers toward female principals on the leader behavior dimensions of representation, persuasiveness, and initiation of structure. Data concerning female and male teachers' perceptions of the leader behaviors of female principals are presented in Table 7.

Section Six: Comparison of Female and Male Teachers' Perceptions of Male Principals' Leader Behaviors

Analysis of the data concerning a comparison of female and male teachers' perceptions of male principals' leader behaviors is presented in this section. No significant difference in perceptions of total leader behaviors was found as presented in Table 8.

Table 8

Means, Standard Deviations, and t-value of Mean Differences in Leader Behavior Scores for Male Principals Reported by Sex of the Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEADER BEHAVIOR</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>$\bar{X}$</th>
<th>s</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DIM 1: REPRESENTATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Teachers</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>0.227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Teachers</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIM 2: DEMANDING RECONCILIATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Teachers</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Teachers</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIM</th>
<th>VARIABLES</th>
<th>Female Teachers</th>
<th>Male Teachers</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DIM 3</td>
<td>TOLERANCE OF UNCERTAINTY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\bar{X}$</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$s$</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$t$-value</td>
<td>-0.24</td>
<td>0.814</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIM 4</td>
<td>PERSUASIVENESS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\bar{X}$</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$s$</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$t$-value</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>0.893</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIM 5</td>
<td>INITIATION OF STRUCTURE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\bar{X}$</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$s$</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$t$-value</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.659</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIM 6</td>
<td>TOLERANCE OF FREEDOM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\bar{X}$</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$s$</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$t$-value</td>
<td>-0.53</td>
<td>0.598</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIM 7</td>
<td>ROLE RETENTION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\bar{X}$</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$s$</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$t$-value</td>
<td>-0.45</td>
<td>0.653</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIM 8</td>
<td>CONSIDERATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\bar{X}$</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$s$</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$t$-value</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.516</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIM 9</td>
<td>PRODUCTION EMPHASIS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\bar{X}$</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$s$</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$t$-value</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.952</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIM 10</td>
<td>PREDICTIVE ACCURACY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\bar{X}$</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$s$</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$t$-value</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.980</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIM 11</td>
<td>INTEGRATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\bar{X}$</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$s$</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$t$-value</td>
<td>-0.52</td>
<td>0.603</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>s</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DIM 12: SUPERIOR ORIENTATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Teachers</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>0.266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Teachers</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

df = 96  *P < .05

Analysis of the data resulted in a mean score of 42.13 with a standard deviation of 7.27 for female teachers on total leader behaviors and a mean score of 41.72 with a standard deviation of 5.97 for male teachers on total leader behaviors. Statistical treatment yielded a t-value of 0.20 and a probability of 0.842. Therefore, there was no significant difference in female and male teachers' perceptions of leader behaviors of male principals. In addition, analysis of the data resulted in no significant differences between female and male teachers' perceptions of male principals in any one of the twelve dimensions measured by the LBDQ. Data concerning female and male teachers' perceptions of leader behavior dimensions for male principals are presented in Table 8.

Section Seven: Comparison of Female and Male Teachers' Perceptions of School Climate in Schools with Female Principals

Analysis of the data concerning a comparison of female and male teachers' perceptions of school climate in schools with female principals is presented in this section. No significant difference in perceptions was found as presented in Table 9.
Table 9
Means, Standard Deviations, and t-value of Mean Differences in Organizational Climate Scores in Schools with Female Principals, Reported by Sex of the Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE PROFILES</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>( \bar{X} )</th>
<th>s</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>DIM 1: DISENGAGEMENT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Teachers</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>395.96</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Teachers</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>395.88</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DIM 2: HINDRANCE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Teachers</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>66.75</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>-1.18</td>
<td>0.240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Teachers</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>68.25</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DIM 3: ESPRIT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Teachers</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>79.59</td>
<td>5.63</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>0.012*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Teachers</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>75.81</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DIM 4: INTIMACY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Teachers</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>73.56</td>
<td>6.02</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>0.121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Teachers</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>71.13</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DIM 5: ALOOFNESS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Teachers</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>72.63</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>0.106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Teachers</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>71.00</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DIM 6: PRODUCTION EMPHASIS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Teachers</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>72.54</td>
<td>4.95</td>
<td>-0.86</td>
<td>0.389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Teachers</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>73.69</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DIM 7: THRUST</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Teachers</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>79.25</td>
<td>7.93</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>0.050*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Teachers</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>75.06</td>
<td>7.57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 9 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>s</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DIM 8: CONSIDERATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Teachers</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>72.37</td>
<td>7.61</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Teachers</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>70.56</td>
<td>7.16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

df = 117  *P < .05

Analysis of the data resulted in a mean score of 395.96 with a standard deviation of 0.78 for female teachers and a mean score of 395.88 with a standard deviation of 0.96 for male teachers. Statistical treatment of the data yielded a t-value of 0.60 and a probability of 0.691. Therefore, there was no significant difference in climate profiles of schools with female principals, as perceived by teachers and measured by the OCDQ. In addition, analysis of the data resulted in no significant differences between female and male teachers' perceptions of school climate in schools with female principals in the dimensions of disengagement, hindrance, intimacy, aloofness, production emphasis, and consideration.

Dimensions on which there were significant differences between female and male teachers' perceptions of the school climate in schools with female principals included esprit and thrust. Analysis of the data for esprit resulted in a mean score for female teachers of 79.59 with a standard deviation of 5.63 and a mean score for male teachers of 75.81 with a standard deviation of 4.68. Statistical treatment of the data yielded a t-value of 2.55 with a probability of 0.012. Analysis of the
data for thrust resulted in a mean score for female teachers of 79.25 with a standard deviation of 7.93 and a mean score for male teachers of 75.06 with a standard deviation of 7.57. Statistical treatment of the data yielded a t-value of 1.98 with a probability of 0.050. Therefore, in schools with female principals, there were significant differences in the perceptions of female and male teachers on the dimensions of esprit and thrust. Data concerning female and male teachers' perceptions of the school climate in schools with female principals are presented in Table 9.

Section Eight: Comparison of Female and Male Teachers' Perceptions of School Climate in Schools with Male Principals

Analysis of the data concerning a comparison of female and male teachers' perceptions of school climate in schools with male principals is presented in this section. No significant difference in perceptions of the school's climate was found as presented in Table 10.

Table 10

Means, Standard Deviations, and t-value of Mean Differences in Organizational Climate Scores in Schools with Male Principals, Reported by Sex of the Teacher

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE PROFILES</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>s</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female Teachers</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>396.01</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Teachers</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>395.93</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIM 1: DISENGAGEMENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Teachers</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>67.55</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Teachers</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>66.53</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 10 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIM 2: HINDRANCE</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>$\bar{X}$</th>
<th>s</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female Teachers</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>71.65</td>
<td>5.35</td>
<td>-0.37</td>
<td>0.714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Teachers</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>72.20</td>
<td>5.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIM 3: ESPRIT</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>$\bar{X}$</th>
<th>s</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female Teachers</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>75.96</td>
<td>5.09</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Teachers</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>75.47</td>
<td>4.96</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIM 4: INTIMACY</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>$\bar{X}$</th>
<th>s</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female Teachers</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>70.81</td>
<td>4.93</td>
<td>-1.01</td>
<td>0.314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Teachers</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>72.20</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIM 5: ALOOFNESS</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>$\bar{X}$</th>
<th>s</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female Teachers</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>70.48</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>-0.54</td>
<td>0.590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Teachers</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>71.07</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIM 6: PRODUCTION EMPHASIS</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>$\bar{X}$</th>
<th>s</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female Teachers</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>71.33</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>-0.58</td>
<td>0.561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Teachers</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>72.07</td>
<td>4.91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIM 7: THRUST</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>$\bar{X}$</th>
<th>s</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female Teachers</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>76.84</td>
<td>7.77</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Teachers</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>75.93</td>
<td>6.65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIM 8: CONSIDERATION</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>$\bar{X}$</th>
<th>s</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female Teachers</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>68.93</td>
<td>6.12</td>
<td>-0.99</td>
<td>0.327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Teachers</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>70.60</td>
<td>5.58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$df = 96$  *$P < .05$*

Analysis of the data resulted in a mean score of 396.01 with a standard deviation of 0.80 for female teachers and a mean score of 395.93 with a standard deviation of 0.80 for male teachers. Statistical
treatment of the data yielded a t-value of 0.35 and a probability of 0.727. Therefore, there was no significant difference in female and male teachers' perceptions of the school's climate in schools with male principals. In addition, analysis of the data resulted in no significant differences between female and male teachers' perceptions of school climate in schools with male principals in any one of the eight dimensions of the OCDQ, as presented in Table 10.

Summary

The analysis of the data was reported in this chapter. The results indicated that there was no significant difference in total leader behaviors exhibited by female and male principals as perceived by teachers and measured by the LBDQ. Null Hypothesis 1 failed to be rejected.

The results indicated that there was no significant difference in organizational climate profiles in schools administered by female and male principals, as perceived by teachers and measured by the OCDQ. Null Hypothesis 2 failed to be rejected.

Hypotheses 3 through 14 concerned the differences between female and male principals' leader behavior within the twelve dimensions of the LBDQ. Analysis of the data resulted in no significant differences between female and male principals on the leader behaviors of demanding reconciliation, tolerance of uncertainty, initiation of structure, tolerance of freedom, role retention, consideration, production emphasis, predictive accuracy or integration. Null Hypotheses 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 failed to be rejected. Significant differences occurred on the leader behavior dimensions of representation, persuasiveness, and superior orientation. Null Hypotheses 3, 6, and 14 were rejected.
Hypotheses 15 through 22 concerned teachers' perceptions of school climate in schools with female and male principals within the eight dimensions of the OCDQ. No significant differences were found in the dimensions of disengagement, hindrance, production emphasis, or thrust. Null Hypotheses 15, 16, 20, and 21 failed to be rejected. Significant differences occurred between female and male principals in the climate dimensions of esprit, intimacy, aloofness, and consideration. Null Hypotheses 17, 18, 19, and 22 were rejected.

Analysis of the data was conducted to determine if female and male teachers perceived female principals differently. On leader behaviors, significant differences were found in female and male teachers' perceptions of female principals in representation, persuasiveness, and initiation of structure. In organizational climate, significant differences were found between female and male teachers' perceptions in esprit and thrust. No significant differences were found in total leader behaviors or organizational climate profiles.

Further analysis of the data was conducted to determine if female and male teachers perceived male principals differently. No significant differences were found in total leader behaviors, organizational climate profiles, or within any one of the twelve dimensions of the LBDQ or eight dimensions of the OCDQ.
Chapter V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

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

Summary

The questions considered in this study pertained to a comparison of the leader behaviors of female and male elementary school principals and the organizational climate in schools with female principals as compared to schools with male principals. This study was concerned with these questions:

1. Is there a significant difference in teachers' perceptions of the leader behavior of female elementary school principals when compared to male elementary school principals?

2. Is there a significant difference in teachers' perceptions of the school climate in schools with female principals compared to schools with male principals?

3. Is there a significant difference in female and male teachers' perceptions of female principals?

4. Is there a significant difference in female and male teachers' perceptions of male principals?

The population for this study included the 124 public elementary schools in the thirteen school districts served by the Upper East Tennessee Educational Cooperative. The sample included ten schools
administered by female principals and ten schools administered by male principals, randomly chosen from the population.

The instruments used to collect the data included the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire, Form XII (LBDQ) (See Appendix E) and the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire, Form IV (OCDQ) (See Appendix F). The questionnaires were administered during April, 1980, to 217 teachers in the twenty schools in the sample, which represented a participation rate of 63 percent.

The study was conducted to answer two general hypotheses. Hypothesis 1 was concerned with the total leader behaviors of female elementary school principals compared to male elementary school principals. Hypothesis 2 was concerned with the organizational climate in schools with female principals compared to schools with male principals. The study further focused on twenty specific hypotheses. Hypotheses 3 through 14 were concerned with a comparison of female principals to male principals within the twelve dimensions of the LBDQ. Hypotheses 15 through 22 were concerned with a comparison of female principals to male principals within the eight dimensions of the OCDQ. In addition, analysis of the data was conducted to test for significant differences in female and male teachers' perceptions of both female and male principals.

The hypotheses for the study were stated in the null format and tested at the .05 level of significance, using a two-tailed test. A t-test for independent samples was utilized to test for significant differences between female and male principals.

The findings in the study included failure to reject Null Hypotheses 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 20, and 21. The findings also resulted in rejection of Null Hypotheses 3, 6, 14, 17, 18, 19, and 22.
Conclusions Based on the Hypotheses

Based on the findings in the study, the following conclusions were warranted:

1. Female and male principals did not differ in demanding reconciliation, tolerance of uncertainty, initiation of structure, tolerance of freedom, role retention, consideration, production emphasis, predictive accuracy, or integration.

2. Although female and male principals did not differ in total leader behaviors, differences occurred in these areas of behavior:
   (a) Female principals acted and spoke more representative of the group.
   (b) Female principals used persuasion and argument more effectively. They exhibited stronger convictions.
   (c) Female principals maintained more cordial relations with superiors. They had more influence with superiors and were striving for higher status.

3. Teachers rated female principals higher on all twelve dimensions of the LBDQ.

4. Organizational climate was not significantly different in schools with female principals when compared to schools with male principals. There were no differences in the following dimensions: disengagement, hindrance, production emphasis or thrust.

5. Differences in climate occurred in these areas:
   (a) Morale was extremely higher in schools with female principals. Teachers' social needs were being satisfied and they were enjoying a sense of accomplishment in their jobs.
(b) Intimacy was considerably higher in schools with female principals. Teachers were enjoying friendly social relations with each other.

(c) Female principals were more aloof. They behaved in a formal and impersonal manner. They tended to "go by the book" and preferred to be guided by rules and policies rather than to deal in an informal face-to-face situation.

(d) Female principals were more considerate. They tried to do a little something extra for teachers in human terms.

6. Female principals scored higher in production emphasis and thrust. Male principals scored higher in disengagement and hindrance.

Conclusions Based on Additional Analysis of the Data

Additional analysis of the data was conducted to determine if female and male teachers perceived female principals differently and if they perceived male principals differently. Based on an analysis of the data, the following conclusions were warranted:

1. Female teachers rated female principals higher on all twelve dimensions of the LBDQ than did male teachers.

2. Female principals were perceived as more representative of the group, more persuasive and to exhibit greater initiation of structure by female teachers than by male teachers.

3. In schools with male principals, no significant differences occurred between female and male teachers' perceptions on either the LBDQ or OCDQ.

4. In schools with male principals, female teachers rated the principal higher than did male teachers on five of the twelve dimensions of the LBDQ:
representation, demanding reconciliation, initiation of structure, consideration, and superior orientation. Male principals were rated higher by male teachers on six dimensions: tolerance of uncertainty, persuasiveness, tolerance of freedom, role retention, production emphasis, and integration.

10. Female teachers rated female principals higher than male principals on all twelve dimensions of the LBDQ.

11. Male teachers rated male principals higher on eight of the twelve dimensions of the LBDQ. Male teachers rated female and male principals equally in demanding reconciliation. Male teachers rated female principals higher in representation, consideration, and superior orientation.

12. In schools with female principals, female teachers rated the climate higher than did male teachers in six dimensions: hindrance, esprit, intimacy, aloofness, thrust and consideration. Male teachers rated it higher in two dimensions: disengagement and production emphasis.

13. Female teachers perceived higher morale in schools with female principals than did male teachers.

14. Female teachers perceived greater thrust from female principals than did male teachers. Female teachers perceived the female principal as motivating the teachers through the example she personally set.

15. In schools with male principals, female teachers rated the climate higher than did male teachers on three dimensions: disengagement, esprit, and thrust. Male teachers rated the climate higher in the five other dimensions.

16. In the climate dimensions, female teachers rated female principals higher in six of the eight dimensions: esprit, intimacy, aloofness,
production emphasis, thrust, and consideration. Female teachers rated male principals higher in two dimensions: disengagement and hindrance.

17. In organizational climate dimensions, male teachers rated male principals higher in five of the eight dimensions: hindrance, intimacy, aloofness, thrust, and consideration. Male teachers rated female principals higher than male principals in three dimensions: disengagement, esprit, and production emphasis.

Recommendations Based on the Findings

The results of this study supported the position that females are perceived to be capable of effective administrative leadership. In view of this conclusion, the following recommendations were made:

1. School systems could include as part of in-service training and staff development the sharing of leader behavior strengths by female and male principals.

2. School systems (either system wide or by school unit) could use such instruments as the LBDQ and OCDQ to assess the present situation and incorporate the findings into the staff development and professional growth activities for the school year.

3. Research could be conducted to determine the relationships between school climate and social or political influences within the same thirteen school districts served by the Upper East Tennessee Educational Cooperative.
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March 28, 1980

Dear __________________________:

I am currently involved in a research project for my dissertation leading to a doctorate in Educational Administration from East Tennessee State University. I plan to survey teachers' perceptions of the principal's leader behavior and the school's organizational climate. No school, school system, principal, or teacher will be identified. Data will be tabulated and analyzed on the basis of the thirteen school districts in Upper East Tennessee and reported by schools with female principals as compared to schools with male principals.

The following school(s) in your district have been randomly selected as part of the sample:__________________________________. May I please contact the principals in these schools for permission to survey the teachers in the schools?

Thank you very much for your cooperation in this matter. Enclosed is a consent form for you to return to me in granting or denying permission to contact the principals. Enclosed is a stamped, self-addressed envelop.

Sincerely,

Diana Rogers

Enclosures
CONSENT FORM TO CONTACT PRINCIPALS

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

_________ No, you may not contact the principals of the randomly selected schools.

(Superintendent)

(School District)
APPENDIX C
Dear ____________________________:

This is to confirm _____________________________ as the date and time scheduled for me to collect data in your school. This involves the members of your teaching staff filling in two questionnaires.

Thank you very much for your willingness to participate in this study.

Sincerely,

Diana Rogers
Date

Dear

I want to thank you very much for permitting me to visit your school to collect data for my research project. I hope the results of my study will be beneficial to individuals serving in our capacity.

Again, thank you very much for your help. I enjoyed visiting your school. Please convey my appreciation to the members of your staff who participated by filling in the questionnaires for me.

I hope the remainder of this school year is a good one for both you and your staff. Best wishes for next year.

Sincerely,

Diana Rogers
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 is (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 (ABCDE) following the item to show the answer you have selected.

\[ A = \text{Always} \]
\[ B = \text{Often} \]
\[ C = \text{Occasionally} \]
\[ D = \text{Seldom} \]
\[ E = \text{Never} \]

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

Example: Often acts as described ......................... A B C D E

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

Example: Occasionally acts as described ................. A B C D E

1. Acts as the spokesperson of the group ................. A B C D E

2. Waits patiently for the results of a decision ....... A B C D E

3. Makes pep talks to stimulate the group .............. A B C D E

4. Lets group members know what is expected of them .. A B C D E

5. Allows the members complete freedom in their work .. A B C D E

6. Is hesitant about taking initiative in the group .... A B C D E

7. Is friendly and approachable .......................... A B C D E

8. Encourages overtime work .............................. A B C D E

9. Makes accurate decisions .............................. A B C D E

10. Gets along well with the people above him/her ...... A B C D E
A = Always
B = Often
C = Occasionally
D = Seldom
E = Never

11. Publicizes the activities of the group .................. A B C D E
12. Becomes anxious when he/she cannot find out what is coming next .................. A B C D E
13. His/her arguments are convincing .................. A B C D E
14. Encourages the use of uniform procedures .................. A B C D E
15. Permits the members to use their own judgment in solving problems .................. A B C D E
16. Fails to take necessary action .................. A B C D E
17. Does little things to make it pleasant to be a member of the group .................. A B C D E
18. Stresses being ahead of competing groups .................. A B C D E
19. Keeps the group working together as a team .................. A B C D E
20. Keeps the group in good standing with higher authority .................. A B C D E
21. Speaks as the representative of the group .................. A B C D E
22. Accepts defeat in stride .................. A B C D E
23. Argues persuasively for his/her point of view .................. A B C D E
24. Tries out his/her ideas in the group .................. A B C D E
25. Encourages initiative in the group members .................. A B C D E
26. Lets other persons take away his/her leadership in the group .................. A B C D E
27. Puts suggestions made by the group into operation .... A B C D E
28. Needles members for greater effort .................. A B C D E
29. Seems able to predict what is coming next ............ A B C D E
A = Always
B = Often
C = Occasionally
D = Seldom
E = Never

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

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
55. Turns the members loose on a job, and lets them go
to it ................................................................ A B C D E
56. Backs down when he/she ought to stand firm ........ A B C D E
57. Keeps to himself/herself .............................. A B C D E
58. Asks the members to work harder .................... A B C D E
59. Is accurate in predicting the trend of events ....... A B C D E
60. Gets his/her superiors to act for the welfare of the group members ......................... A B C D E
61. Gets swamped by details ............................... A B C D E
62. Can wait just so long, then blows up ............... A B C D E
63. Speaks from a strong inner conviction ............... A B C D E
64. Makes sure that his/her part in the group is under-
stood by the group members ............................. A B C D E
65. Is reluctant to allow the members any freedom of
action ..................................................... A B C D E
66. Lets some members have authority that he/she should
keep ..................................................... A B C D E
67. Looks out for the personal welfare of group members .. A B C D E
68. Permits the members to take it easy in their work .... A B C D E
A = Always
B = Often
C = Occasionally
D = Seldom
E = Never

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

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
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
Ms. Diana Ahea Rogers
Route 13
Box 348
Gray, TN 37015

Dear Ms. Rogers:

You have our permission to use, in the English language only, the "Organisational Climate Description questionnaire" from THEORY AND RESEARCH IN ADMINISTRATION by Andrew W. Halpin, subject to the following limitations:

Permission is granted for usage of the material in the manner and for the purpose as specified in your letter. Note: if your dissertation is published, other than by University Microfilms, it is necessary to reapply for permission;

Permission is granted for a fee of $35.00. This fee is payable upon signing;

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

Reprinted with permission of Macmillan Publishing Co., Inc.
from THEORY AND RESEARCH IN ADMINISTRATION by Andrew W. Halpin.
© Copyright by Andrew W. Halpin, 1946.

If you are in agreement, please sign both copies of this letter in the space provided below and return one copy and your remittance to this department.

Sincerely,

Contracts Supervisor

DIANA AHEA ROGERS

P.S. All inquiries relating to scoring, please contact directly by phone Dr. Andrew E. Hayes, at the University of North Carolina, Wilmington, 919-791-6530.
Please check one:  Teacher Respondent Sex: _____ Female  _____ Male

Note: No teacher, principal, school or school district will be identified in this study. Data will be tabulated according to the twenty schools in the sample from the thirteen school districts served by the Upper East Tennessee Educational Cooperative.

ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE DESCRIPTION QUESTIONNAIRE

Form IV

The purpose of this questionnaire is to secure a description of the different ways in which teachers interact and in which teachers interact with the principal. This questionnaire was developed at Ohio State University and has been widely used throughout the country.

Please indicate to what extent each of the descriptions characterizes your school. Please do not evaluate the items in terms of "good" or "bad" behavior, but read each item carefully and respond to terms of how well the statement describes your school this year.

Mark your responses to each of the sixty-four items by circling the appropriate letter response to the right of the descriptive statement. The descriptive scale on which to rate items is explained below:

- A) Rarely occurs
- B) Sometimes occurs
- C) Often occurs
- D) Very frequently occurs

Mark only one response per item; be sure to completely erase all unwanted marks. Thank you for your assistance.

A) Rarely occurs
B) Sometimes occurs
C) Often occurs
D) Very frequently occurs

QUESTIONNAIRE ITEMS

1. Teachers' closest friends are other faculty members at this school

2. The mannerisms of teachers at this school are annoying

3. Teachers spend time after school with students who have individual problems

4. Instructions for the operation of teaching aids are available

5. Teachers invite other faculty members to visit them at home

6. There is a minority group of teachers who always oppose the majority

7. Extra books are available for classroom use

8. Sufficient time is given to prepare administrative reports

9. Teachers know the family background of other faculty members

10. Teachers exert group pressure on nonconforming faculty members

11. In faculty meetings, there is the feeling of "let's get things done."

12. Administrative paper work is burdensome at this school

13. Teachers talk about their personal life to other faculty members

14. Teachers seek special favors from the principal

15. School supplies are readily available for use in classwork

16. Student progress reports require too much work

17. Teachers have fun socializing together during school hours
A) Rarely occurs  
B) Sometimes occurs  
C) Often occurs  
D) Very frequently occurs

18. Teachers interrupt other faculty members who are talking in staff meetings ........................................... A B C D

19. Most of the teachers here accept the faults of their colleagues ......................................................... A B C D

20. Teachers have too many committee requirements ........ A B C D

21. There is considerable laughter when teachers gather informally .......................................................... A B C D

22. Teachers ask nonsensical questions in faculty meetings .. A B C D

23. Custodial service is available when needed .......... A B C D

24. Routine duties interfere with the job of teaching ...... A B C D

25. Teachers prepare administrative reports by themselves ... A B C D

26. Teachers ramble when they talk in faculty meetings ...... A B C D

27. Teachers at this school show much school pride ......... A B C D

28. The principal goes out of his/her way to help members ... A B C D

29. The principal helps teachers solve personal problems .... A B C D

30. Teachers at this school stay by themselves ............ A B C D

31. The teachers accomplish their work with great vim, vigor, and pleasure ................................................ A B C D

32. The principal sets an example by working hard himself/ herself .................................................................. A B C D

33. The principal does personal favors for teachers ........ A B C D

34. Teachers eat lunch by themselves in their own classrooms. A B C D

35. The morale of the teachers is high ................................. A B C D

36. The principal uses constructive criticism .................. A B C D

37. The principal stays after school to help teachers finish their work ...................................................... A B C D
A) Rarely occurs
B) Sometimes occurs
C) Often occurs
D) Very frequently occurs

38. Teachers socialize together in small select groups .... A B C D
39. The principal makes all class-scheduling decisions .... A B C D
40. Teachers are contacted by the principal each day .... A B C D
41. The principal is well prepared when he/she speaks at school functions ............................................. A B C D
42. The principal helps staff members settle minor differences .................................................. A B C D
43. The principal schedules the work for the teachers .... A B C D
44. Teachers leave the grounds during the school day .... A B C D
45. Teachers help select which courses will be taught .... A B C D
46. The principal corrects teachers' mistakes .............. A B C D
47. The principal talks a great deal .................................................. A B C D
48. The principal explains his/her reasons for criticism to teachers .................................................. A B C D
49. The principal tries to get better salaries for teachers.. A B C D
50. Extra duty for teachers is posted conspicuously ........ A B C D
51. The rules set by the principal are never questioned .... A B C D
52. The principal looks out for the personal welfare of the teachers .................................................. A B C D
53. School secretarial service is available for teachers' use .................................................. A B C D
54. The principal runs the faculty meeting like a business conference .................................................. A B C D
55. The principal is in the building before teachers arrive.. A B C D
56. Teachers work together preparing administrative reports.. A B C D
57. Faculty meetings are organized according to a tight agenda .................................................. A B C D
58. Faculty meetings are mainly principal-report meetings ... A B C D
59. The principal tells teachers of new ideas he/she has run across ........................................... A B C D
60. Teachers talk about leaving the school system .......... A B C D
61. The principal checks the subject-matter ability of teachers ..................................................... A B C D
62. The principal is easy to understand ...................... A B C D
63. Teachers are informed of the results of a supervisor's visit ..................................................... A B C D
64. The principal insures that teachers work to their full capacity ..................................................... A B C D
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