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Problem

This is a study of the leadership behavior of high school principals in Jamaica from the perspective of teachers and the principals themselves. The Ministry of Education in Jamaica concurred with the researcher that valuable insights could be gained from this study which could benefit the development of education in Jamaica.

The purpose of this study is to identify the perceptions and expectations relative to Initiating Structure by which principals establish lines of communication and methods of procedure and Consideration by which they establish trust and friendship with their faculties.

The transactional model of leadership describes these two dimensions as complementary factors which characterize the performance of the most effective principals. The literature review supports this premise and establishes the reliability, validity and usefulness of the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ) for research in leadership behavior.
Method

The responses of 16 principals and 195 teachers to the Real and Ideal forms of the LBDQ-XII furnished the data for the test of the hypotheses by the following techniques:

1. Two-way multivariate analysis of variance

2. One-way multivariate analysis of variance made necessary by the presence of significant interaction effect (p < .05) in the two-way analysis

3. t test between all possible pairs of means

Results

The null hypotheses have not been upheld with respect to the one-way analysis of variance and the t tests. With reference to the former, the results are as follows:

1. The principals say that they show significantly greater Initiating Structure and Consideration than the teachers acknowledge (p < .001)

2. They say that they should show significantly greater Initiating Structure and Consideration than their teachers think necessary (p < .001)

3. They say also, that their performance is significantly lower than desirable (p < .001)

4. The teachers say that the performance of their principals is significantly lower than expected (p < .01)

The quadrant analysis defined by coordinates, provided graphic support for these findings.

Conclusion

Teachers and principals, in this study (as in similar studies), indicated that desirable leadership behavior for principals was characterized by high performance on the Initiating Structure and Consideration dimensions measured by the LBDQ. This means that they expect principals (1) to make teachers aware of their expectations, (2) to encourage teachers to use uniform procedures, (3) to try out their ideas among their faculties, (4) to make their attitudes clear to their faculties, (5) to make decisions regarding things to be done, (6) to assign teachers to particular responsibilities, (7) to clarify their own role, (8) to schedule work loads, (9) to request that faculties follow standard regulations, (10) to be friendly and approachable, (11) to do little things that make it pleasant for their
faculties, (12) to put suggestions made by faculties into operation, (13) to treat all teachers as equals, (14) to give advanced notice of changes, (15) to interact with their faculties, (16) to facilitate the personal welfare of teachers, (17) to be willing to make changes, (18) to explain their actions, and (19) to act in consultation with their faculties.

Inasmuch as the teachers and the principals themselves are not satisfied that the principals are meeting these expectations adequately, it is recommended that the Ministry of Education and the principals adopt policies and develop programs that will facilitate achievement of these expectations at higher levels of efficiency and effectiveness.
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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

The achievement of the Jamaica Ministry of Education goal for "The development of a modern teaching profession" (Jamaica: A Guide for Teachers, 1975, p. 23) is, without doubt, contingent upon the nature of the leadership transactions between principals and faculties in Jamaican high schools. Inquiry about teachers' and principals' perceptions of and expectations for the leadership behavior of the principals might provide valuable insights by which to determine desirable future steps relative to the development of the modern teaching profession.

Statement of the Problem

The Permanent Secretary, Dr. Errol Miller, in the Jamaica Ministry of Education, recognized that a study of the leadership behavior of principals "could benefit the development of education in Jamaica" (Appendix C). He concurred with this researcher that there is a need to identify teachers' and principals' perceptions and expectations relative to the two dimensions of the leadership behavior of principals designated as Initiating Structure and Consideration.

In this research, therefore, an investigation has been made of the differences between the perceptions of leadership behavior and the expectations for leadership behavior of these principals. Specifically, the following questions have been studied:
1. Is there any difference between the teachers' perceptions and their principals' perceptions of the principals' leadership behavior?

2. Is there any difference between the teachers' expectations and their principals' expectations for the principals' leadership behavior?

3. Is there any difference between the principals' perceptions of and expectations for their own leadership behavior?

4. Is there any difference between the teachers' perceptions of and expectations for their principals' leadership behavior?

The answers to these questions may suggest the need for goals which may be considered by the Ministry of Education and secondary school principals.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this research has been to identify the leadership behavior of high school principals in Jamaica by investigating the following:

1. The difference between the teachers' perceptions and their principals' perceptions of the principals' leadership behavior

2. The difference between the teachers' expectations and their principals' expectations for the principals' leadership behavior

3. The difference between the principals' perceptions of and expectations for their own leadership behavior

4. The difference between the teachers' perceptions of and expectations for their principals' leadership behavior
Importance of the Study

The Ministry of Education and public high school principals in Jamaica have been provided this study which identifies the expectations teachers and principals hold for the leadership behavior of these principals. The report shows, also, how adequately the principals meet these expectations.

The recommendations incorporated in the final chapter suggest implications for general theory of administration, for selection and evaluation of principals, for pre-service and in-service training for principals, and for further research.

Rationale for the Hypotheses

This research, developed within the conceptual framework of role theory, has been guided by three assumptions. They are:

1. All principals engage in two modes of leadership behavior which may be designated as Initiating Structure and Consideration.

2. The transactional model for leadership behavior provides a framework that facilitates the achievement of maximum individual and organizational goals. It is characterized by high levels of achievement on both the Initiating Structure and the Consideration dimensions.

3. This third assumption has two parts. They are: (a) the actual leadership behavior of the principal is probably not as crucial to the success of the educational enterprise as that leadership behavior which is perceived by teachers and (b) when there is congruence between the perceived and expected leadership behavior of principals from the perspective of teachers and principals, there will be high levels of teacher satisfaction and morale.
Initiating Structure and Consideration

Through Initiating Structure, the principal clearly defines his own role and makes his faculty aware of their role. Through Consideration, he "regards the comfort, well-being, status and contribution" (Stogdill, 1974, p. 143) of his faculty. Leadership behaviors which are related to Initiating Structure and Consideration are coterminous with two dimensions which Barnard (1938) described as effectiveness and efficiency:

Effectiveness relates to the accomplishment of cooperative purpose, which is social and non-personal in character. Efficiency relates to the satisfaction of individual motives, and is personal in character. The test of effectiveness is the accomplishment of a common purpose or purposes, effectiveness can be measured. The test of efficiency is the eliciting of sufficient individual wills to cooperate (p. 60).

Initiating Structure and Consideration are coterminous also with two leadership dimensions which Cartwright and Zander (1953) explained:

(a) The achievement of some specific group goal, or (b) the maintenance or strengthening of the group itself. Examples of member behaviors that serve functions of goal achievement are "initiates actions," "keeps members' attention on the goal," "clarifies the issue," "develops a procedural plan," "evaluates the quality of work done," and "makes expert information available" (p. 541, quoted in Evenson, p. 6).

Getzel's (1958) nomothetic and idiographic postulates suggest parallels for the Initiating Structure and Consideration dimensions investigated in this study. The dynamics of the relationships between the dimensions were described within the context of a social system. He says:

We conceive of the social system as involving two classes of phenomena which are at once conceptually independent and phenomenally interactive. There are first the institutions with certain roles and expectations that fulfill the goals of the system and there are second the individuals with certain personalities and need
dispositions inhabiting the system, whose observed interactions comprise what we generally call "social behavior." . . . This social behavior may be understood as a function of these major elements: institution, role, and expectation . . . the nomothetic or normative dimension of activity in a social system; and individual personality, and need disposition. . . . The idiographic or personal dimension of activity . . . needs and expectations may both be thought of as motives for behavior, the one deriving from personalistic sets and propensities, the other from institutional obligations and requirements. . . . A given act is conceived as deriving simultaneously from both the nomothetic and idiographic dimensions. . . . The proportion of role and personality factors determining behavior will . . . vary with the specific act, the specific role, and the specific personality involved. . . .

The relevance of the general model for administrative theory and practice becomes apparent when it is seen that the administrative process deals with the fulfillment of both nomothetic and idiographic requirements within the context of a particular social system (pp. 152-159).

Initiating Structure and Consideration provide an appropriate vocabulary by which to define leadership behavior.

The Transactional Framework

Zeigler (1973) asserted:

Sound administrative theory and research may ultimately provide knowledge whereby administrative leaders in education can function most effectively (p. 256).

Research based upon the assumptions of the transactional model might suggest future steps towards the achievement of the goals to which Zeigler referred. Progress has been made from a status in which administrators perceived the goals of the organization as inimical to the goals of the individual to one in which these goals are viewed as complementary. Rawlinson (1973) asserted:

The assumption that the incumbent can activate only one role at a time, a viewpoint which has been found convenient in much research on role analysis, has, in large measure been refuted (p. 317).
Fleishman (1973) indicated that Initiating Structure and Consideration are "independent dimensions of leadership and not opposite ends of a single continuum" (p. 8). He explained:

The identification of these two factors of consideration and structure pointed a new method of conceptualizing leadership in which supervisors could, in fact, rank high on both dimensions or have various combinations of these. . . . These are complementary and not necessarily conflicting aspects of supervisory performance (p. 8).

The administrator whose leadership style is characterized as transactional recognizes the needs of the individuals and the goals of the organization and creates an environment within which "both interact for maximum production" (Strayer, 1968, p. 31). In the organization characterized by transactional leadership, the individual realizes his goals best while he works to fulfill the goals of the organization.

Perceived and Expected Leadership Behavior

Morale and teacher satisfaction are affected by teachers' and principals' perceptions of and expectations for the leadership behavior of principals.

Brown (1973) pointed out that "administrative outputs are sensitive also to staff perceptions of a principal's leadership" (p. 307). He suggested the need for principals to sharpen their own perceptions since

. . . even the most successful school principals will project their own style of leadership into their perceptions of individual staff members. The effective-rated teacher to the system-centered principal is quite different from the effective-rated teacher perceived by the individual-centered principal (p. 309).

Getzels (1958) asserted that
the relevant research suggests that congruence in the perception of expectations often takes priority over actual observed behavior... in determining which outcomes of administrative interaction will be reported favorably by the participants in the interaction and which unfavorably (p. 158).

In the absence of congruence in expectations and perceptions, role-set is evidenced:

Conflicts and pressures arising from the role-set are both within the purview of, and significant for what occurs within, the organization. The frequently vague and contradictory expectations which constitute the role-set not only produce conflict and tension for a given role incumbent; they also tend to divert attention from the task performance which is required for efficient goal performance (Abbott, 1973, pp. 192-193).

Getzels (1958) identified two studies which explain the significance of perception in interpersonal or group relationships. These studies are based upon the hypothesis that

when the perceptions of the expectations of participants in an administrative interaction overlap, the participants feel satisfied with the work accomplished no matter what the actual behavior or accomplishment; when the perception of the expectations does not overlap, the participants feel dissatisfied (Getzels, 1958, p. 160).

Ferneau (1954, quoted in Getzels, 1958, p. 160) explained one of the two studies. The interaction of consultants and administrators in a school setting was investigated by a problem-situation instrument in which diverse expectations for the consultant role could find expression. Each consultant and each school administrator was asked to evaluate the outcome of the consultation. Comparisons were made between the expectations for the consultant role held by the consultant himself and by the administrator and the effect of the congruence or discrepancy of these perceptions on the evaluation of the actual interaction. The results showed that when an administrator and a consultant
agreed on the expectations, they were more likely to rate the actual consultation favorably. The actual consultation was generally rated unfavorably when the administrator and the consultant disagreed on the expectations. Ferneau called attention to the fact that

the success or failure was apparently independent of the specific character either of the expectations or of the manifest behavior—provided that the participants' perception of the expectations, whatever their character, overlapped (p. 160).

In the second study, Moyer (1954, quoted in Getzels, 1958, pp. 160-162) investigated the relationship between the expectations of teachers and administrator for leadership in the educational setting and the effects of congruence or discrepancy in this relationship upon teacher satisfaction. The results indicated that "the greater the agreement between teacher and principal on the expectations for leadership, the more favorable the attitudes toward the work situation" (pp. 160-161).

The following statement by Guba and Bidwell (1957) provides an appropriate summary of the rationale under discussion:

Role occupancy, then, whether in the school or in any other institution or group, has at least two aspects: (1) behavior which attains institutional or group goals and (2) behavior which satisfies individual needs. An investigation of the principal-teacher role relationships and of the concepts on which it is based must take account of the ways in which this relationship affects role behavior which is adequate for the organization and for the individuals (Guba and Bidwell, 1947, quoted in Evenson, 1958, p. 7).

While it has been recognized that a study of teachers' and principals' perception of and expectations for the leadership behavior of principals might provide valuable insights into desirable future steps for goal setting, no attempt has been made to prove or support this statement of rationale through the hypotheses that have been investigated in this study.
Hypotheses and Criterion

Four hypotheses have been investigated in this study. They have been stated in the null form to facilitate statistical testing. These are:

1. There is no difference between the teachers' perceptions and their principals' perceptions of the principals' leadership behavior.

2. There is no difference between the teachers' expectations and their principals' expectations for the principals' leadership behavior.

3. There is no difference between the principals' perceptions of and expectations for their own leadership behavior.

4. There is no difference between the teachers' perceptions of and expectations for their principals' leadership behavior. The confidence level for acceptance or rejection of the hypotheses is .05 \( (\alpha = .05) \).

Definition of Terms

Leadership style or leader behavior or leadership behavior refers to the conduct of the formal head of an institution or work-group.

Consideration refers to leadership behavior which emphasizes supportive relationship and personal interest in subordinates.

Initiating Structure refers to that leader behavior which establishes distinct lines of communication and relationship between subordinates and their leader and defines organizational goals.

Perceived behavior refers to actions of the principal which respondents describe on the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire as real.
Expected behavior refers to actions which respondents describe on the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire as ideal.

LBDQ refers to the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (defined in Chapter II).

LBDQ-Ideal-Self refers to responses made by principals on the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire indicating their preference or expectation for a principal's behavior.

LBDQ-Real-Self refers to responses made by principals on the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire indicating their perception of their own behavior as principals.

LBDQ-Ideal-Staff refers to responses made by teachers on the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire indicating their preference or expectation for the behavior of their principal.

LBDQ-Real-Staff refers to responses made by teachers on the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire indicating their perception of their principal's leader behavior.

High Schools in Jamaica are those educational institutions which provide classroom experience for grades 7 through 12. They prepare students for the Ordinary Level and Advanced Level of the Cambridge and London Examinations.

Delimitations

In this study investigation was made of the leadership behavior of principals practicing in Jamaican public high schools during the administration of the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (1975 and 1976). Although many dimensions of leader behavior have been identified, this study was concerned with two dimensions only, Consideration and Initiating Structure.
This study has not been concerned primarily with the problem of evaluation of the performance of the principals, inasmuch as such an evaluation is very complex and would demand more responses than those elicited by this questionnaire.

It is presumed in this study that the LBDQ is a valid and reliable instrument for use in the study of the leadership behavior of principals in Jamaican high schools.

The inferences made from the result of this study are based upon returns of questionnaires from approximately 50 per cent of the sample selected.

The transactional model, while it is generally the most desirable, has not been demonstrated as always optimal.

It is presumed in this study that the results are not significantly affected by (1) self-selection among respondents, (2) the order in which principals completed the two forms of the LBDQ, and (3) the inclusion of those schools only which returned a minimum of five LBDQ-Real-Staff, five LBDQ-Ideal-Staff, and two LBDQ-Self.

The demographic data gathered with the LBDQ responses are for ex post facto study.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE: THE TRANSACTIONAL MODEL
OF LEADERSHIP STYLE AND ITS PRECURSORS

The Trait Model

Researchers' earliest attempts to study leadership produced the trait model. This approach segments leadership ability into "traits of character and personality that mark the leader" (Dale, 1969, p. 429). Ross and Hendry (1957, pp. 17, 18) provided rationale for this emphasis on traits. They pointed out that it was inevitable that traits should be recognized in identifying the leader. Leadership through the centuries had been recognized through lines of inheritance. Hence, leaders were born and not made. Leadership was monopolized by the aristocracy. However, after the overthrow of the feudal nobility, the rise of an equalitarian democracy, and the emergence of a new perspective on leadership, it was recognized that leaders were made and not born. It was frequently assumed that those conditions which favored an individual's emergence as a leader were qualities of that individual.

The great man theory of leadership emerged from this perspective. This theory stated that "it was men of a distinctive stamp, predestined by their possession of unusual traits, who led events and molded situations" (Ross and Hendry, 1957, p. 18). Many attempts were
made to identify those traits which characterized leaders. Stogdill's (1948) review of the extant studies of leadership traits demonstrated that although personal attributes such as social poise, weight, height, health, and appearance correlate with leadership status, these correlations are so small that it is impractical to use any of these measures as predictors of leadership.

Stogdill (1974) compared the surveys of 1948 and of 1970. He concluded that clusters of characteristics tend to differentiate

(1) leaders from followers, (2) effective from ineffective leaders, and (3) higher echelon from lower echelon leaders. . . . The characteristics, considered singly, hold little diagnostic or predictive significance. In combination, it would appear that they interact to generate personality dynamics advantageous to the person seeking the responsibilities of leadership. The conclusion that personality is a factor in leadership differentiation does not represent a return to the trait approach (pp. 81-82).

Gouldner (1950, pp. 23-49) identified some inadequacies of the trait approach. He included the following:

1. Traits are infrequently listed in any important order
2. Often traits appearing on a single list are not mutually exclusive
3. Those traits which are associated with the achievement of leadership are not distinguished from those associated with the maintenance of leadership
4. It has not been determined whether, and which, traits of leadership are present before the assumption of the leadership role and which traits develop after
5. The same traits may function differently depending upon the organization of the personality
Gouldner (1950, pp. 40-41) suggested that probably personality traits common to different leaders have not emerged because many of the studies related to traits have used a false concept of traits. Many times personality or psychological traits have been alluded to as if they were like physical traits. Fiedler and Chemers (1974) asserted that the single most important conclusion from the studies relating personality traits to leadership was that "the leader's abilities and aptitudes or his background tended to be related to the particular and specific goals the group was trying to achieve" (pp. 365-366).

**The Situational Model**

The trait approach to leadership was not acceptable to many theorists who believed that the effective leader emerged as a consequence of circumstance, time, and place. Person (1928, pp. 9, 10-21) proposed two hypotheses to account for leadership.

1. Any particular situation plays a large part in determining leadership qualities and the leader for that situation.

2. The qualities in an individual, which a particular situation may determine as leadership qualities, are themselves the product of a succession of prior leadership situations which have developed and molded him.

Sanford (1951, p. 158) identified three basic factors in leadership phenomena as (1) the leader, (2) the situation, and (3) the follower. Gibb (1954, p. 901) wrote that the four elements in the situational approach are:
1. The structure of the interpersonal relations within a group

2. The group or syntality

3. Characteristics of the total culture in which the group exists and from which the group members have been drawn

4. The physical conditions and the task with which the group is confronted

From his discussion of a number of experiments in which the same groups were observed as they fulfilled six different tasks, Gibb (1954) concluded that

a group member achieves the status of a group leader for the time being in proportion as he participates in group activities and demonstrates his capacity for contributing more than others to the group achievement of the group goal. It is known that the situation is especially liable to change through changes in goals, changes in syntality, changes in interpersonal relations, the entrance of new members and the departure of others, pressures from other groups, and so on. Since individual personality characteristics are, by contrast, very stable, it is to be expected that group leadership, if unrestricted by the conscious hierarchial structuration of the group, will be fluid and will pass from one member to another along the line of those particular personality traits, which, by virtue of the situation and its demands, become, for the time being, traits of leadership. This is why the leader in one situation is not necessarily the leader, even in the same group, in another different situation (p. 902).

In the situational model of leadership, therefore, leadership is always relative to the situation from three perspectives:

1. Leadership is rewarding only in problem situations

2. The characteristics of the leadership role are delimited by the goal of the group

3. The attitudes, ideals and goals of the followers are as important as the personality of the leader
The Behavioral Model

The behavioral approach to leadership is concerned with the actions of the leader. Behavior patterns are the components of the leadership style described by this model.

Bower's and Seashore's (1966, p. 248) review of selected leadership studies showed that leadership concepts tend to fall into two broad groups. One group emphasizes concern for people, while the other group emphasizes concern for tasks. Different theorists have given different labels to these two basic orientations. Some examples are (a) goal orientation versus group-interaction behavior (Hemphill and Coons, 1957), (b) Initiating Structure versus Consideration (Halpin, 1956), (c) employee orientation versus production orientation (Katz, Maccoby and Morse, 1950), (d) providing direct need satisfaction versus enabling goal achievement (Kahn, 1958), (e) human relations skills versus technical skills (Mann, 1965), and (f) group maintenance functions versus goal achievement functions (Cartwright and Zander, 1953).

Likert (1961) described two styles of leadership—the employee-centered leadership versus the job-centered or production-centered leadership. The employee-centered leader has strong concern for the needs and the preferences of his subordinates and gives much consideration to the building of effective work groups with high performance goals. The task-centered or production-centered leader, however, is concerned primarily with ensuring that his subordinates perform the tasks appropriately under close supervision.

Hellriegel and Slocum (1974) held that the leader who scores high on the Consideration dimension will strive to achieve mutual
trust and respect with his subordinates. He is considerate of his subordinates' feelings and opinions. The supervisor, however, who scores high on Initiating Structure tends to build the supervisory roles of subordinates towards the achievement of the goals of the organization. This supervisor spends more time planning, organizing, and controlling the work flow for subordinates and demonstrates less interest in the feelings of his subordinates.

They reported (1974):

In a study of two groups of employees in the Prudential Life Insurance Company, one group was given employee-centered supervision. While productivity for both groups increased, the employee-centered supervision produced an increase in favorable employee attitudes toward the company and supervision, while the production-centered group showed a marked decrease on these two dimensions (p. 339).

They summarized their behavioral approach to leadership (1974):

Employee-centered or considerate leadership has been related to (1) lower grievances, absenteeism, and turnover, (2) more intra-group cooperation, and (3) sometimes higher productivity. Further, employee-centered leadership behavior is most effective when (1) decisions are nonroutine, (2) decisions do not need to be made rapidly..., (3) the information inputted to the group is not standardized, and (4) subordinates (a) feel a need for independence, (b) regard their participation in the decision making process as legitimate, and (c) can work without close supervision (pp. 341-342).

Probably the strongest argument against the behavioral model is that it fails to recognize that the modes of behavior which are treated as if they were mutually exclusive could be considered instead as coordinate dimensions.

The Contingency Model

This theory postulates that the leader who is most effective is the one who can adapt, who can change his style according to the
dictates of the situation, the group, and his personal values. Hence, the question is not which style is best, but what style would be the most effective in the given situation.

The problem as identified by Fiedler and Chemers (1974, p. 373) has the following components:

1. Classifying personality attributes of the leader
2. Classifying leadership situations
3. Matching a particular type of leader to a particular leadership situation

Fiedler (1971) was concerned with determining which leadership style is the most effective, the relations-centered or the task-centered.

Task-centered leadership behavior consists of structuring the activities and relationship of subordinates in terms of task accomplishment. The task-centered leader's performance is more effective in very favorable and very unfavorable situations.

Relations-centered leadership behavior emphasizes the building and maintenance of good personal relationships between the leader and his subordinates. This type of leader, Fiedler (1971, p. 131) indicated, performs more effectively in situations intermediate in favorableness. The performance of the leader is measured in terms of the group's performance on its major assignment.

The relations-motivated and the task-motivated individuals are identified by an instrument developed by Fiedler and Chemers (1974, pp. 373-374). A bipolar adjective scale requires the respondent to think of everyone with whom he has ever worked and then to describe
the person with whom he could work least well. The description of the person’s lowest preferred coworker (LPC) provides an LPC score for that individual. A relatively high score indicates a high LPC or relationship-motivated person, whereas a low score indicates a low LPC or task-motivated person. The high LPC person’s chief goal is to establish and maintain close interpersonal relationships. When situations are tense, when his relations with co-workers seem tenuous, and when the situation is generally anxiety-arousing, the high LPC individual will show concern for good interpersonal relations. However, "this person does not have to behave in this way when his goals of being related are already secured" (Fiedler and Chemers, 1974, p. 374).

The low LPC person’s major goal is the accomplishment of a task or assignment. His self-esteem increases when he does a good job. However, when he feels that there is no problem in the accomplishment of the task, he will pursue his secondary goal.

Fiedler and Chemers (1974, p. 377) indicated that the field studies which can be used to validate the contingency model include Fiedler (1971) and Hunt (1967). Fiedler (1971) admitted that "the model seems to predict leadership performance in field situations, but not completely in laboratory situations" (p. 147).

Graen, Alvares, Orris and Martella (1970) analyzed, from strategical and procedural perspectives, the contingency model of leadership effectiveness and its supporting research. Their conclusions were as follows:

Although the antecedent probability based upon previously published reports appeared to be greater than zero, the evidential
probability based upon the evidence reviewed herein approaches zero. Thus the resulting inverse probability casts grave doubt on the plausibility of the contingency model (p. 285).

Graen, Alvares and Orris (1971) asserted that two parallel experimental studies were conducted which attempted to replicate and study further the contingency model of leadership effectiveness. However, the two studies showed results which were inconsistent with those predicted by the contingency model. Therefore, the authors concluded that "these data along with other evidential studies cast doubt on the plausibility of the contingency model of leadership effectiveness" (p. 196).

**The Transactional Model**

Halpin (1966, p. 84) saw the approaches to leadership style as developmental stages through which an adequate theory passes.

The trait model represents a very primitive attempt to account for leadership style, since it describes personality traits and not the behavior of leaders. Sanford (1952, p. 51) pointed out:

1. There are either no general leadership traits or, if they do exist, they are not to be described in any of our familiar psychological or common sense terms.

2. In a specific situation, leaders do have traits which set them apart from followers, but what traits set what leaders apart from what followers will vary from situation to situation.

While the behavior model provides a more tenable description of leader behavior than does the trait model, the concepts are sensitized rather than integrated. The leader has the option to select between Initiating Structure, as a leadership style, or the alternative, Consideration. However, Halpin (1966, p. 87) asserted that the two
kinds of behavior, Initiating Structure and Consideration, while relatively independent are not necessarily incompatible. In fact, the successful leader "should be strong in Initiating Structure and should also show high Consideration for the members of his work-group" (p. 87).

Under the situational model and the contingency model, selection of a leadership style depends upon the situation. Implications are that leadership styles are as transitory as are situations and probably outside the control of the leader.

Halpin (1966) suggested:

The situational emphasis which has characterized research during the past decade arose as a protest against the earlier trait approach, but in some respects this present emphasis may have been carried to excess. To say that leader behavior is determined exclusively by situational factors is to deny to the leader freedom of choice and determination. This violates common sense and experience . . . a gradual but growing counter-reaction is taking shape—a drawing away from the extreme situational position, with increasing recognition that the truth probably lies in an area of middle ground (p. 84).

The transactional model incorporates more dimensions than the trait model, the situational model, the behavioral model, or the contingency model. Leadership style is evidenced through a transaction. It is a function of both the leader and the perceiver of the leader behavior.

Insight into the dynamics of leadership style was provided through Bakke's (1953) theory of organization. The individual, Bakke pointed out, hopes to use the organization to further his own goals. At the same time the organization attempts to use the individual to further its goals. This might be interpreted as the intent of the
individual to make the organization Consideration-oriented and the in­
tent of the organization to be Initiating Structure-oriented. However, 
through a fusion process, the organization to some degree remakes the 
individual, and the individual remakes the organization.

The transaction that culminates in the fusion probably will be 
very significant in determining the leader behavior in situations that 
may arise in the future, instead of the situations determining the 
leader behavior.

This fusion process which Bakke described might be interpreted 
in terms of transaction in which the organization commits itself to be 
Consideration-oriented, while at the same time being Initiating 
Structure-oriented. Leadership style then, in an organizational set­
ting, becomes an integration of Consideration-orientation and Initiat­
ing Structure-orientation typifying the most productive transaction.

This position is consistent with the Managerial Grid in which 
Blake and Mouton (1964) conceptualized a range of eighty-one leader­
ship styles based upon the level of concern for people (Consideration) 
and the level of concern for tasks (Initiating Structure).

The five major leadership styles identified by the grid are:
1. 1:9 which emphasizes concern for people with negligible 
   concern for tasks
2. 9:1 which emphasizes concern for task with negligible con­
cern for people
3. 1:1 which indicates default in concern for task and con­
cern for people
4. 5:5 which indicates a compromise between concern for people and concern for task

5. 9:9 which indicates an integration of concern for people and concern for task (This represents the outcome of an ideal level of transaction which results in maximum level of satisfaction for subordinates and maximum level of production.)

The transactional model demonstrates that Consideration and Initiating Structure are not mutually exclusive leadership styles. Instead, levels of fusion or interaction of these two dimensions of leader behavior might represent different leadership styles. The concept of either/or on these dimensions is rejected. It is recognized in the transactional model that leadership style can be from the perspective of the leader, as well as from the perspective of the subordinates. Sergiovanni, Metzcu and Burden (1969, p. 62) pointed out that while the great volume of research on leadership examines the problem from an organizational perspective, not much attention is given to the study of leadership from the perspective of the members of the organization. Brown (1967), in his study of "Reactions to Leadership," made the assumption that "one can learn something of the leadership of a school from the staff perceptions—and judgments drawn therefrom—of the principal" (p. 62). This assumption, he affirmed, is derived from another more basic assumption that

a perception of another person is a function of both sender and receiver of the percept. A descriptive statement based on such perceptions therefore gives away the nature of the describer as well as the described (p. 62).

He stated further (1967) that statements of teachers which describe the leader behavior of their principal provide valuable
sources from which inferences can be drawn regarding the nature of leadership within the school. He reasons:

This is true more because of than in spite of the susceptibility of these descriptive statements to projective distortion . . . the nature of leadership at a school will be revealed in the quality of transactions between the behavior of the leader and the perception thereof by the led (p. 62).

With the awareness of some definitions which indicate that all perceptions are distorted, Brown (1967) reported that "what makes possible man's universe of discourse is his willingness to accept consensus of 'distortion' as fact" (p. 67).

Mead (1975) summarized some concepts of the transactional model: (see Figure 1)

1. Initiating Structure and Consideration are not on the same continuum: they are coordinates.

2. The two dimensions of leader behavior are separately rated on a continuum ranging from high positive through high negative.

3. While a leader behavior might indicate low on any given dimension, this does not imply negative behavior or relationship.

4. Any positive level of leader behavior on one dimension that coordinates with any positive level of leader behavior on the other dimension is considered transactional. This implies that an authoritarian leader (one who is high on positive Initiating Structure and low on positive Consideration) may be classified as demonstrating a transactional leadership style. However, the most productive transactional leadership is one in which a high positive level of Initiating Structure behavior coordinates with a high positive level of Consideration behavior,
Fig. 1. The Transactional Model for Leadership Style
5. When a positive level of leader behavior on one dimension is associated with a negative level of leader behavior on the other dimension, then leadership becomes unidirectional and there is default with respect to the other dimension. The factor with which the dimension showing a negative level is related is considered as being exploited.

6. If a negative level of leader behavior is associated with both dimensions, both factors with which the dimensions are associated—the organization and the people in the organization—are being exploited, there is default in transaction and complete absence of accountability. The leader is on his way out of the organization. This is the reverse of what happens when the leader achieves high levels of positive behavior on both dimensions demonstrating consolidation and maximum growth in production as well as in morale.

7. The four general outcomes of leader behavior can be summarized as follows:

a. Negative leader behavior on Consideration and Initiating Structure indicates the exploitation of the organization and exploitation of the people within the organization.

b. Negative leader behavior on Consideration and positive leader behavior on Initiating Structure indicate leadership of the organization through the exploitation of the members of the organization.

c. Negative leader behavior on Initiating Structure and positive leader behavior on Consideration indicate leadership of the members of the organization through the exploitation of
the organization, forfeiture of the goals of the organization, and abandonment of the mission of the organization.

d. Leadership of the organization through the leadership of the members of the organization indicates transactional leadership and, with corresponding increase in levels of leader behavior on both dimensions, there might be an accompanying increase in the realization of organizational goals and morale.

Some Practical Implications of the Principal's Leadership Style for Teacher Morale

Under the transactional model of leadership style, there are some very important implications of the principal's leader behavior for teacher satisfaction and the level of performance of the institution. The challenge to the principal consists in providing each teacher maximum opportunity to grow and mature continuously into a human being who, because of a favorable working climate, is able to realize his own goals best by working for the success of the organization to which he belongs. The behavior of the principal should facilitate the teacher's need for participation, job clarity, belonging and acceptance, success, and self-respect.

The Administrator's Behavior

Morale is affected by teachers' perception of their administrator. If teachers believe that their administrator is competent and deserves respect, if they know that they will be treated fairly as professionals, their morale will be high.
Administrators are preferred whose leadership is stronger by modeling than by mandate. While differences of opinion will always exist on professional matters, good morale will persist if the administrator can be expected to be impartial and willing to examine all aspects of the issue objectively.

Among the personal characteristics of the principal suggested by Silverman (1957, pp. 204-210), these are worth listing:

1. The administrator will not criticize his teacher who is in conflict with parents
2. He will demonstrate trust in his teachers
3. He will give praise to those deserving of credit
4. He will not be hypocritical
5. He will pay special attention to the physical comfort of his teachers
6. He will not play favorites among his teachers
7. He will not make snap decisions or judgments
8. He will be consistent, tactful, and flexible
9. He will consult with his teachers before he makes changes which affect them

Metfessel and Shea (1961, p. 17) indicated some administrative relationships which may contribute to low morale. These include: (1) faculty meetings dominated by the principal, (2) inadequate inservice programs and leadership, (3) coercion of teachers to teach subjects which they are unqualified to teach, (4) failure of the administrator to back teachers with issues such as promotion, discipline and homework, (5) poor leadership in curriculum development, (6) inadequate
supervisory assistance, (7) administrative policies that are inconsistent or unfair, (8) lack of concern by the administrator for the personal welfare of his teachers, (9) lack of adequate short-term and long-range planning, (10) lack of job security for teachers, (11) responsibility without authority, (12) autocracy in policy determination, and (13) poor teacher-administrator relations.

"The competent school administrator will generate power through and with people rather than power over people" (Wynn, 1955, p. 45).

Provision for Participation in Policy-Making

Teachers should be encouraged to initiate action within reasonable limits. In the absence of such involvement, hostility and frustration among the faculty might be experienced. However, a deep sense of belonging is accompanied by the opportunity to participate in policy making. Wiles (1967, p. 240) explained that this feeling of satisfaction was derived from teachers' sense of importance because they contribute to decision making. When they participate in setting goals, they have a deeper sense of responsibility to fulfill such goals. They do not feel that they are being governed or manipulated by imposed dictates.

A major reason for involving teachers in policy making, according to Anderson and Van Dyke (1972, p. 282), is the fact that they are the ones who eventually must implement the policies. Teachers want to participate in solving those problems related to their work. Those who have been allowed this opportunity are among the happiest and most satisfied teachers.
In public schools, there might be much limitation on how involved in policy making the faculty might become since policy might be formulated, adopted, and prescribed by the board of education or the state legislature. Under these circumstances, teachers are usually willing to cooperate if they are kept informed. Van Zwoll (1964, p. 175) recommended that in circumstances in which teachers cannot be involved in the formulation of policy, they may be involved in the determination of the means for carrying out those policies.

Findings from a study conducted by Schultz (1952, pp. 53-56) indicated that democratic administration contributes to a high level of teacher morale. One hundred per cent of those teachers who were most satisfied reported that teachers in their school system are given an opportunity to express themselves on school problems.

Administrators should avoid rendering mere lip service or mere pretense of involving staff in decision making. Lowe (1954, p. 55) clearly pointed out that when staff members are invited to study a problem or make recommendations for change, it is important that they be informed concerning the results of the recommendations they make even if no action is taken. Whenever possible, rewards or citations should be given for exceptionally good performance.

In his support of this point, Moore (1966, p. 79) observed that the working environment should provide the teacher with the feeling that his contribution is recognized and that the channels of communication are free and open and will be used in making decisions.
Job Clarity

The results of a study reported by Maher and Darrell (1970, pp. 125-133) demonstrated that the degree of satisfaction an employee receives from his job increases as he clearly perceives his individual job objectives as well as the objectives of the people with whom he works and the mission of the organization for which he works. This concept received support from Wynn (1955, p. 45), who asserted that each teacher should have information regarding (1) the philosophy and policies of the organization for which he works, (2) the kind of performance that is expected of him, (3) where he may obtain the help he needs, (4) the requirements of his job, duties, responsibilities, and freedom, and (5) his place in relation to other organizational components.

The Need for Belonging and Acceptance

High morale will be encouraged if there are good relations among the faculty. There must be generated a feeling of confidence in the ability of colleagues.

Smith (1973, p. 187) postulated that morale is a group phenomenon: a high level of morale is based upon faith and pride in the group and its leadership.

The role of the principal in fulfilling the teachers' needs for acceptance must be consistently fulfilled. He must let his teachers know that they are liked, appreciated, and wanted by their principal, that the principal has confidence in them as persons and as professionals. The principal should radiate warmth, friendliness,
and poise. He should understand his teachers' jobs and his teachers' problems. He should recognize the good work of his teachers by informing other teachers and the community.

The Need for Success

It is very important to professionals that they experience a sense of achievement. Anderson and Van Dyke (1972, p. 284) placed the responsibility for ensuring that the teacher experiences success upon the principal who must assign the right professional tasks to the right teachers. Many teachers suffer great frustration because they are assigned teaching responsibilities for which they have little or no preparation.

Teachers experience success when their level of achievement is very close to their level of aspiration and to the expectations of the principal. The teacher who achieves far below his level of aspiration or below the expectations of the principal, or who believes he is considered incompetent by the principal, might become frustrated, depressed, anxious, uncooperative, and indolent.

The principal may avoid this experience by utilizing the approach recommended by Lautenschlager (1957): (1) he may create situations in which teachers have the opportunity of discovering their success themselves (This could be done, in part, through an efficient school-wide testing program based upon the goals of the school.), (2) he might provide an environment in which teachers can become better acquainted with their students (This makes it possible for teachers to see greater evidence of growth and success among their students.), and (3) he should provide an environment in which his teachers have freedom

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
to make unintentional mistakes without fear of retribution (He should recognize individual differences among his faculty.)

The Need for Self-Respect

The principal must always bear in mind that any action which affects one staff member is significant to his entire faculty. Wiles (1967) made the point:

When a single personality is disregarded, the feeling of security and confidence within the total group breaks down, and each member feels, with justification, that if one person has not received fair treatment, it may be his turn next (p. 243).

It is important that the principal judge his decisions and actions by how they will affect the way his faculty feel about their job. He should always remember that "Morale is a delicate plant that grows slowly in an atmosphere of mutual respect. It can be severely stunted by one false action" (Wiles, 1967, p. 243).

Teachers have a need to maintain their self-respect in their work relations. They need to feel that they are working with instead of for someone else. A teacher loses his self-respect when he feels he must be a "yes man." Wiles stressed the fact that "a principal who gives his staff members the impression that they are robots carrying out the orders of a more intelligent being breaks down the morale of the staff" (p. 241).

The principal can help his teachers maintain their self-respect in a number of ways recommended by Wiles: (1) teachers should be involved in planning their own work instead of being ordered to perform certain functions, (2) no teacher should feel he is reduced to slave status, (3) the principal should not relate to any teacher in a manner
that would make that teacher feel humiliated in the eyes of his colleagues or in the eyes of his students, (4) instead of being demanding, the principal's remarks should build the teachers' prestige, and (5) all teachers should receive equal consideration.

Rules should be kept to a minimum. The teacher's maturity should be recognized and his need for self-direction facilitated. Rules should be guiding principles rather than specific instructions. Tension between the principal and his faculty will be reduced if these guidelines are drawn up by a committee of staff members and not by the principal acting alone (Wiles, 1967, p. 242).

The Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ)

The Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire has been widely used in research on leader ideology and leader behavior.

The original form of the questionnaire was designed by Hemphill and Coons (1950) for the Personnel Research Board at the Ohio State University. The two dimensions, Initiating Structure and Consideration, were identified by Halpin (1957) as basic factors in leader behavior. The identification of these two dimensions was based on a factor analysis of the responses of 300 crew members who gave descriptions of the leader behavior of fifty-two aircraft commanders. "Initiating Structure and Consideration accounted for approximately 34 and 50 per cent, respectively, of the common variance" (Halpin, 1966, p. 88).

Keys were derived for these two dimensions of leader behavior on the basis of the factor analysis:

The original Consideration key of 28 items has an estimated reliability (corrected by the Spearman-Brown formula) of .94. The
corresponding estimate for the 29-item Initiating Structure key is .76. In the later, published form of the LBDQ there are only 15 items on each of the keys. The estimated reliabilities are .93 and .86, respectively (Halpin, 1966, p. 88).

Halpin (1966, p. 88) asserted that determination can be made by objective and reliable methods as to how specific leaders differ in leadership style through the measuring of the behavior of leaders on the Initiating Structure and Consideration dimensions. The LBDQ provides a means by which dimensions of leader behavior can be operationally defined and, therefore, facilitates the empirical testing of additional specific hypotheses about leader and group behavior.

The Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire
Form XII

The Development of LBDQ-XII

Stogdill (1963) developed a new theory of role differentiation and group achievement and found support from an abundance of research data for the concept that a number of variables operate in the differentiation of roles in social groups. The theory suggests possible factors including tolerance of uncertainty, persuasiveness, tolerance of member freedom of action, predictive accuracy, integration of the group, and reconciliation of conflicting demands. Possible new factors which are suggested by the results of empirical research include representation of group interests, role assumption, production emphasis, and orientation towards superiors.

Questionnaires were drafted incorporating new items which were developed from the hypothesized subscales. These were administered to successive groups and after item analysis, they were revised, readministered, reanalyzed, and revised again.
The first use of the new scales was reported by Harder (1960) in his Master's thesis study of an airbourne division and a state highway patrol organization. A revised form of the questionnaire was used by Day (1961) in his doctoral research of an industrial organization. Stogdill, Goode, and Day (1962, 1963a, 1963b) used other revisions in their study of industrial and governmental organizations.

Form XII is the fourth revision of the questionnaire. This latest revision consists of a series of short statements descriptive of leader behavior. Each member of the leader's group indicates the frequency with which the leader engages in each form of behavior by drawing a circle around one of five letters, A, B, C, D and E (representing the adverbs, always, often, occasionally, seldom, or never) which follow the statement. Most items are given a score which may range from five through one (A=5, B=4, C=3, D=2 and E=1). Twenty starred items appearing on the Scoring Key are scored in the reverse (A=1, B=2, C=3, D=4, and E=5). Twenty items included in the two subscales, Initiating Structure and Consideration, are listed below.

The Initiating Structure subscale statements follow:
1. He lets group members know what is expected of them.
2. He encourages the use of uniform procedures.
3. He tries out his ideas in the group.
4. He makes his attitudes clear to the group.
5. He decides what shall be done and how it shall be done.
6. He assigns group members to particular tasks.
7. He makes sure that his part in the group is understood by the group members.
8. He schedules the work to be done.
10. He asks that group members follow standard rules and regulations.

The Consideration subscale includes these statements:

1. He is friendly and approachable.
2. He does little things to make it pleasant to be a member of the group.
3. He puts suggestions made by the group into operation.
4. He treats all group members as his equals.
5. He gives advance notice of changes.
6. He keeps to himself.
7. He looks out for the personal welfare of group members.
8. He is willing to make changes.
9. He refuses to explain his actions.
10. He acts without consulting the group.

Reliability of LBDQ-XII

Stogdill (1963) indicated that:

The reliability of the subscales was determined by a modified Kuder-Richardson formula. The modification consists in the fact that each item was correlated with the remainder of the items in its subscale rather than with the subscale score including the items. This procedure yields a conservative estimate of subscale reliability (p. 8).

A table of the reliability coefficients appears in Appendix B.
Validity of the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire

Stogdill (1969) demonstrated the validity of the LBDQ through the use of a scenario. He based his study on these two assumptions:

Validity implies that a given subscale measures the pattern of behavior that it is intended to measure. The items in a subscale of the LBDQ define the pattern of behavior the subscale is intended to measure (p. 153).

Two hypotheses were tested:

1. Two different actors playing the same role will not be described as significantly different on the subscale for that role.

2. The same actor playing two different roles will be described as significantly different on the subscales for the two roles.

Stogdill (1969), assisted by a playwright, prepared scenarios for six subscales of the LBDQ-XII. These were Consideration, Initiating Structure, Production Emphasis, Tolerance of Freedom, Influence with Superiors, and Representation. Two roles, leader and follower, were played by each of five sets of adult actors. A motion picture was made of the leader and the follower playing the roles. The movie was shown to graduate students in education who functioned as observers to describe the behavior of the leaders:

The same actor playing two different roles was described significantly higher in the enacted role than in the other role. No significant difference was found between two different actors playing the same role (p. 157).

From these findings it was concluded that the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire subscales measure what they are purported to measure and, therefore, "the LBDQ may be regarded as valid under the experimental conditions described" (p. 158).
Relevant Research

The foundations and impetus for this research are to be found in the theory described by Halpin (1966) and Stogdill (1974) and in the studies on leadership behavior which they summarized. The earliest studies were concerned with the investigation of the leader behavior of aircraft commanders and the development of the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire. Similar studies were done in industry. These were concerned primarily with training and are not relevant to this study. While this review summarizes some air crew studies, the primary focus is on the educational studies.

1. The leadership behavior of fifty-two B-29 commanders was studied by Halpin (1954). Scores for these commanders were obtained with the LBDQ from the commanders and their crews. The crews were asked whom they would choose to be members in their squadron if they had the responsibility of making up a crew from among the crew members. On the basis of the responses by the crews, a Crew Satisfaction Index was computed. The index of the crew's satisfaction with the leadership of their commander was determined by computing the ratio between the number of nominations received by the incumbent commander and the number of nominations which were made for the position of aircraft commander. The LBDQ scores were correlated with the Crew Satisfaction Index and with ratings the commanders received from their superiors. The results showed (a) negative correlations between the ratings given by superiors and the Consideration scores, (b) positive correlations between the supervisors' ratings and the Initiating Structure scores, and (c) high positive correlations between the Crew
Satisfaction Index and the Consideration scores. There was found a tendency for superiors and subordinates to evaluate oppositely the contribution of the leader behavior dimensions to leadership effectiveness. The leader in this position must resolve apparent conflicts in role expectations.

2. In a study similar in design to the one described above, eighty-seven B-29 aircraft commanders were studied (Halpin, 1953, quoted in Halpin, 1966). Each commander was rated by his crews on three dimensions: "confidence and proficiency," "friendship and cooperation," and "morale." He was rated by his superiors on seven characteristics, three of which were: "effectiveness in working with others," "attitude and motivation," and "over-all effectiveness." A Crew Satisfaction Index was derived and correlations were computed (the Consideration and Initiating Structure scores with the superiors' ratings and the crew members' ratings with the Crew Satisfaction Index). Another objective of this study was to test the hypothesis that those commanders whose superiors rated them highest would score above the mean on Consideration and Initiating Structure, while those whose superiors rated them lowest would score below the mean on these two leader behavior dimensions. The results of this study indicated that (a) the ratings given commanders by their superiors correlated significantly with the Initiating Structure scores, (b) the corresponding Consideration correlations were not significant, (c) the ratings the commanders received from their crews—including the Crew Satisfaction Index—correlated significantly with the Initiating Structure scores and the Consideration scores, and (d) commanders who
scored above the mean on Initiating Structure and above the mean on Consideration were rated by their superiors as high in over-all effectiveness. Those who scored below the mean on these two dimensions were likely to be rated low in effectiveness. Halpin concluded that successful leaders facilitate both group maintenance and group achievement.

3. In a study conducted by Christner and Hemphill (1955) the members of fifty-two newly assembled B-29 crews at Combat Crew Training School used the LBDQ to describe their commanders and to rate each other and each crew as a unit on such items as "crew morale," "friendship," "proficiency," and "willingness to go into combat with each other." The results of the study showed that the members of crews who described their commanders high on Consideration tended to increase the ratings they gave one another on attitude items such as "mutual confidence" and "willingness to go into combat together." Crews who described their commanders high on Initiating Structure tended to increase the ratings that they gave one another on "friendship" and "confidence." The researchers concluded that during this initial period of crew assembly, the members of crews whose commanders scored high on Consideration and Initiating Structure tended to develop more favorable crew attitudes than the members of crews whose commanders received low scores on both dimensions. These results show that leadership style influences early group-learning experience.

4. Halpin (1955a) compared the leadership ideologies of thirty-two B-29 and B-50 commanders with the description, by their crews, of their actual behavior on the two dimensions, Initiating
Structure and Consideration. The results indicated that, from their ideology scores indicated on the LBDQ-Ideal, the commanders recognized the value of scoring high on both dimensions of leader behavior. However, their awareness of the manner in which they should behave as leaders had little influence upon how their crews perceived them as behaving.

5. Holloman (1967) investigated the leadership behavior of military and civilian personnel in a large air force organization. His findings indicated that (a) military and civilian supervisors were not perceived by their superiors as different in Consideration and in Initiating Structure although superiors expected military supervisors to show more Initiating Structure and less Consideration than civilian supervisors, and (b) military supervisors were perceived by subordinates as demonstrating higher Consideration and greater Initiating Structure than civilian supervisors.

6. The leader behavior of eighteen department heads in a liberal arts college was investigated by Hemphill (1955). Using the LBDQ-Real, the members of these departments described how the department heads behaved. Then on the LBDQ-Ideal, they described how they thought the department heads should behave. The members of the departments also ranked the five departments of the college which had the reputation of being best led or best administered. The five departments which had the reputation of being least effectively led or administered were also ranked. The results showed that (a) the correlations between the reputation scores and the LBDQ-Real scores were .36 for Consideration and .48 for Initiating Structure (For significance at the .05 level of confidence .47 was required.), (b) when the
discrepancy scores were correlated with the reputation scores, the ob-
tained coefficients, −.52 and −.55 respectively, were both statis-
tically significant, (c) the greater the departure of the real be-
behavior of the department head from the norm of the ideal behavior
described, the poorer was the administrative reputation of the de-
partment and (d) the departments with high reputation were those whose
heads scored high on both Consideration and Initiating Structure.

7. Halpin (1955) compared the leader behavior of one hundred
and thirty-two aircraft commanders and sixty-four school administrators.
The school administrators and the aircraft commanders responded to the
LBDQ-Ideal and were described by members of their respective staffs on
the LBDQ-Real. The objective of this study was to determine whether
leaders who function in these two different institutional settings
exhibit differences in their leadership ideology and in their style
of leadership behavior. The data were analyzed in the following
manner: (a) On the LBDQ-Ideal the leader's own score indicated his
ideology on the Initiating Structure and Consideration dimensions.
(b) The scores on the LBDQ-Real were used to determine how well group
members agreed in describing their respective leaders--between-group
versus within-group analyses of variance were made for each sample
and separately by dimension. At the .01 level of confidence, the F
ratio was significant. (c) The extent of agreement among group mem-
bers in describing their leaders was expressed by the unbiased
correlation ratio (epsilon). The ratios for the Consideration dimen-
sion were .49 and .61 for the school administrators and the aircraft
commanders, respectively. For the Initiating Structure dimension,
the corresponding ratios were .49 and .44. (d) Group-mean Initiating Structure and Consideration scores were used as indices of the leader's behavior for the LBDQ-Real. (e) The leadership ideology and leader behavior of the school administrators and the aircraft commanders were compared in terms of group differences and were analyzed in two ways: (i) by t ratios of the mean difference between the number of administrators and the number of commanders who scored either above or below the mean of the pooled samples on the dimensions; and (ii) by determining the number and per cent of cases in each sample that fell into each of the four quadrants illustrated in Figure 2: (a) above the mean on Consideration and above the mean on Initiating Structure, (b) below the mean on Consideration and below the mean on Initiating Structure, (c) above the mean on Consideration but below the mean on Initiating Structure, and (d) above the mean on Initiating Structure.
Structure but below the mean on Consideration. (f) The chi-squared ($\chi^2$) test was used to determine the statistical significance of the difference between the number of school administrators and the number of aircraft commanders who scored in each quadrant. The findings indicated that (i) there was support for the hypothesis that leaders who function within these two different institutional settings exhibit differences in their leadership ideology and differences in their styles of leadership behavior; (ii) the school administrators showed more Consideration and less Initiating Structure than the aircraft commanders in both leadership ideology and leader behavior; (iii) both groups showed that they should demonstrate more Consideration and greater Initiating Structure than their group members perceived them as showing; (iv) on the LBDQ-Real and the LBDQ-Ideal, the aircraft commanders showed significant correlations between Consideration and Initiating Structure while the school administrators showed no significant correlations on these dimensions; and (v) the school administrators, to a greater extent than the aircraft commanders, treated the two dimensions as if they were independent.

8. Halpin (1956) studied the leadership styles of fifty school superintendents. His findings can be summarized as follows: (a) the staff respondents tended to agree in their description (on the Initiating Structure and Consideration dimensions) of their respective superintendents; (b) the board members who responded tended to agree in the description of their respective superintendents; (c) the board members and staff did not agree with each other in their description of the superintendents; (d) the superintendents were
described by their staffs as showing less Consideration than they were described as demonstrating by the board members or by the superintendents themselves; (e) the staff members' descriptions and the superintendents' self-descriptions on the Initiating Structure dimension showed significant, although low, correlation; (f) the staffs did not differ significantly from school to school in the level of Consideration they expected their superintendents to show; (g) board members, staffs, and superintendents described the ideal superintendent as one who scores high on both the Consideration and the Initiating Structure dimensions; and (h) the leadership behavior of the superintendent as perceived by board members, staffs, and the superintendents themselves differed significantly from the ideal behavior of a superintendent as described by all three groups.

9. The perceptions and expectations of superintendents, principals, and staff members for the leadership behavior of high school principals were studied by Evenson (1953). He found that (a) there was agreement among teachers in their perceptions of the leader behavior of their principals; (b) staff members did not agree with the superintendents and principals in their perceptions of the principals' behavior on the Consideration dimension; (c) on the Consideration and Initiating Structure dimensions, the principals' self-descriptions of their leader behavior differed from the descriptions of the staff and of the superintendents; (d) the superintendents tended to describe the principals as higher on Consideration and Initiating Structure than the principals' were described by their teachers; (e) on the Consideration dimension, the staffs differed significantly from
school to school in their expectations for the leader behavior of
their principals; (f) the principals' description of the ideal leader
behavior on the Consideration dimension differed from the superin­
tendents' and the staffs' description of the ideal leader behavior
for a principal; (g) the superintendents' description of the ideal
leader behavior for a principal on the Consideration dimension did
not correlate significantly with the corresponding scores of the
principals or of the staffs; (h) the perceived leader behavior of the
principals differed significantly from the ideal leader behavior de­
scribed for a principal by the superintendents, staff, and principals;
(i) while less than fifty per cent of the principals were rated by
their staffs in the upper right quadrant, the staff considered that
the ideal principal would score in this quadrant; and (j) the staffs
all agreed that the ideal principal would not be described by the
lower-left quadrant.

10. Hills (1963) found support (in a study of 872 elementary
school teachers' description of the leader behavior of fifty-three
principals) for his thesis that "an adequate concept of leadership
must include the performance of the leader in representing the inter­
est of the group to higher organizational levels and to the organi­
zation's clientele" (p. 83).

11. Carson and Schultz (1964) investigated the question: "Do
student leaders perceive and expect a type of leadership behavior from
the dean different than that expected by the president and department
heads?" (p. 355). The results of this study indicated that there
existed discrepancies in perceptions and expectations between student
leaders and other referent groups, especially presidents. These discrepancies suggested the existence of role conflict in the expectations for the deans' leadership behavior.

12. Fast (1964, quoted in Stogdill, 1974) studied the relationship between the leadership behavior of principals and teacher satisfaction. He found a positive relationship between the Consideration and Initiating Structure behaviors of principals (as described by their teachers) and teacher satisfaction. However, no relationship was found between expected behavior for the principal and teacher satisfaction. Teacher satisfaction decreased as the discrepancy between expected behavior and observed behavior of the principal increased.

13. Bailey (1966, quoted in Stogdill, 1974) studied the leadership behavior of eight principals and its relationship to teachers' satisfaction with and support for decisions made by the principal with his staff. Four principals who were described by their teachers as higher in Consideration than in Initiating Structure and four other principals who were described as higher in Initiating Structure than in Consideration each played a decision making game with four teachers. The findings indicated that (a) there was no significant relationship between the principal's scores on the Initiating Structure and the Consideration dimensions and the ability of the teachers to arrive at a decision or to perceptions that teachers had help in the decision making; and (b) the Consideration of the principal was related significantly to the satisfaction of his teachers with both the decision and its support.
14. Hunt (1967) studied the expectations and perceptions of the leadership behavior of elementary school principals. The findings of this study showed that (a) there was a significant difference, from school to school, in the staffs' perception of the leadership behavior of the principals on both the Consideration and Initiating Structure dimensions; (b) staff members did not agree with their principals in their perception of the leader behavior of the principals on Consideration and Initiating Structure; (c) there was almost no relationship between the description of the principal and the description of his staff of how much Consideration and Initiating Structure the principal demonstrated; (d) when considered as a group, there was no significant difference in the mean level by which staffs described their principals' leader behavior and by which the principals described their own behavior on the two dimensions; (e) there was significant difference, from school to school, in staffs' expectations of how much Consideration the principal should show; (f) there was no significant difference, from school to school, in staffs' expectations of how much Initiating Structure principals should demonstrate; (g) there was no relationship between the expectations of teachers and their principal for the ideal behavior of the principal on any of the two dimensions (the possibility of conflict in role expectation for the principal is suggested by this finding); (h) the mean level by which the ideal leader behavior of the principal was described on the Consideration dimension was much higher in the principals' expectations than in the expectations of their staffs; (i) there was significant difference between the perceived leader behavior of the principals and the ideal
leader behavior of a principal as described by both teachers and principals on both dimensions (there was agreement among principals and staffs that the principals should show more Consideration and more Initiating Structure behaviors); (j) there was significant relationship between the length of experience of staff members and the manner in which they described the Consideration of their principals; and (k) there was no relationship between the length of experience of individual staff members and the ratings they gave on the Consideration-Ideal and Initiating Structure-Real and Ideal dimensions.

From the review of these studies, there is rationale for concluding that the effective leader is one whose performance is high on both the Initiating Structure and the Consideration dimensions of leadership style described by the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire.

Summary

In this chapter, an overview of the literature relevant to the study has been presented according to the following format:

1. A theoretical framework for the study has been presented through a summary of five models of leadership behavior, (a) the trait model, (b) the situational model, (c) the behavioral model, and (d) the transactional model. The transactional model has been recognized as the model which facilitates best the highest levels of organizational efficiency and satisfaction of individual needs.

2. Some practical implications of the leadership behavior of principals for the morale of teachers have been presented.
3. The Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ) has been discussed for the purpose of providing information relative to (a) its development, (b) reliability, and (c) validity.

4. Some of the research utilizing the LBDQ have been summarized. The results of these studies (a) recognize the LBDQ as a valuable instrument for use in studies of leadership behavior, (b) provide evidence supporting the concept of Initiating Structure and Consideration as basic dimensions of leadership behavior, (c) identify effective leadership as characterized by high performance on both dimensions of leadership behavior, and (d) indicate that there is only a slight positive relationship between leaders' expectations for their own behavior and their group members' description of their leaders' behavior.
CHAPTER III

RESEARCH DESIGN AND PROCEDURES

In this chapter the following are discussed: (1) the population and sample, (2) the instrument for collecting the data, (3) the procedure for the selection of respondents, (4) the hypotheses and criterion, and (5) the statistical method used to test the hypotheses and describe the results.

Population and Sample

Those who participated in this study were selected from a population of 1960 teachers and 40 principals in the 40 public high schools in Jamaica. One of these schools reported a staff of less than 20 teachers. These schools are listed in the Ministry of Education publication, Jamaica: A Guide for Teachers (1975, pp. 25-38) as one of the six different kinds of institutions which provide education at the secondary level. The others are: (1) Senior departments of all age schools, (2) secondary schools, (3) community colleges, (4) technical high schools, and (5) vocational schools. The high schools include grades 7 through 12. Students are prepared for the Ordinary Level and Advanced Level of the Cambridge University and London University Examinations.

A sample of 20 schools was selected randomly by use of a table of random numbers. By the fish bowl method of drawing names from a
bag, 20 teachers were selected from each school and assigned at ran-
dom to one of two equal groups to complete the Real and Ideal forms
of the questionnaire used in this study (the LBDQ). The principals
in the schools were asked to complete both forms of the LBDQ.

Appendix J (p. 123) shows that altogether, 420 respondents
were selected for the study. In terms of status groups, there were
400 teachers and 20 principals. Of these, 230 responded to the ques-
tionnaire. In terms of status groups, there were 214 teachers and 16
principals making a total of 55 per cent of the sample.

The size of the sample, while arbitrarily determined, was in
part based upon the cost of the study. The number of respondents
selected in each school was suggested by the sample size of 9 selected
by Evenson (1958) and 10 by Hunt (1967).

The Instrument

The development, description, reliability, and validity of the
instrument used to collect the data for this study, the LBDQ, have
been presented on pages 34 to 38 of this study. The LBDQ appears in
Appendix I (p. 121). This questionnaire contains 100 questions. In
this study, the 10 items on each of the two dimensions, Initiating
Structure and Consideration, have been used on two forms of the LBDQ,
namely, (1) the LBDQ-Real on which the perceived or actual leadership
behavior was described, and (2) the LBDQ-Ideal on which the expected
leadership behavior was described.

Each item was scored on a scale from 5 to 1 with always re-
ceiving a score of 5, often, a score of 4, occasionally, a score of
3, seldom, a score of 2, and never, a score of 1. Negatively scored items were scored in the reverse order with always receiving a score of 1 and never, a score of 5. This gave a maximum score of 50 and a minimum score of 10 for each dimension.

Procedure

The researcher visited Jamaica in 1975 to contact the Permanent Secretary in the Ministry of Education, Dr. Errol Miller, and the 20 schools constituting the selected sample. A letter introducing the study was presented to Dr. Miller who, in return, wrote a letter to the principals acknowledging the support of the Ministry of Education for the study (see Appendix C, pp. 108 and 110). The 20 selected schools were visited by the researcher who presented to the principals letters from the Permanent Secretary and his research adviser (See Appendix C, p. 108 and D, p. 111).

The general purpose of the study was explained to the principals and teachers whose participation was enlisted (see Appendix E, p. 113, G, p. 117, and H, p. 119). Questionnaires were distributed to teachers who were randomly selected and assigned to the two groups as described earlier and also to the principals. Questionnaires from 13 schools were completed and returned immediately.

Seven principals declined to participate. One principal indicated that his school had just participated in another research project and could not be involved in the present study. Another principal expressed fear that information regarding her school might be communicated to the Ministry of Education. She believed, also, that it was unethical for principals to be rated by their teachers. The
other principals indicated that their teachers were overloaded with work and could not participate. These were replaced by teachers and principals from 7 other schools. These schools also were selected by use of a table of random numbers, and the principals were invited, by telephone, to participate. The teachers' names were read from staff lists by the principals and were assigned, by use of the fish bowl method of random selection, to two groups by the researcher. These teachers and principals were mailed the LBDQ with stamped self-addressed envelopes for the return of the questionnaires.

As in the case with many studies using questionnaires, the teachers and principals were invited but not obligated to participate. Because of this option, it cannot be demonstrated that self selection did not function to preclude bias. It cannot be presumed, however, that bias was present in the sample, and if it did, its nature or direction is unknown.

Principals were not instructed to complete the two forms of the LBDQ (the LBDQ-Real and LBDQ-Ideal) in any specified order. How the completion of any form might affect the completion of the other is not known. Although the possibilities of a halo effect cannot be denied, it has been assumed that if present, this halo effect would not significantly affect the results.

Those schools only which returned a minimum of 5 questionnaires for both forms of the LBDQ-Staff and one on both forms of the LBDQ-Self were considered to have returned questionnaires in amounts satisfactory for inclusion in this study. Although this approach might be considered an atypical or unconventional sampling technique,
rationale for its use were offered by Halpin (1957), Evenson (1958), and Hunt (1967). Halpin (1957) indicated that experience with the LBDQ showed that average scores based upon 5 to 7 responses furnished a reasonably stable score. Evenson (1958) selected nine respondents to fill out the LBDQ. The responses of only 7 of these were used to arrive at the average scores. Hunt (1967) invited 10 teachers to complete the LBDQ. He selected 7 of these at random for use in establishing the average score of the staff. These unusual procedures might be considered as limitations of the design which should be considered when inferences are made from the results of the data analyzed.

Hypotheses and Criterion

Four null hypotheses were tested. They are:

1. There is no difference between the teachers' perceptions and their principals' perceptions of the principals' leadership behavior.

2. There is no difference between the teachers' expectations and their principals' expectations for the principals' leadership behavior.

3. There is no difference between the principals' perceptions of and expectations for their own leadership behavior.

4. There is no difference between the teachers' perceptions of and expectations for their principals' leadership behavior.

The confidence level for acceptance or rejection of the hypotheses is .05 ($\alpha = .05$). The actual p values, however, for each of the tests are reported.
Statistical Method

The score of each principal (designated X), on the LBDQ, was used in the analysis of the data. The average of the scores of the teachers in each school (designated \( \bar{Y} \)) was used in the analyses.

The reliability of group means as a measure of staff responses was measured by the analysis of variance procedure for estimating reliability (Winer, 1962, pp. 124-132).

The hypotheses were tested by the following techniques:

1. Two-way multivariate analysis of variance, with the two dimensions being Real/Ideal (considered as a repeated measure) and Principal/Teacher Mean (the two variables Initiating Structure and Consideration were treated together, to allow for the effect of correlation between them).

2. Four separate one-way multivariate analyses of variance taking separately the two dimensions named above, because of the presence of significant interaction effect.

3. Further study of the separate variables by use of t tests between all possible pairs of means (some correlated and some independent).

The quadrant method of analysis was used to locate the leadership behavior of each principal in one of four quadrants defined by coordinates as follows: (1) Above the mean on both Consideration and Initiating Structure, (2) above the mean on Consideration but below the mean on Initiating Structure, (3) below the mean on both Initiating Structure and Consideration, and (4) above the mean on Initiating Structure but below the mean on Consideration.
Samples of letters and materials related to this study are included in the Appendix. The demographic data gathered with the responses to the LBDQ are not relevant to the goals of the present study. Analysis of this data will be reported in future articles. (See Appendix E, p. 113, G, p. 117, and H, p. 119.)
CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS AND EVALUATION OF DATA

The analysis and presentation of the findings of this study have been based upon the need to provide answers to the following questions: (1) What are the expectations for the leader behavior of principals from the perspective of the principals themselves, as well as, from the perspective of the teachers? (2) How do the principals and the teachers perceive the leadership behavior of the principals? (3) Are there any differences among these perceptions and expectations?

Through the application of inferential statistics to the data provided by the study, the leadership style of the principals, as a group, has been analyzed and attempts made to generalize beyond the limits of the present sample. Through the application of descriptive statistics to the data provided, individual principals in Jamaican secondary schools have been furnished information about their own leadership behavior. From this analysis, principals might gain some insights for self-evaluation and improvement.

Frequency of Responses

Table 1 shows the number of teachers and principals who completed the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire. The responses of sixteen principals and one hundred seventeen LBDQ-Real and one hundred ten LBDQ-Ideal questionnaires have been analyzed.
TABLE 1
NUMBER OF PRINCIPALS AND TEACHERS RESPONDING TO
THE LBDQ AND NUMBER OF RESPONSES INCLUDED IN
SAMPLE BY SOURCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Number of LBDQ-Real Responses Analyzed</th>
<th>Number of LBDQ-Ideal Responses Analyzed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Range, Means, and Standard Deviations
for the LBDQ Responses

Tables 2 and 3 indicate, for the LBDQ-Real and the LBDQ-Ideal, respectively, the range, means, and standard deviations for the Self and Staff scores on both the Initiating Structure and Consideration dimensions. For each principal, the leader behavior score on each dimension has been designated X. The ascribed mean score ($\bar{X}$) and the standard deviation (S) of the distribution of scores which have been determined for the staff descriptions together with the sample size, indicate the range and variance among the scores.

With respect to the responses made by the principals, no variance is associated with their scores, because in each case there was only one respondent. However, a range of variance is associated with the teachers' responses, since as many as ten teachers provided descriptions for one principal on one dimension of the LBDQ. Hence, while it was appropriate to examine the differences using the individual score of each principal (Self-Score) on the separate LBDQ...
TABLE 2

LBDQ-REAL CONSIDERATION AND INITIATING STRUCTURE DATA FOR PRINCIPALS' 
SCORES (X), TEACHERS' MEANS (Y) AND STANDARD DEVIATION (S)

| School Number | Size of Sample | Consideration | | | | | | Initiating Structure | | | |
| | | Self | Staff | X | Y | S | Self | Staff | X | Y | S |
| 1 | 5 | 45 | 29.2 | 5.8 | 46 | 33.8 | 1.9 |
| 2 | 5 | 44 | 22.8 | 12.6 | 48 | 31.6 | 8.8 |
| 3 | 9 | 44 | 39.0 | 5.5 | 45 | 40.4 | 2.5 |
| 4 | 5 | 44 | 40.0 | 0.7 | 46 | 41.0 | 0.7 |
| 5 | 6 | 42 | 36.0 | 4.5 | 40 | 40.3 | 0.8 |
| 6 | 6 | 43 | 33.2 | 4.9 | 41 | 39.0 | 4.3 |
| 7 | 6 | 43 | 36.0 | 10.8 | 40 | 40.0 | 5.9 |
| 8 | 6 | 44 | 45.0 | 2.2 | 39 | 40.0 | 5.4 |
| 9 | 6 | 45 | 32.2 | 8.7 | 38 | 41.8 | 5.8 |
| 10 | 5 | 44 | 32.2 | 10.5 | 46 | 33.0 | 8.5 |
| 11 | 5 | 43 | 39.6 | 5.9 | 41 | 41.0 | 2.7 |
| 12 | 9 | 40 | 33.3 | 5.1 | 36 | 31.0 | 7.2 |
| 13 | 10 | 50 | 38.1 | 5.4 | 38 | 37.1 | 5.3 |
| 14 | 8 | 40 | 37.0 | 7.6 | 41 | 37.8 | 8.3 |
| 15 | 5 | 40 | 32.6 | 4.5 | 38 | 40.6 | 0.8 |
| 16 | 5 | 42 | 32.4 | 1.1 | 37 | 35.0 | 3.0 |

Mean 43.3 34.9 41.3 37.7
S 2.4 5.1 3.4 3.2

dimensions, it was also important to determine the appropriateness of using the mean response of teachers in analyzing the several relationships.

Reliability of Ascribed Mean Scores for Teachers' Responses

The one-way analysis of variance to estimate reliability was computed to determine whether the Staff-ascribed mean scores are reliable indices for computing the relationships among the groups on the two dimensions. Table 4 shows the estimates of reliability for the LBDQ-Real. It indicates reasonable levels of reliability on both dimensions, 0.70 for the Consideration dimension and 0.65 for
### TABLE 3

LBDQ–IDEAL CONSIDERATION AND INITIATING STRUCTURE DATA FOR PRINCIPALS' SCORES (X), TEACHERS' MEANS (\(\bar{Y}\)) AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS (S)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Number</th>
<th>Size of Sample</th>
<th>Consideration Self (X)</th>
<th>(\bar{Y})</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>Initiating Structure Self (X)</th>
<th>(\bar{Y})</th>
<th>S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>45.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>43.2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>33.2</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>39.7</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>40.4</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>41.6</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>40.4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>40.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>43.6</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43.4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>43.6</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>39.6</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>45.4</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>40.8</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>46.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mean**

- Consideration: 46.2, \(\bar{Y}\): 39.7
- Initiating Structure: 46.3, \(\bar{Y}\): 39.1

**S**

- Consideration: 2.9
- Initiating Structure: 1.8

### TABLE 4

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE TO ESTIMATE RELIABILITY OF LBDQ–REAL-STAFF ASCRIBED MEAN SCORES FOR SIXTEEN PRINCIPALS AND ONE HUNDRED ONE TEACHERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean Square Between Groups</th>
<th>Mean Square Within Groups</th>
<th>R</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consideration</td>
<td>147.5279</td>
<td>44.5008</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiating Structure</td>
<td>83.5255</td>
<td>29.2469</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The one-way analysis of variance to estimate reliability was computed to determine whether the Staff-ascribed mean scores are reliable indices for computing the relationships among the groups on the two dimensions. Table 4 shows the estimates of reliability for the LBDQ–Real. It indicates reasonable levels of reliability on both
dimensions, 0.70 for the Consideration dimension and 0.65 for the Initiating Structure dimensions. Table 5 shows the estimates of reliability for the LBDQ-Ideal. It indicates reliabilities of 0.59 and 0.49 for the Consideration and the Initiating Structure dimensions, respectively. Although these reliabilities were not very high, they were considered an adequate basis for the use of the ascribed mean scores in the test of the hypotheses.

TABLE 5
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE TO ESTIMATE RELIABILITY OF LBDQ-Ideal-Staff Ascribed Mean Scores for Sixteen Principals and Ninety-Four Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean Square Between Groups</th>
<th>Mean Square Within Groups</th>
<th>R</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consideration</td>
<td>109.4322</td>
<td>44.8517</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiating Structure</td>
<td>105.7774</td>
<td>53.6916</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Statistical Analysis of Data

As indicated earlier, the hypotheses have been tested in three ways:

1. By two-way multivariate analysis of variance with the two dimensions being Principal/Staff and Real/Ideal
2. By one-way multivariate analysis of variance
3. By t tests of independent and correlated means

Two-Way Multivariate Analysis of Variance

The results of the application of the two-way multivariate analysis of variance for repeated measures (correlated samples) are shown in Table 6.
TABLE 6
APPROXIMATE F STATISTIC AND CONFIDENCE INTERVAL
FOR TWO-WAY MULTIVARIATE ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>F (Approximate)</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principal versus Teacher Mean</td>
<td>47.0528</td>
<td>2 and 29</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real versus Ideal</td>
<td>12.9801</td>
<td>2 and 29</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>5.7602</td>
<td>2 and 29</td>
<td>&lt; .05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Initiating Structure and the Consideration variables have been considered together. Since the interaction F ratio is significant (p < .05), further discussion of the two-way analysis of variance is inappropriate. The significant interaction indicates that the four separate one-way multivariate analyses must be undertaken instead of the two-way analysis.

One-Way Multivariate Analysis of Variance

Real-Staff Versus Real-Self
The pooled-within-groups matrix of sums of squares and cross products is shown in Table 7, and the vector of differences of means is from Table 2 [8.4 3.6]. The test of the difference of this vector from [0 0] yields an approximate F statistic of 16.92, with 2 and 29 degrees of freedom, which is significant beyond the .001 level. This highly significant difference between the teachers' perceptions of the principals' leadership behavior and the principals' perceptions of their own behavior indicates that the principals believed that they were performing at a higher level than their teachers reported.
Ideal-Staff Versus Ideal-Self

The pooled-within-groups matrix of sums of squares and cross products (for the Ideal-Staff versus the Ideal-Self) is shown in Table 8 and the vector of differences of means is from Table 3.

[6.5 7.2]. The test of the difference of this vector from [0 0] yields an approximate F statistic of 19.54, with 2 and 29 degrees of freedom, which is significant beyond the .001 level. Although the principals and the teachers expected a high level of performance from the principals, the principals' expectations for their own performance were significantly higher than the expectations of the teachers.
Real-Self Versus Ideal-Self

To test the difference of the vector $[2.9 \ 5.0]$ from $[0 \ 0]$, a multivariate test for repeated measures has been used. The matrix of sums of squares and cross products is shown in Table 9. The approximate $F$ statistic of 17.31, with 2 and 14 degrees of freedom is significant beyond the .001 level. The highly significant difference between the principals' perceptions of their actual leader behavior and their expectations for the leader behavior of principals suggests that the principals, as a group, were not satisfied with their own performance. They felt that they should be performing at higher levels than they were actually achieving.

Real-Staff Versus Ideal-Staff

To test the difference of the vector $[4.8 \ 1.4]$ from $[0 \ 0]$, a multivariate test for repeated measures was used. The matrix of the sums of squares and cross products is shown in Table 10. The approximate $F$ statistic of 6.8434, with 2 and 14 degrees of freedom, is significant beyond the .01 level. This highly significant difference between the teachers' perceptions of the leadership
behavior of their principals as a group and their expectations for the leadership behavior of these principals suggests that the teachers were not satisfied with the performance of their principals.

TABLE 10

Sums of Squares and Cross Products for LBDQ–Real–Staff and LBDQ–Ideal–Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>405.6307</td>
<td>299.1848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>299.1848</td>
<td>513.7713</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Univariate Tests of Means

As a final procedure, it was decided to study the variables separately by means of t tests—Independent for Staff versus Self comparison, correlated for Self versus Self and Staff versus Staff comparisons.

Comparison of the Independent Means

Table 11 indicates the t values for the difference between the Real–Self and the Real–Staff independent means as follows:

1. The t value of 2.69 for the Initiating Structure dimension, with 30 degrees of freedom, is significant beyond the .02 level. This indicates that there is a highly significant difference between the teachers' perception and the principals' perception of the real leadership behavior of the principals on the Initiating Structure dimension. The principals believed that their Initiating Structure behavior was higher than that reported by their teachers.
TABLE 11

TESTS OF THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN REAL-SELF AND REAL-STAFF INDEPENDENT MEANS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comparison</th>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self versus Staff</td>
<td>Initiating Structure</td>
<td>2.6911</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>&lt; .02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self versus Staff</td>
<td>Consideration</td>
<td>5.9160</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. The t value of 5.92 for the Consideration dimension, with 30 degrees of freedom, is significant beyond the .001 level. The principals and the teachers differed in their perceptions of the leader behavior of the principals. The principals said that they showed greater Consideration than the teachers reported.

Table 12 indicates the t values for the difference between the Ideal-Self and the Ideal-Staff independent means as follows:

TABLE 12

TESTS OF THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN IDEAL-SELF AND IDEAL-STAFF INDEPENDENT MEANS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comparison</th>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self versus Staff</td>
<td>Initiating Structure</td>
<td>5.6512</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self versus Staff</td>
<td>Consideration</td>
<td>4.8320</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. The t value of 5.65 for the Initiating Structure dimension, with 30 degrees of freedom, is significant beyond the .001 level. This indicates a highly significant difference between the expectations of the principals for their own leadership behavior and the expectations
their teachers held for the principals' leadership behavior. The principals said that they should perform with significantly higher levels of Initiating Structure than the teachers felt were necessary.

2. The t value of 4.83 for the Consideration dimension, with 30 degrees of freedom, is significant beyond .001 level. This indicates a high level of significance between the expectations of the principals and the teachers for the principals' leadership behavior. The principals said that they should perform with significantly higher levels of Consideration than the teachers said were demanded.

The teachers and the principals expected a high level of performance from the principals. However, the principals' expectations were significantly higher than the expectations of the teachers on both the Initiating Structure and the Consideration dimensions.

Comparisons of the Correlated Means

Table 13 shows the t values for the difference between correlated means on LBDQ-Real and LBDQ-Ideal for both the Initiating Structure and the Consideration variables:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comparison</th>
<th>Dependent Variables</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Real-Self versus Ideal-Self</td>
<td>Initiating Structure</td>
<td>5.1387</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real-Self versus Ideal-Self</td>
<td>Consideration</td>
<td>4.3727</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real-Staff versus Ideal-Staff</td>
<td>Initiating Structure</td>
<td>0.9436</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>&gt; .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real-Staff versus Ideal-Staff</td>
<td>Consideration</td>
<td>3.4934</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>&lt; .05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. With respect to the Real-Self versus the Ideal-Self the following results are indicated: (a) The $t$ value of 5.14 on the Initiating Structure dimension, with 15 degrees of freedom, is significant beyond the .001 level. This highly significant difference between the principals' perceptions of their own leadership behavior and their expectations for the leadership behavior of principals suggests that the principals, as a group, were not satisfied with the levels of Initiating Structure that they were maintaining. They said that they should show higher levels of Initiating Structure. (b) The $t$ value of 4.37 for the Consideration dimension, with 15 degrees of freedom, is significant beyond the .001 level. This highly significant difference between the principals' perceptions and expectations for the leadership behavior of principals suggests that the principals were not satisfied with the level of Consideration they were showing. Their expectations for their performance was higher than their level of performance.

2. With respect to the Real-Staff versus the Ideal-Staff the following results are indicated: (a) The $t$ value of 0.94 for the Initiating Structure dimension, with 15 degrees of freedom, is not significant ($p < .05$). Although there was a difference between the perceptions and expectations of teachers for the leadership behavior of principals, this difference was not significant. (b) The $t$ value of 3.49 for the Consideration dimension, with 15 degrees of freedom, is significant beyond the .05 level. The teachers indicated a highly significant difference between their perceptions and expectations for the leadership behavior of their principals. They felt that their
principals, as a group, were not showing as much Consideration as they were expected to show.

Principals and teachers alike, believed that the leadership style of the principals should be characterized by high levels of Initiating Structure and Consideration. However, the principals indicated greater expectations for their own performance than the teachers expressed. Also, while both groups (principals and teachers) indicated that the principals were performing at lower levels than were desirable, the principals felt that they were providing leadership at higher levels of efficiency than those reported by the teachers.

The Quadrant Technique

The comparison of the Self score and the Staff-ascribed mean score of each principal, on both dimensions of the LBDQ-Real and the LBDQ-Ideal with the group-means for teachers and for principals on both dimensions of the LBDQ-Real, provides another approach by which the relationships under investigation have been studied. The means on the Initiating Structure and on the Consideration dimensions of the LBDQ-Real for each group of respondents provides coordinates for four quadrants by which the Self and Staff scores for the sixteen principals have been described as falling into one of the four quadrants of Figure 3 as follows:

1. Above the mean on both Consideration and Initiating Structure in Quadrant I

2. Above the mean on Consideration but below the mean on Initiating Structure in Quadrant II
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiating Structure</th>
<th>Quadrant IV</th>
<th>Quadrant I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Above the mean on Initiating Structure but below the mean on Consideration</td>
<td>Above the Mean on both Consideration and Initiating Structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quadrant III</td>
<td>Quadrant II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below the Mean on both Consideration and Initiating Structure</td>
<td>Above the Mean on Consideration but below the Mean on Initiating Structure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 3. Model for Quadrant Analysis.

3. Below the mean on both Consideration and Initiating Structure in Quadrant III
4. Above the mean on Initiating Structure but below the mean on Consideration in Quadrant IV

Rationale for the Quadrant Technique

Rationale for the quadrant analyses is based upon the findings of Halpin (1957 and 1966), Hemphill (1957), Evenson (1958), Hunt (1967) and Mead's (1975) assumptions (described earlier).

Halpin (1966) pointed out:

The leaders described in Quadrant I are evaluated as highly effective, whereas those in Quadrant III, whose behavior is ordinarily accompanied by group chaos, are characterized as most ineffective. The leaders in Quadrant IV are the martinets and the "cold fish" so intent upon getting a job done that they forget they are dealing with human beings, not with cogs in a machine. The individuals described in Quadrant II are also ineffective leaders. They may ooze the milk of human kindness, but this contributes little
to effective performance unless their Consideration behavior is accompanied by a necessary minimum of Initiating Structure behavior (pp. 98-99).

Halpin (1957) found support for the hypotheses that commanders who are rated highest by their superiors on "Overall Effectiveness in Combat" are those who score above the mean on both leader behavior dimensions, and that the commanders who are rated lowest by their superiors on this same criterion are those who score below the mean on both dimensions (p. 54).

He concluded that the evidence thus indicates that the effective aircraft commander is not the one who engages in one form of leader behavior at the expense of the other, but rather is the leader whose behavior is above average in respect to both the Consideration and Initiating Structure dimensions (p. 64).

Hemphill (1957) from his study of "Leader Behavior Associated with the Administrative Reputations of College Departments" found a conjunctive relationship between Consideration and Initiating Structure suggesting that minimal amount of behaviors is required for achievement of good reputation, and that an excess of one type of behavior does not compensate for the lack of the other (p. 81).

The quadrant analysis has been computed and described in terms of the number and per cent of principals whose leadership behaviors were associated with each quadrant. The following is a description of the findings derived from the analysis of the leadership style of principals by the application of the assumptions of the quadrant model.

**The Leadership Style of the Individual Principals**

Identification of the leadership style of each principal is based upon the quadrant analyses. Those principals described above the mean on both Initiating Structure and Consideration are considered
as the most effective principals. Those who are described below the mean on both Initiating Structure and Consideration are considered as the least effective principals. Reference is being made to Figure 4 when the principals' perceptions and expectations are under consideration. When the teachers' perceptions and expectations are under consideration, reference is being made to Figure 5.

Principal Number One

This principal described the leadership behavior of the ideal principal as above the mean on both Initiating Structure and Consideration. He described his own leadership behavior as satisfying these criteria. However, while concurring with their principal in their expectations for his leadership behavior, the teachers disagreed that he was meeting the expectations. They described his leadership behavior below the mean on both Initiating Structure and Consideration.

Principal Number Two

This principal described his expectations for the principal's leadership behavior above the mean on both Initiating Structure and Consideration. However, his teachers described both their expectations for his leadership behavior and their perceptions of his actual leadership behavior below the mean on both Initiating Structure and Consideration.

Principals Numbers Three and Four

These principals described their expectations for the leadership behavior of principals above the mean on both Initiating Structure
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consideration</th>
<th>Consideration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Real</strong></td>
<td><strong>Real</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ideal</strong></td>
<td><strong>Ideal</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>5 (31.25%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 (18.75%)</td>
<td>12 (75%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Real)</td>
<td>(Real: 1,2,3,4,10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Ideal: 14,15,16)</td>
<td>(Ideal: 1,2,3,4,5, 6,7,8,9,10, 12,13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 (50%)</td>
<td>3 (18.75%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (6.25%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Real: 5,6,7,11, 12,14,15,16)</td>
<td>(Real: 8,9,13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Ideal: 11)</td>
<td>(Ideal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 (31.25%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 (12.5%)</td>
<td>2 (12.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Real: 1,2,10,12, 16)</td>
<td>(Real: 0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Ideal: 2,5)</td>
<td>(Ideal: 6,11)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mean = 43.3**

**Fig. 4.** LBDQ-Self Scores Real and Ideal Distributed According to Quadrants Defined by Coordinates of LBDQ-Real-Self Mean Scores.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consideration</th>
<th>Consideration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Real</strong></td>
<td><strong>Real</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ideal</strong></td>
<td><strong>Ideal</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 (18.75%)</td>
<td>8 (50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>12 (75%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Real: 6,9,15)</td>
<td>(Real: 3,4,5,7,8, 11,13,14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Ideal: 0)</td>
<td>(Ideal: 1,3,4,7,8, 9,10,12,13, 14,15,16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 (31.25%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 (12.5%)</td>
<td>2 (12.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Real: 1,2,10,12, 16)</td>
<td>(Real: 0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Ideal: 2,5)</td>
<td>(Ideal: 6,11)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mean = 34.9**

**Fig. 5.** LBDQ-Staff Ascribed Mean Scores on the Real and Ideal Distributed According to Quadrants Defined by Coordinates of LBDQ-Real-Staff Group Means.
and Consideration. They described their own leadership behavior as satisfying these criteria. Their teachers concurred with them in both their expectations for and their perceptions of their leadership behavior.

**Principal Number Five**

This principal described his expectations for the leadership behavior of the principal above the mean on both Initiating Structure and Consideration. He described his own leadership behavior below the mean on both dimensions. His teachers, while they described their expectations for his leadership behavior below the mean on both dimensions, described his actual leadership behavior above the mean on both Initiating Structure and Consideration.

**Principal Number Six**

This principal described his expectations for the leadership behavior of the principal above the mean on both Initiating Structure and Consideration. However, he described his actual performance below the mean on both dimensions. The teachers expected him to perform above the mean on Consideration and below the mean on Initiating Structure, but they described his actual performance above the mean on Initiating Structure and below the mean on Consideration.

**Principal Number Seven**

This principal described his expectations for the leadership behavior of the principal above the mean on both Initiating Structure and Consideration. However, he described his actual performance below
the mean on both Initiating Structure and Consideration. The teachers concurred with him in their expectations but they described his actual leadership behavior above the mean on both Initiating Structure and Consideration.

**Principal Number Eight**

This principal described his expectations for the leadership behavior of the principal above the mean on both Initiating Structure and Consideration. However, he described his actual leadership behavior above the mean on Consideration but below the mean on Initiating Structure. The teachers concurred with him in their expectations but they described his actual leadership behavior above the mean on both Initiating Structure and Consideration.

**Principal Number Nine**

This principal described his expectations for the leadership behavior of the principal above the mean on both Initiating Structure and Consideration. However, he described his actual leadership behavior above the mean on Consideration but below the mean on Initiating Structure. The teachers concurred with him in their description of their expectations for his performance, but they described his actual leadership behavior above the mean on Initiating Structure and below the mean on Consideration.

**Principal Number Ten**

This principal described his expectations for the leadership behavior of the principal above the mean on both Initiating Structure and Consideration. He described his actual leadership behavior as
satisfying these criteria. However, while the teachers concurred with his descriptions of his expectations, they disagreed with him that he was meeting these expectations. They described his actual leadership behavior as below the mean on both Initiating Structure and Consideration.

**Principal Number Eleven**

This principal described both his expectations for and his perceptions of his leadership behavior below the mean on both Initiating Structure and Consideration. His teachers, however, described their expectations for his leadership behavior above the mean on Consideration and below the mean on Initiating Structure. They reported that his actual leadership behavior was above the mean on both Initiating Structure and Consideration.

**Principal Number Twelve**

This principal described his expectations for the leadership behavior of the principal above the mean on both Initiating Structure and Consideration. However, he described his actual leadership behavior below the mean on both Initiating Structure and Consideration. His teachers concurred with him in their descriptions of their expectations for and perceptions of his leadership behavior.

**Principal Number Thirteen**

This principal described his expectations for the leadership behavior of the principal above the mean on both Initiating Structure and Consideration. However, he described his actual leadership
behavior above the mean on Consideration but below the mean on Initiating Structure. The teachers concurred with him in their description of their expectations for his leadership behavior. But, unlike him, they described his actual leadership behavior above the mean on both Initiating Structure and Consideration.

**Principal Number Fourteen**

This principal described the expectations for the leadership behavior of the principal above the mean on Initiating Structure but below the mean on Consideration. However, he described his actual leadership behavior below the mean on both Initiating Structure and Consideration. His teachers described both their expectations for and perceptions of his leadership behavior above the mean on Initiating Structure and Consideration.

**Principal Number Fifteen**

This principal described the expectations for the leadership behavior of the principal above the mean on Initiating Structure and below the mean on Consideration. He described his actual leadership behavior below the mean on both Initiating Structure and Consideration. His teachers described their expectations for his leadership behavior above the mean on both Initiating Structure and Consideration. They described his actual leadership behavior above the mean on Initiating Structure and below the mean on Consideration.

**Principal Number Sixteen**

This principal described his expectations for the leadership behavior of the principal above the mean on Initiating Structure and
below the mean on Consideration. He described his actual leadership behavior below the mean on both Initiating Structure and Consideration. His teachers described their expectations for his leadership behavior above the mean on both Initiating Structure and Consideration.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSION, RECOMMENDATIONS
AND IMPLICATIONS

This chapter presents a summary of the study under five major headings as follows: (1) purpose of the study, (2) population studied, (3) procedure, (4) major findings, and (5) findings from the quadrant analysis. Additionally, it presents the conclusions implied by the results of testing the null hypotheses; specific recommendations which are supported by the results; and implications for future research.

Purpose

The purpose of this study was to identify the perceptions and expectations of principals in Jamaican high schools from the perspective of teachers and principals, through an investigation of the following four questions:

1. Is there any difference between the teachers' perceptions and their principals' perceptions of the principals' leadership behavior?

2. Is there any difference between the teachers' expectations and their principals' expectations for the principals' leadership behavior?

3. Is there any difference between the principals' perceptions of and expectations for their own leadership behavior?
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4. Is there any difference between the teachers' perceptions of and expectations for their principals' leadership behavior?

Population Studied

The population studied included the 1690 teachers and 40 principals in the 40 high schools in Jamaica. A sample of 20 schools, representing 50 per cent of the population, was selected by use of a table of random numbers. By the fishbowl method of drawing names from a bag, 20 teachers were selected and assigned at random to one of two equal groups. One group was assigned to complete the Real form of the LBDQ and the other group the Ideal form of the same questionnaire. The principal in each of the 20 selected schools was invited to complete both the Real and the Ideal forms of the LBDQ.

Altogether, 420 respondents were selected for the study. In terms of status groups, this included 400 teachers and 20 principals. Of these, 230 responded to the questionnaire. In terms of status groups, 214 teachers and 16 principals made a total of 55 per cent of the total sample.

Procedure

The Real and Ideal forms of the LBDQ were used to identify the perceptions and expectations, respectively, related to the principals' leadership behavior.

The 20 selected schools were visited by the researcher who presented letters from his research advisor and the Permanent Secretary in the Ministry of Education, Dr. Errol Miller, to the principals.
The general purpose of the study was explained to all the principals and teachers whose participation was enlisted. Seven principals declined the participation of their schools and themselves in the study. These were replaced by teachers and principals of 7 other schools. The schools were selected by use of a table of random numbers and the principals were invited by telephone to participate. The teachers' names were read from the staff lists by the principals and were randomly assigned, by the fish bowl method to the two groups by the researcher. These teachers and principals were mailed the LBDQ with stamped self-addressed envelopes for the return of the questionnaires.

Those schools only which returned a minimum of 5 LBDQ-Real-Staff, 5 LBDQ-Ideal-Staff, one LBDQ-Real-Self and one LBDQ-Ideal-Self were considered to have returned questionnaires in amounts satisfactory for inclusion in this study.

The reliability of group means as a measure of staff responses in the schools was measured by the analysis of variance procedure for estimating reliability. Each principal's scores on the LBDQ was used in the analysis of the data.

The hypotheses were tested by the following statistical techniques: (1) two-way multivariate analysis of variance, (2) four separate one-way multivariate analysis of variance made necessary by the presence of significant interaction effect ($p < .05$) in the two-way analysis of variance procedure, and (3) t tests between all possible pairs of means. The level of significance for acceptance or rejection of the hypotheses was .05 ($\alpha = .05$).
Major Findings

Four specific hypotheses were tested in this study. From these hypotheses the following summaries were made after careful analysis of the data:

Hypothesis One

There is no difference between the teachers' perceptions and their principals' perceptions of the principals' leadership behavior. This hypothesis was not upheld at the .05 level. The result of the one-way multivariate analysis of variance shows a significant difference, beyond the .001 level, between the teachers' and the principals' perceptions of the principals' leadership behavior. With respect to the t test, the level of significance is beyond .02 on Initiating Structure and beyond .001 on Consideration. The principals, as a group, believed that their leadership was characterized by greater Consideration and Initiating Structure behaviors than the teachers reported.

Hypothesis Two

There is no difference between the teachers' expectations and their principals' expectations for the principals' leadership behavior. This hypothesis was not upheld at the .05 level. The result of the one-way multivariate analysis of variance shows a significant difference, beyond .001, between the teachers' and the principals' expectations for the principals' leadership behavior. With respect to the t test, the level of significance is beyond .001 on both Initiating Structure and Consideration. The principals, as a group, believed
that their leadership should be characterized by greater Initiating Structure and Consideration behaviors than the teachers thought were necessary.

Hypothesis Three

There is no difference between the principals' perceptions of and expectations for their own leadership behavior. This hypothesis was not upheld at the .05 level. The result of the one-way multivariate analysis of variance shows a significant difference, beyond the .001 level, between the principals' perceptions of and expectations for their own leadership behavior. With respect to the t test, the level of significance is beyond .001 on both Initiating Structure and Consideration. The principals, as a group, were dissatisfied with their own leadership behavior. They recognized that their performance needed improvement.

Hypothesis Four

There is no difference between the teachers' perceptions of and expectations for their principals' leadership behavior. With respect to the one-way multivariate analysis of variance test this hypothesis was not upheld at the .05 level. There is a significant difference, beyond the .01 level, between the teachers' perceptions of and expectations for the leadership behavior of their principals. With respect to the t test, however, the hypothesis was not upheld (p > .05) for the Consideration dimension, but was upheld (p < .05) for the Initiating Structure dimension. There is congruence in the teachers' perceptions of and expectations for the principals'
leadership behavior with regards to Consideration. With regards to Initiating Structure, however, there is significant difference between how the teachers expect the principals to perform and how they see them actually performing.

There is no conflict in the results from the one-way analysis of variance and the t test. Both Consideration and Initiating Structure are examined together with the one-way analysis of variance. The results indicate that when these two variables are considered together as one factor, teachers report that they expect their principals to perform with greater effectiveness than is realized by their actual leadership behavior. When Consideration and Initiating Structure are analyzed as separate variables by the t test, however, there is discrimination relative to perceptions and expectations on each of these two dimensions of leadership behavior. The teachers indicated that they expect their principals to show greater Consideration than they now show. They do not see a need, however, for the principals' leadership to be characterized by higher levels of Initiating Structure. In this latter performance area the principals are meeting their teachers' expectations.

**Findings from the Quadrant Analysis**

The leadership behavior of each principal was described as associated with one of four quadrants defined by coordinates as follows:

1. Above the mean on both Initiating Structure and Consideration in Quadrant I
2. Above the mean on Consideration but below the mean on Initiating Structure in Quadrant II

3. Below the mean on both Initiating Structure and Consideration in Quadrant III

4. Above the mean on Initiating Structure but below the mean on Consideration in Quadrant IV

Five principals (numbers 1, 2, 3, 4, and 10) described their leadership behavior within Quadrant I and eight principals (numbers 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 11, 13, and 14) were described by their teachers within this quadrant. These principals described themselves and were described by their teachers as highly effective with leadership characterized by high levels of both Initiating Structure and Consideration.

Eight principals (numbers 4, 5, 7, 11, 12, 14, 15, and 16) described their leadership behavior within Quadrant III and five principals (numbers 1, 2, 10, 12 and 16) were described by their teachers within this quadrant. These principals described themselves or were described by their teachers as very ineffective with leadership characterized by low levels of Initiating Structure and Consideration behaviors. The following observations suggest remarkable differences in the way teachers and principals perceived the leadership behavior of the principals:

1. Two principals only (numbers 4 and 8) were described, not by themselves only, but also by their teachers, as highly effective (in Quadrant I).

2. Three principals (numbers 1, 2, and 10) described their leadership behavior as highly effective but were described by their
teachers as very ineffective (in Quadrant III) in their leadership behavior.

3. Three principals (numbers 5, 7, and 11) who described their leadership behavior as very ineffective were described by their teachers as demonstrating highly effective leadership behavior.

Conclusions

Within the limitations of the present study, inferences can be drawn regarding the perceptions and expectations related to the leadership behavior of high school principals in Jamaica. The findings from this study are consistent with the findings of Halpin's study of school superintendents, Evenson's study of high school principals, and Hunt's study of elementary school principals.

Teachers and principals, in this and similar studies, indicated that desirable leadership behavior for principals was characterized by high scores on the Initiating Structure dimension, as measured by the LBDQ. This means that they expect principals (1) to let their teachers know what is expected of them, (2) to encourage teachers to use uniform procedures, (3) to try out their ideas among their faculties, (4) to make their attitudes clear to their faculties, (5) to make decisions regarding things to be done and methods for their accomplishment, (6) to assign teachers to particular responsibilities, (7) to clarify their role as leaders of their faculties, (8) to schedule the work to be done, (9) to maintain definite standards of performance, and (10) to request that their faculties follow standard rules and regulations.
Teachers and principals, in this and similar studies, indicated that desirable leadership behavior was characterized by high scores on the Consideration dimension, as measured by the LBDQ. This means that they expected principals (1) to be friendly and approachable, (2) to do little things for their teachers to make it pleasant for them to be members of their faculties, (3) to put suggestions made by teachers into operation, (4) to treat all teachers as their equals, (5) to give advance notice of changes, (6) to interact with their faculties, (7) to look out for the personal welfare of their faculties, (8) to be willing to make changes, (9) to explain their actions, and (10) to act in consultation with their faculties.

The teachers and principals were in disagreement with respect to their perceptions and expectations related to the leadership behavior of the principals. The mean levels by which the principals described their actual leadership behavior, as well as expectations for their leadership behavior, were higher than the mean levels by which their teachers described the actual and expected leadership behavior of the principals. The difference in perceptions and expectations among teachers and principals could be a source of misunderstanding or role conflict among them. Each principal might attempt to determine for himself how his leadership behavior is perceived by his teachers and clarify his teachers' expectations for his leadership.

Principals should be careful about assuming that their perceptions and expectations for leadership are congruent with those of their teachers. In this study and others, the quadrant analysis
showed that while some principals described their performance as high on Initiating Structure and Consideration, their teachers described their leadership as low on these dimensions.

Teachers in this and other studies described their principals as high on one dimension and low on the other. Initiating Structure and Consideration might have been found conflicting with each other by some principals. Some might have experienced difficulty in their attempts to establish routine procedures by being considerate. For other principals, Initiating Structure and Consideration were not opposing.

Recommendations

The findings of this study provide the basis for the following recommendations which are presented for the consideration of the Jamaica Ministry of Education and the principals in the public high schools:

1. It is recommended that the Jamaica Ministry of Education, in recruiting high school principals, select those principals who are not merely aware that the effective principal will provide leadership characterized by an integration of high levels of both Initiating Structure and Consideration, but who have internalized the concept of their leadership role and developed the skills and competencies for productive administration.

2. It is recommended that the Ministry of Education develop selection criteria and instruments which will identify candidates for the principalship who have internalized the concepts of their
leadership role and developed skills and competencies for productive administration.

3. It is recommended that the Ministry of Education provide principals who are already on the job, in-service training related to Consideration and Initiating Structure as important or interrelated dimensions for effective leadership. Demonstrated competencies in these skills might be considered as the criteria for the award of tenure to principals.

4. It is recommended that the Ministry of Education establish multiple criteria of effectiveness for use in the evaluation of principals. Consultants might be used in evaluating principals' performance. To obtain an accurate picture of the performance of the principals, evaluation by their teachers might be helpful. The teachers, however, might be unwilling to participate unless they have the assurance that their opinions will be strictly confidential.

5. It is recommended that the Ministry of Education ensure that the education provided for students in educational administration (who are preparing for the principalship of public high schools) include content related to Initiating Structure and Consideration.

The methods used in training might be selected and developed both to ensure and facilitate the measurement of change in leadership behavior. This might be crucial, inasmuch as the principal's own report of his preference for leadership behavior might not be a reliable source by which to determine his present or future effectiveness. The Ministry of Education might reconsider the practice of relying completely on institutions of higher education to prepare candidates for
the principalship, and, instead, collaborate with institutions of higher education for the purpose of developing coordinated programs of instruction and supervision for principals. Consideration might be given to adopting a two phase process in the development of school principals. Phase one is the preparatory period. Phase two is the period during which the administrator is confronted with the complex realities of the organization in which he works.

The Ministry of Education might find it rewarding to develop, with colleges, internships which may be supervised jointly by personnel from both the college of education and the Ministry of Education. This approach offers the opportunity for students to develop realistic understanding of the obstacles to professional leadership, as well as methods by which they may be overcome.

6. It is recommended that the Ministry of Education examine its own policies and priorities to determine whether it imposes constraints upon principals and teachers such that the expectations of either group would be irrelevant to optimal performance of the educational system.

7. It is recommended that the principal see his role as that of facilitator for the release of the human potential of his staff.

8. It is recommended that the principal attempt, through introspection, to gain insight into the effect his actions have upon those with whom he works. He might consider the importance of accepting himself if he expects his faculty to accept him.

9. It is recommended that the principal seek to enjoy a sense of personal security if he desires to achieve high levels of
effectiveness as a school administrator. The secure principal is less likely to relate to his faculty in a punitive manner.

10. It is recommended that the principal be flexible but also be consistent.

11. It is recommended that the principal strive to achieve a high level of personal fulfillment through improved understanding of his role in relation to the total educational environment.

12. It is recommended that the principal embark upon a continuous program to improve his knowledge and skills through self-education. He might consider taking courses in personnel administration by attending college classes or by correspondence. He might consider attending leadership or management seminars or workshops, developing reading lists in personnel administration and subscribing to periodicals.

13. It is recommended that the principal clarify the goals of the school and of the school system.

14. It is recommended that the principal recognize leadership as a shared function by which he might increase his own performance by providing his teachers with maximum incentives and opportunities to grow and mature into human beings who, because of a favorable working climate, realize their own goals best through the pursuit of the goals of the organization.

15. It is recommended that the principal conduct position clarification for each teacher. The procedure might include (a) a clear definition of the teacher's individual job objectives and the job objectives of his colleagues, (b) a clear statement of the
mission of the institution for which he works, (c) an explanation of the philosophy and policies of the institution, (d) a clear description of the kind of performance expected of him and the criteria for evaluating his performance, (e) an indication concerning where he may obtain the help he needs, (f) an identification of the requirement of his job, duties, responsibilities, and freedom, (g) an explanation of his place in relation to other organizational components.

16. It is recommended that the principal involve his teachers in decisions and change which affect them. He might consider demonstrating consistency, flexibility and tactfulness in these matters and generating power through rather than over his faculty.

17. It is recommended that the principal encourage teachers to initiate action within reasonable limits. The teachers might be allowed to participate in setting goals since they have a deeper sense of responsibility to fulfill such goals as they themselves participate in setting. Teachers might be given an opportunity to express themselves on school problems.

18. It is recommended that when faculty members are asked to study problems and make recommendations for change, the principal consider informing the staff concerning the results of the recommendations even if no action is taken. In so doing the principal lets his teachers know that their contribution is recognized and that the channels of communication are free and open and will be used in making decisions.

19. It is recommended that the principal satisfy his teachers' need for success by assigning the appropriate professional tasks to
the appropriate teachers, making work loads equitable and fair, providing an environment in which his teachers have the freedom to make unintentional mistakes without fear of retribution, and recognizing individual differences among his teachers.

20. It is recommended that the principal strive to show his teachers that they are liked, appreciated and wanted, that the principal demonstrate confidence in them as persons and as professionals, radiate warmth, friendliness, and praise, and to recognize the good works of his teachers by informing other teachers and the community.

21. It is recommended that the principal be accessible to all his teachers especially when his help is needed to solve problems.

Implications for Further Research

The following is a list of suggestions for further research:

1. A study of the leadership behavior of principals in Seventh-day Adventist schools might be compared with the findings of the present study.

2. A study of the leadership behavior of high school principals and teachers, in Jamaica, from the perspective of students might be useful.

3. There is need to identify some objective independent criteria of leadership effectiveness and determine, by empirical method, the relationship between these criteria of effectiveness and the Initiating Structure and Consideration dimensions of the LBDQ.

4. There is need to study the relationship between the behavior and values of principals and the behavior and values of teachers.
5. There is a need to determine the type of training necessary to produce a specific type of leader.

6. There is need to study the relationship between the leadership behavior of teachers and principals and the academic achievement of students.

7. There is a need to identify whether the perceptions and expectations of teachers and principals are a function of students' abilities and behavior.
APPENDIX A

LEADER BEHAVIOR DESCRIPTION QUESTIONNAIRE—FORM XII
LEADER BEHAVIOR DESCRIPTION QUESTIONNAIRE—Form XII

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

Purpose of the Questionnaire

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

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

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

Published by
Bureau of Business Research
College of Commerce and Administration
The Ohio State University
Columbus, Ohio

Copyright 1962
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 (A) always, (B) often, (C) occasionally, (D) seldom or (E) never acts as described by the item.

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

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

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

Example: He often acts as described. ......................................................... A B C D E
Example: He never acts as described. ......................................................... A B C D E
Example: He occasionally acts as described .............................................. A B C D E

1. He acts as the spokesman of the group .............................................. A B C D E
2. He waits patiently for the results of a decision .................................... A B C D E
3. He makes pep talks to stimulate the group ........................................ A B C D E
4. He lets group members know what is expected of them .................... A B C D E
5. He allows the members complete freedom in their work .................... A B C D E
6. He is hesitant about taking initiative in the group ............................... A B C D E
7. He is friendly and approachable ......................................................... A B C D E
8. He encourages overtime work ............................................................. A B C D E
9. He makes accurate decisions ............................................................... A B C D E
10. He gets along well with the people above him ................................... A B C D E
11. He publicizes the activities of the group ............................................ A B C D E
12. He becomes anxious when he cannot find out what is coming next ..... A B C D E
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A = Always
B = Often
C = Occasionally
D = Seldom
E = Never

13. His arguments are convincing ........................................... A B C D E
14. He encourages the use of uniform procedures ....................... A B C D E
15. He permits the members to use their own judgment in solving problems. A B C D E
16. He fails to take necessary action ....................................... A B C D E
17. He does little things to make it pleasant to be a member of the group... A B C D E
18. He stresses being ahead of competing groups .......................... A B C D E
19. He keeps the group working together as a team ....................... A B C D E
20. He keeps the group in good standing with higher authority .......... A B C D E
21. He speaks as the representative of the group .......................... A B C D E
22. He accepts defeat in stride .............................................. A B C D E
23. He argues persuasively for his point of view .......................... A B C D E
24. He tries out his ideas in the group ...................................... A B C D E
25. He encourages initiative in the group members ........................ A B C D E
26. He lets other persons take away his leadership in the group ......... A B C D E
27. He puts suggestions made by the group into operation ............... A B C D E
28. He needs members for greater effort .................................... A B C D E
29. He seems able to predict what is coming next .......................... A B C D E
30. He is working hard for a promotion .................................... A B C D E
31. He speaks for the group when visitors are present .................... A B C D E
32. He accepts delays without becoming upset ............................ A B C D E
33. He is a very persuasive talker .......................................... A B C D E
34. He makes his attitudes clear to the group .............................. A B C D E
35. He lets the members do their work the way they think best ......... A B C D E
36. He lets some members take advantage of him ........................ A B C D E

101
Always
B — Often
C — Occasionally
D — Seldom
E — Never

37. He treats all group members as his equals........................................... A B C D E
38. He keeps the work moving at a rapid pace........................................ A B C D E
39. He settles conflicts when they occur in the group.............................. A B C D E
40. His superiors act favorably on most of his suggestions..................... A B C D E
41. He represents the group at outside meetings.................................... A B C D E
42. He becomes anxious when waiting for new developments................ A B C D E
43. He is very skillful in an argument..................................................... A B C D E
44. He decides what shall be done and how it shall be done.................... A B C D E
45. He assigns a task, then lets the members handle it........................... A B C D E
46. He is the leader of the group in name only....................................... A B C D E
47. He gives advance notice of changes................................................ A B C D E
48. He pushes for increased production.................................................. A B C D E
49. Things usually turn out as he predicts............................................. A B C D E
50. He enjoys the privileges of his position.......................................... A B C D E
51. He handles complex problems efficiently........................................ A B C D E
52. He is able to tolerate postponement and uncertainty...................... A B C D E
53. He is not a very convincing talker................................................... A B C D E
54. He assigns group members to particular tasks.................................. A B C D E
55. He turns the members loose on a job, and lets them go to it............ A B C D E
56. He backs down when he ought to stand firm.................................... A B C D E
57. He keeps to himself............................................................................ A B C D E
58. He asks the members to work harder.............................................. A B C D E
59. He is accurate in predicting the trend of events............................... A B C D E
60. He gets his superiors to act for the welfare of the group members....... A B C D E
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61. He gets swamped by details.................................................. A B C D E
62. He can wait just so long, then blows up.............................. A B C D E
63. He speaks from a strong inner conviction............................ A B C D E
64. He makes sure that his part in the group is understood by the group members ............................................. A B C D E
65. He is reluctant to allow the members any freedom of action..... A B C D E
66. He lets some members have authority that he should keep........ A B C D E
67. He looks out for the personal welfare of group members........ A B C D E
68. He permits the members to take it easy in their work............. A B C D E
69. He sees to it that the work of the group is coordinated.......... A B C D E
70. His word carries weight with his superiors........................ A B C D E
71. He gets things all tangled up............................................. A B C D E
72. He remains calm when uncertain about coming events............ A B C D E
73. He is an inspiring talker.................................................. A B C D E
74. He schedules the work to be done...................................... A B C D E
75. He allows the group a high degree of initiative.................... A B C D E
76. He takes full charge when emergencies arise........................ A B C D E
77. He is willing to make changes.......................................... A B C D E
78. He drives hard when there is a job to be done...................... A B C D E
79. He helps group members settle their differences................... A B C D E
80. He gets what he asks for from his superiors........................ A B C D E
81. He can reduce a madhouse to system and order..................... A B C D E
82. He is able to delay action until the proper time occurs........... A B C D E
83. He persuades others that his ideas are to their advantage........ A B C D E
84. He maintains definite standards of performance. .................. A B C D E
85. He trusts the members to exercise good judgment. .................. A B C D E
86. He overcomes attempts made to challenge his leadership. ......... A B C D E
87. He refuses to explain his actions. ................................. A B C D E
88. He urges the group to beat its previous record. ...................... A B C D E
89. He anticipates problems and plans for them. ......................... A B C D E
90. He is working his way to the top. ................................. A B C D E
91. He gets confused when too many demands are made of him. .... A B C D E
92. He worries about the outcome of any new procedure. ............... A B C D E
93. He can inspire enthusiasm for a project. .......................... A B C D E
94. He asks that group members follow standard rules and regulations. A B C D E
95. He permits the group to set its own pace. .......................... A B C D E
96. He is easily recognized as the leader of the group. ................. A B C D E
97. He acts without consulting the group. ............................... A B C D E
98. He keeps the group working up to capacity. ........................ A B C D E
99. He maintains a closely knit group. ................................. A B C D E
100. He maintains cordial relations with superiors. ...................... A B C D E
APPENDIX B

RELIABILITY COEFFICIENTS (MODIFIED KUDER-RICHARDSON)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>Army Division</th>
<th>Highway Patrol</th>
<th>Aircraft Executives</th>
<th>Ministers</th>
<th>Community Leaders</th>
<th>Corporation Presidents</th>
<th>Labor Presidents</th>
<th>College Presidents</th>
<th>Senators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Representation</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Demand Reconciliation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Tolerance Uncertainty</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Persuasiveness</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Initiating Structure</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Tolerance Freedom</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Role Assumption</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Consideration</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Production Emphasis</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Predictive Accuracy</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Integration</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Superior Orientation</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td></td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Stogdill, 1963.*
APPENDIX C

MINISTRY OF EDUCATION INTRODUCTORY LETTERS

Letter to the Permanent Secretary
Letter from the Permanent Secretary
June 19, 1975

Dr. E. Miller  
The Permanent Secretary  
Ministry of Education  
Government of Jamaica  
Kingston, Jamaica  

Dear Dr. Miller:

From the reports I have had, I can't help but commend you and your government for the most comprehensive program introduced to make high school education available to more Jamaican youth.

In recognition of the fact that there are unique problems which characterize major new programs such as your high school program, Mr. Don Mead, under my direction, would like to conduct a research study which could provide information on one crucial factor: organizational leadership in schools.

Contemporary theory, research and practice in educational administration identify a very crucial role for teachers in determining administrative structures of modern schools. Teachers are recognized also as a potential source of help in the diagnosis of problems and the identification of solutions.

In this research Mr. Mead proposes to study the leadership style of high school principals through an investigation of teachers' perception and preference for the leader behavior of their principals. This will be done among a sample of schools randomly selected.

Mr. Mead is a citizen of Jamaica, and a civil servant in the U.S.A. working as the director of Berrien County Juvenile Center. He is currently working on his Doctor of Education degree at Andrews University. We know Mr. Mead to be a man of integrity. Therefore, we can assure you professional conduct on his part as he gathers his data in Jamaica. The results of this study will be presented to you first, and only upon your approval it would be made available to the public.
May I invite your cooperation in this study and solicit a letter to the principals and teachers in support of this research.

Studies of this nature have proven beneficial to various school systems and I am confident that the results of Mr. Mead's study will provide valuable perspectives on leadership in the high schools of Jamaica.

Thanking you.

Sincerely yours,

Dr. Bernard M. Lall
Professor of Educational Administration

cz
Dear Principal:

Mr. Nehemiah Mead is conducting his study of leadership style of principals in Jamaican High Schools.

The Ministry of Education is aware of this study and recognises that very useful insights could be gained from a study of this type which could benefit the development of education in Jamaica.

The Ministry gives its blessings to the conduct of this study, subject to your convenience.

Yours sincerely,

Errol Miller
Permanent Secretary
APPENDIX D

LETTER OF INTRODUCTION TO THE PRINCIPALS
June 19, 1975

Dear Principal:

We are currently engaged in a research to determine the leadership style of high school principals.

The study calls for the administration of the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire Form XII among principals and teachers in a sample of schools randomly selected. Because your school has been selected, we wish to solicit your participation and request your permission for twenty of your teachers to participate.

Your school will be visited between June 24 and July 10 for the purpose of administering the questionnaire.

Full anonymity will be guaranteed to you and your school.

We shall appreciate your participation and support. We shall be indebted to you for your contribution to the success of this field study, and shall provide you a summary of the findings.

Sincerely,

Nehemiah Mead, Doctoral Candidate

Bernard Lall, Professor of Educational Administration
Andrews University
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Dear Principal:

We wish to invite you to participate in a research to determine the leadership style of Jamaican principals by completing this sheet and the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire Form XII (LBDQ-XII).

INSTRUCTIONS:
1. On the LBDQXII-IDEAL, please describe the way THE IDEAL PRINCIPAL behaves.
2. On the LBDQXII-REAL, please describe your own behavior as a principal.
3. Please answer ALL questions.

BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION:
1. Name of school: ...............................................................
2. Age: Below 29..... 30-39..... 40-49..... 50-59..... 60 or over.....
3. Years of training recognized on the salary schedule:
   One..... two..... three..... four..... five..... more than five.....
4. Years of experience in education:
   0-9..... 10-19..... 20-29..... 30 or more.....
5. Years at this school: 0-4..... 5-9..... 10-19..... 20 or more.....
6. Marital status:
   Male single..... male married..... female single..... female married.....

JOB PREFERENCE: Do you enjoy being a principal? Yes..... no.....

SELF-RATING: Excellent..... good..... average..... marginal..... poor.....

YOU ARE GUARANTEED FULL ANONYMITY.
APPENDIX F

FOLLOW-UP LETTER
Dear Principal:

I appreciate your cooperation with the questionnaire completed by your teachers. However, they cannot be used if I do not have two done by you.

I realize my intrusion on your time, but I would be greatly indebted to you if you could complete these two for me and return them in the stamped self-addressed envelope.

Thank you for your help.

Sincerely,

Nehemiah Mead.
APPENDIX G

LBDQ-REAL-STAFF INTRODUCTION
Dear Teacher:

We invite you to participate in a research to determine the leadership style of Jamaican high school principals by completing this sheet and the LBDQ-XII

INSTRUCTION:
Please answer all questions on this sheet and all questions on the LBDQ-XII. You will be describing the REAL behavior of your principal. YOU ARE GUARANTEED FULL ANONYMITY.

BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION:
1. Name of school: .................................................................
2. Age: Below 29..... 30-39..... 40-49..... 50-59..... 60 or over.....
3. Years of training recognized on the salary schedule:
   One..... two..... three..... four..... five..... more than five.....
4. Years of experience in education:
   0-9..... 10-19..... 20-29..... thirty or more.....
5. Years at this school: 0-4..... 5-9..... 10-19..... 20 or over.....
6. Marital status: Male single..... male married..... female single.....
   female married.....

EVALUATION OF THE PRINCIPAL:
1. How does your principal perform? Excellent..... good..... average.....
   marginal..... poor.....
2. Your choice for principal would be the current one..... someone else.....

PLEASE RETURN THE QUESTIONNAIRE IN THE STAMPED SELF-ADDRESSED ENVELOPE

THANK YOU FOR HELPING ME GRADUATE
   ---NEHEMIAH MEAD
Dear Teacher:

We wish to invite you to participate in a research to determine the leadership style of Jamaican high school principals by completing this sheet and the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire Form XII (EBDQ-XII).

INSTRUCTION:

Please describe the Ideal principal or the way you think your principal SHOULD behave. Do not describe the way your principal behaves. Use the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire for describing the IDEALPRINCIPAL. Please answer ALL questions.

BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION:

1. Name of school: .................................................................

2. Age: Below 29..... 30-39..... 40-49..... 50-59..... 60 or over.....

3. Years of training recognized on the salary schedule:
   One.... two.... three.... four.... five..... more than five....

4. Years of experience in education:
   0-9..... 10-19..... 20-29..... 30 or more.....

5. Years at this school: 0-4..... 5-9..... 10-19..... 20 or more.....

6. Marital status:
   Male single..... male married..... female single..... female married.....

EVALUATION OF THE PRINCIPAL:

1. How does your principal perform?
   Excellent..... good..... average..... marginal..... poor.....

2. Your choice for principal: The current one..... someone else.....
   YOU ARE GUARANTEED FULL ANONYMITY.

PLEASE RETURN THE QUESTIONNAIRE IN THE STAMPED SELF-ADDRESSED ENVELOPE
THANK YOU FOR HELPING ME GRADUATE

NEHEMIAH MEAD 120
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APPENDIX I

SCORING KEY FOR THE LBDQ-REAL AND LBDQ-IDEAL ITEMS
ON THE CONSIDERATION AND INITIATING STRUCTURE
DIMENSIONS
TABLE 15

SCORING KEY FOR THE LBDQ-REAL AND LBDQ-IDEAL ITEMS ON THE CONSIDERATION AND INITIATING STRUCTURE DIMENSIONS*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Number</th>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Initiating Structure</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Consideration</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Initiating Structure</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Consideration</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Initiating Structure</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Consideration</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Initiating Structure</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Consideration</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Initiating Structure</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Consideration</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Initiating Structure</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>Consideration</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Initiating Structure</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>Consideration</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>Initiating Structure</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>Consideration</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>Initiating Structure</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>Consideration</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Form XII of the LBDQ contains one hundred items, however, only the items on the Consideration and Initiating Structure dimensions are included in this table.*
APPENDIX J

NUMBER OF QUESTIONNAIRES DISTRIBUTED AND NUMBER AND PER CENT RETURNED
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>LBDQ Distributed</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>LBDQ Returned</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ideal</td>
<td>Real</td>
<td>Ideal</td>
<td>Real</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20  200  20  200  16  105  52.5  16  109  54.5
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