DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 116 279 EA 007 759

AUTHOR Duncan, F. Martin
TITLE Task and Employee Oriented Styles of Behavior in Selected Minnesota School Administrators.
PUB DATE Aug 75
NOTE 73p.; Thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Specialist degree at Mankato State University

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.76 HC-$3.32 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS Administrative Personnel; *Administrator Attitudes; Administrator Characteristics; Bibliographies; Data Analysis; Educational Administration; Elementary Secondary Education; *Leadership Styles; *Occupational Surveys; Tables (Data); *Teacher Administrator Relationship; *Teacher Morale
IDENTIFIERS Minnesota

ABSTRACT

This study investigates the effect of different leadership styles on the group morale of school employees. The author bases his analysis on data collected from 304 randomly selected Minnesota school district administrators. Administrators were classified as either task-oriented or employee-oriented, according to their responses on the Least Preferred Coworker scale, a 16-item semantic differential scale. Employee group morale was rated by subjects on the 10-item Group Atmosphere scale. Analysis of the data showed a significant difference in group atmosphere between employees under task-oriented administrators and employees under employee-oriented administrators. In addition, administrator orientation appeared to change with increasing years of administrative experience; employee-oriented elementary principals had significantly more years administrative experience and more years in their current position than did task-oriented elementary principals. (Author/JG)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

McGraw-Hill

TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."

p. 59-61

ED116279

TASK AND EMPLOYEE ORIENTED STYLES OF BEHAVIOR IN SELECTED MINNESOTA SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS

by

F. Martin Duncan

A thesis submitted in partial
fulfillment of the requirements for the
Specialist degree at
Mankato State University

Mankato, Minnesota
August, 1975

EA 007 759

Date _____

This thesis has been examined and approved.

Examining Committee:

P. O. Brunwood Chairman

D. E. Bahman

C. J. Salek

EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION

TASK AND EMPLOYEE ORIENTED STYLES OF BEHAVIOR IN SELECTED MINNESOTA SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS

F. Martin Duncan, B.A., M.A.T.
Mankato State University, 1975

How do differing styles of leadership behavior among school administrators affect group morale? This research study utilized data collected from 304 randomly selected Minnesota school district administrators. The subjects were classified as task or employee oriented by the manner in which they reacted to their Least Preferred Coworker on the LPC Scale, a nationally used 16 item semantic differential scale. Employee group morale was rated by the subjects on the 10 item Group Atmosphere scale.

Analysis of data showed significant difference in group atmosphere (GA) between those groups of employees under task and employee oriented administrators. In addition, subject orientation appeared to change with increasing years of administrative experience; Employee oriented elementary principals had significantly more years of administrative experience and more current position years than did task oriented elementary principals.

The study concludes that employee group morale is significantly different between task and employee oriented administrators, and recommends study of the integrative style of leadership behavior, which indicates the person's basic goal is the coordination of employee needs and institutional requirements.

PREFACE

"A prince, whose character is thus marked by every act which may define a tyrant, is unfit to be the ruler of a free people."

U.S. Declaration of Independence
(lines 97-8)

Any prince, whose behavior is thus marked, by singular lack of concern for his employees, disregard for the needs of his employees, or failure to recognize responsibilities inherent within his position as leader, is thus unfit to be a school executive. For in no other area of public administration, does the requirement for participatory decision-making combine more importantly with a necessary perception of the needs of employees, as a particular concern in administration of public schools. Thus, personally charged with the responsibility of examining leadership style and its relationship to group atmosphere and support given by the employee, it becomes the purpose of this study to make a small, but hopefully significant, contribution to the study of educational leadership.

F. Martin Duncan
August, 1975

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author wishes to express his profound appreciation to:

- My wife, Carolynn, for her help, assistance and support during the past year,
- Dr. P.O. Brunsvold, adviser, and Drs. V.E. Beckman and C.J. Salek, committee members, for their valuable advice and assistance,
- Dr. Alva G. Blum, for his assistance in the preliminary design of the study, and
- Dr. Virgil Christenson, for review and assistance in analysis techniques.

And to McGraw-Hill Book Company, for use of the Least Preferred CoWorker Scale, and Group Atmosphere Scale,

from A Theory of Leadership Effectiveness by Fred E. Fiedler. Used with permission of McGraw-Hill Book Company.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

McGraw-Hill

TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter		Page
I.	INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY	1
	A. Introduction	1
	B. Statement of the Problem	5
	C. Hypotheses	7
	D. Importance and Significance	7
	E. Assumption	9
	F. Limitations	9
	G. Definitions	9
	1. Leadership	9
	2. Leadership Style	10
	3. Task Orientation	10
	4. Employee Orientation	10
	5. Integrative Orientation	10
	6. Group Atmosphere	10
	7. Decision Making Situation	10
	H. Organization of the Study	10
II.	REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	12
	A. Studies in Leadership Style	12
	1. Variables Affecting Leadership	15
	2. Other Descriptions of Behavioral Style	18
	B. Task and Employee Orientation	20
	C. Group Morale	22
	D. The Decision Making Conference	25
	E. Summary	27

Chapter Page

III. RESEARCH DESIGN. 30

A. Research Method. 30

1. Design 30

2. Data Needed. 31

3. Sources of Data. 31

B. Instruments. 32

1. Biographical Questionnaire 32

2. Least Preferred Coworker Scale 32

3. Group Atmosphere Scale 33

C. Analysis of Data 33

1. Analysis of Variance 34

2. Analysis of CoVariance 34

IV. RESEARCH FINDINGS. 35

A. Normative Data 36

B. Hypothesis One 37

C. Hypothesis Two 40

D. Hypothesis Three 42

E. Age as Covariant of Experience 43

V. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS. 45

A. Summary. 45

B. Conclusions 47

C. Recommendations. 49

BIBLIOGRAPHY. 53

APPENDICES. 57

A. Research Device. 58

B. Supplementary Tables 62

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	Number of Teachers by Orientation for Three Administrative Positions	37
2.	Number of Students by Orientation for Three Administrative Positions	38
3.	Group Atmosphere by Administrator Orientation	38
4.	Administrative Experience in Years by Administrative Position	41
5.	Current Position Experience in Years by Administrative Position	41
6.	Weekly Conference Hours by Administrator Orientation	42
7.	Administrator Age by Orientation for Three Administrative Positions	44

Chapter One

INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

Chapter One introduces leader behavior as the subject of the study, presents the problem, its importance and significance, and assumptions and limitations within the study.

INTRODUCTION

Aristotle, in his Politics, described leadership within the democratic process as leadership by the many, who in a group become the better leader:

> For the many, of whom each individual is but an ordinary person, when they meet together may very likely be better than the few good, if regarded not individually but collectively . . . for each individual among the many has a share of virtue and prudence, and when they meet together, they become in a manner one man, who has many feet, and hands, and senses; that is a figure of their mind and disposition. Hence the many are better judges. . . .[1]

Hence the many become as one man, the leader. The act of leadership singly or in groups, has been examined from the time of Lao Tsu (the Tao Te Ching, 6,000 B.C.) to most recently, within the last 50 years. The growing cost of public leadership has precipitated concern and examination of the administration provided in the public sector.

More recently, Fred E. Fiedler and the Personnel Research groups at the Universities of Illinois, Utah, and Washington have endeavored to

---

[1]Aristotle, "Politics," The Great Books of the Western World, 9 (Chicago, 1965), p. 479.

describe the behavior of leaders, and how task or employee oriented styles of behavior affect the group in a decision-making situation. From their work has evolved a possible answer to the demand for accountability in executive selection. For the public seems to sense a failure in its trial and error methods of selecting public administrators, to which Fiedler has replied,

> Fitting the man to the leadership job by selection and training has not been spectacularly successful. It is surely easier to change almost anything in the job situation than a man's personality and his leadership style. Why not try, then, to fit the leadership job to the man?[2]

Conceivably, then, the ultimate result of pre-selection by personality and leadership style would be the appointment of executives with a better-than-guess chance to become an effective administrator.

Many writers have also commented about the motivation of group performance, and the apparent inconsistency in current administrative theory, which holds that consideration for employees (employee orientation) creates effective group performance. Murphy, however, concluded that "superintendents who are excessively considerate or are very lacking in consideration are less likely to motivate the work group to greater activity and job performance."[3] Yet, administrative theorists are currently advocating human relations skills for administrators.

The movement for a "democratic" leadership, in the 1930's and 1940's, resulted in a very loose system of administrative control. "Probably the

---

[2]Fred E. Biedler, "Engineer the Job to Fit the Manager," Harvard Business Review, 43 (Sept., 1965), 115.

[3]Marcus D. Murphy, "Some Dimensions of Leadership Behavior of School Superintendents in Selected Texas School Districts," Dissertation Abstracts, 30A (1969), 5203.

most unrealistic aspect of 'democratic' leadership was its assumption that the leader was not supposed to impose his personality or ideas upon any of his staff."[4] Holland goes on to remark that a good leader often inspires his followers. "The characteristic of the trained leader---often found in the military, labor and industry---is that he looks upon motivating his group as a primary responsibility . . . this is called building spirit."[5] Constantly, then, we see the administrator or leader as the man in the middle. To Holland and other writers, leadership means responsibility for motivation accepted from the constituency, and accountability accepted from superiors.

The primary focus of most research, until recently, has been the traits of effective leaders. Morphet et al. conclude that leadership traits failed to identify effective leadership, just as the "times make the man" approach failed to explain Hitler, Mussolini, and Stalin.[6] The fact that no one could explain those leaders without effective leadership traits, led to the current study of "leader behavior" in a social system.

The study of leadership presents still another contradiction when we question the functions or roles of the leader. For example, many persons do not clearly distinguish between the leader and the holder of a position with status in the organizational hierarchy. Many persons thus assume that the holder of an important position in the hierarchy is, by virtue of that, a leader. Most behavioral scientists do not hold that

---

[4]Howard K. Holland, "Democratic Leadership: Does It Abrogate Executive Responsibility?" School Executive, 79 (Nov., 1959), 77.

[5]Holland, p. 77.

[6]Edgar L. Morphet et al. Basic Principles, Concepts and Issues. Part One: Educational Organization and Administration Concepts, Practices and Issues (2nd ed.); Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1967, pp. 126-27.

view. Lipham[7] has attempted to solve this problem by suggesting in effect that the term leader by restricted to the role of change agent and the term administrator to the role of maintaining the organization. It is the position, within this study that leadership can be provided by an administrator in his acts of maintaining an organization as well as in his acts as a change agent. Leadership can prevent or facilitate change.

What a leader is and what a leader does are both very current problems, and the general focus of this study. One might say, by way of narrowing the focus, that public, educational, positional leadership is under study here. By which is meant: public, as opposed to private, educational as opposed to governmental; positional as opposed to informal leadership. Where the traits approach failed to correlate with attainment of leadership status, this study examined leader behavior in a social system, and the current theory that style of behavior impacts upon and creates atmosphere in the group.

Juilfs summarized best the focus of this study when he remarked that the administrator must recognize the professional status, worth, and dignity of the teachers working with him, "if a principal would have a democratic orientation,"[8] to his administrative chores. This study examined not the teachers but the orientation or style of the administrator, as his style of behavior hypothetically affects group morale.

---

[7]James H. Lipham, "Leadership and Administration," Behavioral Science and Educational Administration, ed. Daniel E. Griffiths. The Sixty-Third Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part II. (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1964).

[8]Erwin J. Juilfs, "Are Administrative Competence and Democratic Administration Compatible?" NASSP Bulletin, 43 (April, 1959), 80.

Group morale varies from school district to district, and may be a product of interaction between administrators and staff--may be a product of differing or homogeneous styles of behavior. Hypothetically, group morale is seen as related to the administrator's style, as task- or employee-oriented. Variations in leader styles may affect 1) group morale as perceived by administrators, 2) subsequent group performance in public schools, 3) school-community relations, and 4) school personnel practices.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

How do differing styles of leadership behavior among school administrators affect group morale in the decision making situation? In this instance, the social system under investigation was the public schools of Minnesota, the actors within the system were school administrators. The decision making situation was one in which administrators discuss problems, explore possible consequences, and reach tentative decisions about problems. Group morale was based on the quality of leader-member relations as perceived by the leader,[9] as determined by the Group Atmosphere scale. The task- or employee-oriented styles of behavior were determined by the Least Preferred CoWorker Scale, a projective personality device developed by Fiedler and associates.[10]

---

[9]Allan B. Posthuma, "Normative Data on the Least Preferred Co-Worker Scale (LPC) and the Group Atmosphere Questionnaire (GA)," National Technical Information Service: Organizational Research, Univ. of Wash., 1970, p. 1.

[10]From A Theory of Leadership Effectiveness by Fred E. Fiedler, 1967. Used with permission of McGraw-Hill Book Co.

In reviewing recent research which investigated styles of leader behavior, it was found that Fiedler and his associates had dealt almost exclusively with military and industrial studies of management, authority, and the resulting group effectiveness. Fiedler, in discussing the control and influence of the leader, comments that,

> from a theoretical as well as an intuitive point of view, the interpersonal relationship between the leader and his group members is likely to be the most important single variable which determines his power and influence.[11]

While this study did not propose to examine the effectiveness of the employee or administrator groups in the public schools, it attempted to determine the effect of differing styles of behavior upon group morale within Hypothesis One.

Current literature on leadership styles seems to also suggest that increasing years of experience increases the administrators' tendency to be more task oriented, and less employee oriented. A study of authoritarianism (task-orientation) by Peterson showed that the level of authoritarianism was found to correlate positively with age.[12] Seeman, in reviewing the literature, reported that "the only significant trend is that 'old hands' . . . tend to report <u>less</u> initiating structure and <u>more</u> domination, a measure of task-orientation."[13]

---

[11]Fred E. Fiedler and Martin M. Chemers. <u>Leadership and Effective Management</u> (Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman and Co., 1974), p. 64.

[12]Gary D. Peterson, "Personality Authoritarianism and the Perceived Leadership Behavior of North Dakota Administrators," <u>Dissertation Abstracts</u>, 29A (1968), 3812.

[13]Melvin Seeman, "A Comparison of General and Specific Leader Behavior Descriptions," <u>Leader Behavior: Its Description and Measurement</u>, eds. Ralph M. Stogdill & Alvin E. Coons. (Research Monograph 88, Bureau of Business Research, Ohio State University, 1957), p. 95.

Generally, the research seems to suggest that increasing years of experience result in an increase in task-orientation, hence Hypothesis Two. This study examined both total years of experience and years in the current position, as well as age, as a possible source of variance within the effect of experience upon style of behavior.

Hypothesis Three proposed that time spent in decision-making conferences affects task and employee orientation in school administrators. If the time spent in conference situations is a reflection of the administrator's style of behavior, then it was felt that there could be a significant relationship between task and employee oriented styles of behavior, and the time spent in conferences.

Hypotheses

Hypothesis One: Task and employee oriented styles of behavior among school administrators affect group morale in the decision making situation.

Hypothesis Two: Task and employee oriented styles of behavior among school administrators are affected by administrative experience.

Hypothesis Three: Time spent in decision-making conferences affects task and employee oriented styles of behavior.

IMPORTANCE AND SIGNIFICANCE

The weight of evidence from research leads to the conclusion that more can be learned about leadership "by centering attention upon leadership acts than upon leaders. The essential element in leadership is that acts take place which affect behavior."[14] Thus, it became important to investigate

[14]Roald F. Campbell, John E. Corbally, Jr., and John A. Ramseyer, Introduction to Educational Administration (3rd ed.); Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1966, p. 169.

styles of behavior, or styles of "action" which affect behavior. Many writers have tended to point to two clusters of behavioral styles which have been the focus of most leadership research. These clusters of behavior have been labeled as autocratic, authoritarian, task-oriented, and initiating on one hand versus democratic, equalitarian, permissive, group-oriented, and considerate on the other. The leader either can make decisions and direct group members or he can share decision making and coordinating of events with the members of his group. "He can use the proverbial stick or the equally proverbial carrot for motivating his members. All these methods, and any combination of them, have worked in some situations. . . . The problem of what constitutes the best leadership style has, in fact, been one of the major controversies in the area."[15]

This study did not propose to define "the best leadership style," but to examine behavior in the decision making situation. As Jacob Getzels points out,

> to lead is to engage in an act which initiates a structure in interaction with others, and to follow is to engage in an act which maintains a structure initiated by another . . . the nature of the relationship depends upon the operating leadership-followership styles in the particular social system.[16]

Leadership style may be said to define the nature of the relationship, as style relates to and impacts upon the decision making situation between administrators. In the area of public school administration, very little research has been attempted which examines leadership style in relation to given variables: group atmosphere, years of administrative

---

[15]Fred E. Fiedler, A Theory of Leadership Effectiveness. (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1967), p. 14.

[16]Jacob W. Getzels, James M. Lipham, and Roald F. Campbell, Educational Administration as a Social Process. (New York: Harper & Row, 1968), p. 145.

experience, and time spent in decision making conferences. Many writers seem to think these variables may be those which to a large measure affect the decision making styles of the school executive, and directly affect group performance, and school community relations. The importance of this study, then, lay in its examination of group atmosphere, as perceived by task and employee oriented administrators.

The study has implications for administration, in that the results present a description of leadership styles among varying conditions of group morale which could be applied to school motivation practices, to personnel management, to public relations efforts, and to the concern for participatory decision making.

ASSUMPTION

The variables affecting each task within a school district are assumed to be homogeneous among similarly sized school districts.

LIMITATIONS

Limitation One: The total universe from which the sample was drawn was restricted to all Minnesota school districts limited to three administrators.

Limitation Two: The quality of leader-member relations, interpreted as group morale, was limited to group atmosphere as perceived by the administrators within the district.

DEFINITIONS

Leadership: The influencing of the actions, behaviors, beliefs, and feelings of one actor in a social system by another actor with the willing cooperation of the actor being influenced.[17]

---

[17]Morphet, p. 122.

Leadership Style: Behavior of an individual which describes a motivating need-structure of that individual in various leadership situations.

Task Orientation: Behavior of an individual which indicates the person's basic goal is to accomplish the task, and derive self-esteem from successful achievement, as determined by the Least Preferred Co-Worker Scale (LPC).

Employee Orientation: Behavior of an individual which indicates the person's basic goal is to have strong emotional and affective ties with others, and to derive self-esteem from successful human relations efforts as determined by the Least Preferred CoWorker Scale (LPC).

Integrative Orientation: Behavior of an individual which indicates the person's basic goal is the coordination of employee needs and institutional requirements.

Group Atmosphere: A rated perception of the quality of leader-member relations, as perceived by the school district administrator on the Group Atmosphere scale.

Decision Making Situation: A Conference situation in which two or more actors exercise leadership within the social system by influencing actions, behaviors, beliefs, and feelings with the willing cooperation of the actor being influenced.

ORGANIZATION OF THE STUDY

Chapter One introduces the study of leadership behavior, the statement of the problem, importance, assumptions, and limitations of

the study. Chapter Two reviews related literature with especial emphasis on Studies in Leadership Style; Task and Employee Orientation; Group Morale. Chapter Three presents the research design; the method, instruments, and analysis procedures. Chapter Four presents the research findings, organized by normative data for the study and data for each of the three hypotheses. Chapter Five concludes the study with a summary of the problem findings, conclusions, and recommendations for research and recommendations for administrative theory.

Chapter Two

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Chapter Two presents an overview of past leadership studies which have attempted to deal with what a leader is and what a leader does. This overview is followed by a review of task and employee oriented behavior, group morale, and the decision-making situation. A summary concludes the review of related literature.

STUDIES IN LEADERSHIP STYLE

Earlier studies investigated "democracy" and "autocracy" as observed behavior in groups. Lewin and Lippitt, in 1938, concluded from observation and analysis, that there were in the autocratic group 1) higher tension, 2) a feeling of "I'ness," 3) 30 times more hostility compared to the democratic group and 4) disorganization when authority was removed. The democratic groups, on the other hand, demonstrated 1) more cooperative behavior, 2) an objective attitude, 3) higher constructiveness and 4) a higher degree of unity.[1] In a later study of group behavior, Haythorn studied authoritarian and equalitarian leaders and followers. He concluded that the behavior of individuals in groups

[1]Kurt Lewin and Ronald Lippitt, "An Experimental Approach to the Study of Autocracy and Democracy: A Preliminary Note," Sociometry, 1 (January, 1938), 298-99.

is dependent on the personalities of other group members, ". . .the behavior of leaders is, to a significant degree, a function of the attitudes or personality characteristics of the followers."[2]

But these early studies relied heavily on pure observation as a method of analysis and description. During the 1950's, the traits approach in the social sciences became predominant. In order to classify leader behavior by traits, Hemphill et al.[3] at the Ohio State University Personnel Research group created the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ) which identified nine dimensions of leader behavior: 1) integration, 2) communication, 3) production emphasis, 4) representation, 5) fraternization, 6) organization, 7) evaluation, 8) initiation, and 9) domination. These nine areas provided a framework for the collection of specific items of leader behavior which were later closely examined, and grouped into two dimensions, Consideration and Initiating Structure.[4]

However, in trying to describe behavior of leaders, Hemphill concluded that,

> the considerable number of large differences between corresponding pairs of correlation coefficients make it clear that leaders tend to value or describe their own behavior differently than subordinates describe and evaluate the behavior of leaders.[5]

---

[2]W. Haythorn et al. "The Effects of Varying Combinations of Authoritarian and Equalitarian Leaders and Followers," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 53 (1956), 218.

[3]John K. Hemphill and Alvin E. Coons, "Development of the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire," Leader Behavior: Its Description and Measurement, eds. Ralph Stogdill and Alvin E. Coons. (Research Monograph 88, Bureau of Business Research, Ohio State University, 1957) pp. 6-38.

[4]Hemphill and Coons, pp. 8-9.

[5]Hemphill and Coons, p. 19.

Murphy, in another study of the LBDQ, investigated behavior by two dimensions of leader behavior: 1) tolerance of freedom and role assumption, and 2) consideration and production emphasis. Murphy found "a staff's description of the behavior of a school superintendent is more accurate than the superintendent's description of his own behavior."[6]

Consequently, it was determined that the LBDQ device was only valid as an observational device of perceived traits of leader behavior. Working concurrently with the Ohio Personnel group, the Personnel Research Group at the University of Washington developed the Least Preferred Co-Worker Scale (LPC), a projective device which enables a subject to project his internal feelings, attitudes, values, or needs to a coworker.. Thus, the subject unconsciously reveals himself as he reacts to his least preferred coworker.

Fred E. Fiedler, in using the Least Preferred CoWorker Scale, (LPC), developed his Contingency Model Theory[7] which examined the control and influence of business executives. Breifly summarized, the Contingency Model proposes that the effectiveness of an executive is contingent upon 1) leader-member relations, 2) the task structure, and 3) position power,[8] which together create the favorableness of the sittation in which the administrator functions. Thus, the effectiveness of a group or organization,

---

[6]Marcus D. Murphy, "Some Dimensions of Leadership Behavior of School Superintendents in Selected Texas School Districts," Dissertation Abstracts, 30A (1969) 5203.

[7]Fred E. Fiedler, A Theory of Leadership Effectiveness (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1967).

[8]Fred E. Fiedler and Martin M. Chemers. Leadership and Effective Management (Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman & Co., 1974), pp. 64-70.

> depends upon the proper match between the leader's personality and the degree to which the situation provides him control and influence. . .task motivated leaders tend to perform best in very favorable and unfavorable situations while relationship-motivated leaders perform best in moderately favorable situations.[9]

In a test of his contingency theory, Fiedler and the Belgian Navy tested whether culturally homogeneous task groups would perform significantly better than heterogeneous task groups on three types of tasks.[10] He found that,

> . . .groups under managing, task-controlling (Low LPC) leaders performed best in very favorable group-task situations as well as in group-task situations which were relatively unfavorable or very unfavorable. Permissive, considerate, group-oriented (High LPC) performed best in situations intermediate in favorableness.[11]

Fiedler's "Contingency Model" Theory, then, postulates that the effectiveness of a group is contingent upon the relationships between "leadership style and the degree to which the group situation enables the leader to exert influence."[12] This study, although not examining the effectiveness of school administrators or the performance of school employees, is indebted to the work of Feidler and his associates.

Variables Affecting Leadership

Other studies of leadership style have attempted to examine various variables in relation to the behavioral style of administrators,

---

[9]Fiedler and Chemers, p. 140.

[10]Fred E. Fiedler, "The Effect of Leadership and Cultural Heterogeneity on Group Performance," Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 2 (July, 1966) 237-64.

[11]Fiedler, "Effect of Leadership," pp. 237-8.

[12]Fiedler, Theory, p. 15.

Harroll studied leadership style and innovation, and found there was a tendency for approximately two-thirds of the principals "whose personal characteristics were inclined toward an idiographic orientation [employee-oriented], and an open belief system. . ."[13] to be in schools with a high rate of innovation.

Olson studied the congruence and dissonance of environment with the needs of the individual, and found the most effective leaders were significantly more congruent with their academic environment than the least-effective leaders.[14]

Eidell _et al._ studied the authority structure within control, multi-unit, and Individual Prescribed Instruction (IPI) schools. Control schools had principals "as the predominant authority figure in a consultive relationship"[15] where classroom instruction decisions were made. Unitized and IPI schools, on the other hand, "show a significant movement from consultive types of authority relations to a more participative type of relationship."[16]

---

[13]Lloyd W. Harroll, "Innovative Tendencies of Elementary School Principals as Related to Self-Perception of their Leadership Style, Belief Systems, Reference Group Identification, and Value System Orientation." _Dissertation Abstracts_, 33A (1972) 2647.

[14]Gary F. Olson, _Congruence and Dissonance in the Ecology of Educational Administration as a Basis for Discriminating Between Patterns of Leadership Behavior._ (Normal, IL: Illinois State University, 1967), p. 17.

[15]Terry L. Eidell et al. _Innovativeness and the Organizational Attributes of Schools._ (Eugene, OR: Center for Advanced Study of Educational Administration, 1969). Paper presented at Symposium 1:6 Innovativeness and the Organizational Attributes of Schools, AERA Annual Meeting, Los Angeles, CA, 1969, p. D-6.

[16]Eidell et al., pp. D-6-7.

In a study of employee satisfaction, Grassie and Carss divided teachers into non-professional and professional-orientation groups of Subjects (Ss) who rated their schools on climate, bureaucracy, and satisfaction. They found the professional-orientation group were able to express satisfaction "in a setting characterized by considerate and trustful leadership"[17] in the absence of a rigid hierarchy of authority and detailed organizational constraint. However, Grassie and Carss felt that modifications to structure and leadership quality would not improve satisfaction in the non-professional orientation group and might reduce the satisfaction of the other group.[18]

Research of training to improve human relations skills was reported by Fiedler, who concluded that training an individual to behave in a considerate or employee-centered manner was ineffective. His data suggested that an individual's behavior is determined largely by the motivational system and the degree to which the person's attainment of goals is secure or threatened.[19] He concluded that,

> providing individuals with skills, be they to improve human relations or technical competence, may increase the situational favorableness and in this way bring about changes in leadership behavior. This means that leadership training should result in better performance for some, and in poorer performance for other leaders. Recent research does, in fact show this to be the case.[20]

---

[17]McCrae C. Grassie and Brian W. Carss, "School Structure, Leadership Quality, and Teacher Satisfaction," Educational Administration Quarterly, 9 (Winter, 1972), 24.

[18]Grassie and Carss, p. 25.

[19]Fred E. Fiedler, "Personality, Motivational Systems, and Behavior of High and Low LPC Persons," Human Relations, 25 (November, 1972) 407.

[20]Fiedler, "Personality," p. 407.

In summary, we see then, that leadership style has been investigated with an eye to other variables, such as innovation, congruence and dissonance with the environment, the authority structure, employee satisfaction, and training for human relations skills. Other related literature, reviewed next, attempts to describe behavioral style by motivational needs.

Other Descriptions of Behavioral Style

Getzels and Guba,[21] in 1957, first presented their model of behavior in a social system, in which they proposed that most behavior falls within the nomothetic or idiographic dimensions. They described these dimensions as maximizing the role and role expectations (nomothetic) or maximizing personality and need-dispositions (idiographic). Their model also depicted group morale as resulting from feelings of belongingness, rationality, and identification within the employee.[22]

Another study, Theory X-Theory Y of Douglas McGregor[23] proposes that managers are either task or employee oriented, respectively, in their behavioral orientation toward employees. Blake and Mouton in The Managerial Grid[24] propose a 1, 1 to 9, 9 grid of behavior in which managers are task oriented in the 9, 1 position, employee oriented in the 1, 9 position. Where Getzels and Guba hypothesized that effective managerial behavior integrated the motivational needs of employees

---

[21] J. W. Getzels and E. G. Guba, "Social Behavior and the Administrative Process," School Review, 65 (Winter, 1957) 423-441.

[22] Getzels and Guba, pp. 438-40.

[23] Douglas McGregor. The Human Side of Enterprise (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1960).

[24] Robert R. Blake and Jane S. Mouton. The Managerial Grid (Houston: Gulf Publishing Co., 1964).

and managers, Blake and Mouton proposed that the 9,9 position of behavior did indeed integrate employee and institutional requirements, as proposed in Theory Y by McGregor.

More recently, Sergiovanni and Carver[25] discussed the motivation needs of closure seekers and responsibility seekers,

> Closure seekers are primarily interested in accomplishment, confidence, pride and recognition. . . .Responsibility seekers are primarily interested in responsibility and personal growth. . . .Closure seekers are largely task-oriented. . .have relatively specialized competencies and skills. . . .Responsibility seekers, on the other hand. . .are more interested in professional people than in professional content. While closure seekers work very hard to keep up in their areas of specialization, responsibility seekers are willing to spend less time in keeping up but more time in developing interpersonal and organizational skills. (Underlining mine)[26]

Thus, the motivational needs of a leader are a way of describing the person's behavioral style.

Sergiovanni, Metzcus, and Burden investigated teacher preferences for leadership style, and hypothesized that style preferences would vary with the need (avoidance or approach) orientations of teachers. They found, that whatever the need orientation type, "teachers seem to prefer integrative leadership styles characterized by both initiating structure (systems orientation) and consideration (person orientation)."[27]

---

[25]Thomas J. Sergiovanni and Fred C. Carver, The New School Executive: A Theory of Administration (New York: Dodd, Mead & Co., 1973).

[26]Sergiovanni and Carver, p. 82.

[27]Thomas J. Sergiovanni, Richard Metzcus, and Larry Burden, "Toward a Particularistic Approach to Leadership Style: Some Findings," Educational Administration Abstracts 4 (Fall, 1969) 54.

The preceding description of integrative leadership style prompted the definition of integrative orientation (page 11), a description of the behavior of administrators located in the middle (second and third Quartiles) of the LPC distribution.

In summary, then, we can see that other descriptions of behavioral style, as related to motivational need, include nomothetic-idiographic, Theory X-Theory Y, closure or responsibility seekers, integrative, or as characterized by position on the managerial grid. Earlier studies of democracy-autocracy in the organization failed to identify what a leader does, as did the traits approach of the 1950's. Observation and description of behavior failed to correlate with the true personality needs-disposition of the administrator. And the Contingency Model proposed that power, leader-member relations, and task structure determined the effectiveness of a manager. Other variables relating to leadership style have been discussed, and next task and employee orientation are reviewed.

TASK AND EMPLOYEE ORIENTATION

Task orientation indicates the person's basic goal is achievement where employee orientation indicates the need to have personal relationships with employees.

Doyle and Ahlbrand studied task- and human relations-oriented leaders and the relationship of their orientation to group productivity, measured by generation of ideas in an instructional problem-solving experiment. They found the human relations-oriented principals to be more supportive of teacher's ideas "while task-oriented principals

are more critical (non-supportive) of teacher's ideas."[28]

Where Doyle and Ahlbrand studied only the orientation, Maher studied teacher expectations and perceptions of principal leadership behavior in collective negotiations, and found their perceptions of behavior to be inaccurate. But more importantly, Maher concluded that,

> Role-personality conflict is present in the leadership behavior situation of elementary school principals regardless of the collective negotiations situation.[29]

Teacher perceptions of behavior in negotiations situations are inaccurate. Role-personality conflict appears to be present in some situations, while task or employee orientation creates varying levels of perceived support for ideas.[30]

On the other hand, Sampson investigated Fiedler's conception of leader orientation by comparing groups with leaders oriented toward the sociometric stars of the group with groups whose leaders were oriented toward their sociometric isolates. He found that groups led by trainers oriented toward most-liked group members were more effective---in terms of member satisfaction and group achievement, than were groups led by trainers oriented toward least-liked group members.[31] However, Sampson's study of group effectiveness sheds little light on the concept of task and employee orientation, but does indicate that high LPC persons have effective group performance.

---

[28]Wayne J. Doyle and William P. Ahlbrand, "Hierarchical Group Performance and Leader Orientation," Educational Administration Abstracts, 9 (Winter, 1974) 45.

[29]Edward J. Maher, "An Analysis of the Leadership Behavior of Elementary School Principals as Perceived by School Personnel in Selected Collective Negotiations Situations," Dissertation Abstracts, 33A (1972) 2660.

[30]Doyle and Ahlbrand, p. 45.

[31]Edward E. Sampson, "Leader Orientation and the T-Group Effectiveness," Educational Administration Abstracts, 8 (Spring, 1973) 59.

The Least Preferred CoWorker Scale (LPC) is designed to give a measure of the motivational-needs within a person, which create behavior or "action" within two dimensions. The subject is asked to rate his least preferred coworker on a 16 item semantic differential scale, from which an averaged score places the subject as high or low LPC. We can visualize the high LPC individual (who perceives his least preferred coworker in a favorable manner) as a person who derives his major satisfaction from successful interpersonal relationships. On the other hand, the low LPC subject perceives his LPC in a very unfavorable manner, and he is a person who derives major satisfaction from task performance.[32]

Task or employee orientation is not a measure of the teacher perceptions of administrative behavior, as in Maher's study, nor is it specifically a measure of support for teachers, as in Doyle and Ahlbrand's research. Task or employee orientation, as measured by acceptance or rejection of a least preferred coworker, is an orientation toward the role expectations (task) of the job or personality need-dispositions of the employees.

GROUP MORALE

This study has defined group atmosphere as a rated perception of the quality of leader-member relations, as perceived by the school district administrator on the Group Atmosphere scale. Group morale then is synonymous with group atmosphere. The level of affective leader-member relations is defined by means of the group atmosphere scale, "a bi-polar

---

[32]Fiedler, Theory, pp. 45-6.

adjective scale similar to the Semantic Differential, on which the leader is asked to describe the climate of his group."[33]

Fishbein et al., in a recent study, investigated leadership effectivness, and found that,

> the leader-member affective relation was. . .the most important single determinant of [S's] expectations about the most effective leader's behavior; in all cases, the affective-relations dimension accounted for more than 50% of the controlled variance in these expectations [a laboratory situation, Ss asked to estimate leader behavior].[34]

From Fishbein, it could be concluded that affective leader-member relations are hypothetically a large element of leadership effectiveness. But group morale, according to Morphet et al.[35] appears to be a function of how well the school meets individual needs, and whether the formal organization has established goals accepted by all the actors.

> Each informal group has two principal goals; group achievement and group maintenance. Each group defines its own achievement goals. The group maintenance goal is attained when both group and individual needs are substantially met and members get satisfaction from group membership. When a group continues to attain its two primary goals, the morale is high; but if it fails the morale is low.[36]

Morphet et al. continue by pointing out that a formal organization without goals accepted by its members, has no authority and the "morale of the actors in this organization is low."[37]

---

[33]Fiedler, "Effect of Leadership," p. 250.

[34]Martin Fishbein et al., "A Consideration of Two Assumptions Underlying Fiedler's Contingency Model for Prediction of Leadership Effectiveness," American Journal of Psychology, 82 (December, 1969) 467.

[35]Edgar L. Morphet et al. Basic Principles, Concepts, and Issues. Part One Educational Organization and Administration (2nd ed.); Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1967.

[36]Morphet et al., pp. 144-5.

[37]Morphet et al., p. 145.

Morale, then, can be seen as a determinant of leadership effectiveness, but related to how well the school meets individual needs and has established goals accepted by members. In terms of climate, as a measure of morale, Grassie and Carss found that more of the schools in their study had closed climates than had open climates.[38] Blumberg found that "differences in perceived supervisor behavioral style were related to differential morale scores in a statistically significant manner."[39] In another study, the principal's positive quality of regard for teachers was a determining factor in the organizational climate of the school.[40] Gruenfeld concluded that,

> affective leader-member relations is an important situational determinant of the kinds of and incidence of behaviors exhibited by leaders. . .a leader's behaviors are a function of, not only of personality, but also of the supportiveness of his subordinates.[41]

And in summary, Eriksen reported the following conclusions from a study of morale: 1) interpersonal administrative morale is situational, 2) the superintendent structures the role of the principal, a big factor in morale, 3) morale permeates the entire staff, and 4) morale in human relations is the key to administrative success.[42]

---

[38]Grassie and Carss, p. 21.

[39]Arthur Blumberg, "Teacher Morale as a function of Perceived Supervisor Behavioral Style," Educational Administration Abstracts, 41 (Spring, 1969) 37.

[40]Fred C. Feitler, A Study of Principal Leader Behavior and Contrasting Organizational Environments. A paper presented at American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting, 57th, Chicago, IL, 1972, p. 11.

[41]L.W. Gruenfeld, D.E. Rance, and P. Weissenberg, "The behavior of task-oriented (Low LPC) and socially oriented (High LPC) leaders under several conditions of social support," Journal of Social Psychology, 79 (1969) 106.

[42]Walter B. Eriksen, "A Critical Evaluation of the Superintendent-Principal Administrative Relationship in the Elementary Schools of Southern California," Dissertation Abstracts, 21 (1960) 1434.

Within this review of group morale studies, can be seen concern for the principal's role, morale as a situational determinant of leader behavior, and the relationship of morale to individual needs and accepted school goals. In one study, by Fishbein et al.,[43] group morale was determined to be a large element of the leader's effectiveness. It becomes evident, then, that group morale is both complex and interrelated with the behavior of administrators. It was the purpose of this study to examine the effect of task and employee oriented administrators upon group morale, as determined by the Group Atmosphere Scale.

THE DECISION MAKING CONFERENCE

All leader-member interaction occurs in a decision making "conference," be it a casual meeting in the hall or a more formal meeting in the leader's office. These interactions occur between actors within the social system, the school organization, in which leaders exercise both formal and functional authority. Helwig, in a discussion of both formal (authority of position, authority of legitimacy) and functional (authority of competence, authority of person) authority concluded that,

> . . .the ultimate source of the supervisor's influence, and thus power, would be in his formal authority through legitimacy and position, reinforced by authority of competence and most weakly by authority of person (human relations skills).[44]

Thus, formal and functional authority can be seen as partially creating the supervisor/leader's power in the social system, the school.

---

[43] Fishbein et al., p. 467.

[44] Carl Helwig, Democratic Supervision and Creative Supervision: Are They Possible Bishmomers? (HEW: Office of Education, 1968), p. 5.

While power is one element of the decision making conference affecting leader-member interaction, the task at hand, whether structured or very fluid, is also a factor in conferences. This study recognized that tasks vary between school districts, and accepted the assumption that the structure of the task when compared between similarly sized districts, is relatively homogeneous, or similar (page 10).

A third variable directly affecting the interaction in a conference is the effect of participation upon decision making. Vroom defines participation as "a process of joint decision making by two or more parties in which the decisions have future effects on those making them."[45] The actors in the conference, according to Vroom, have important needs which are perceived to be satisfied by participation in decision making, and which lead to positive attitudes toward those persons who make participation possible.[46] In a summary of his findings, Vroom concluded that,

> Authoritarians [Low LPC] and persons with weak independence needs are apparently unaffected by opportunity to participate in making decisions. On the other hand, equalitarians [High LPC] and those with strong independence needs develop more positive attitudes toward their job and greater motivation for effective performance through participation.[47]

From the research and related literature, then, we could summarize that 1) participation in decision making creates motivation to achieve needs, and thus to perform in the job-task situation, 2) tasks are an element of all conferences, and represent the current problem to be overcome,

---

[45]Victor H. Vroom. Some Personality Determinants of the Effects of Participation (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1960), p. 9.

[46]Vroom, pp. 10-11.

[47]Vroom, p. 60.

and 3) authority within the social system creates power even if not exercised in the decision making conference.

SUMMARY

Leadership studies have ranged from the differences between democratic and autocratic, between authoritarian-equalitarian, to studies of leader traits, and most recently, to the study of task and employee oriented behavioral styles. Various variables within the social system are differently affected by leadership style: innovation, training, authority structure, employee satisfaction, etc. And behavior could be described as nomothetic-idiographic, 9,1 (task) or 1,9 (employee) oriented, integrative, or seeking closure or responsibility.

Task and Employee Orientation are differing styles of behavior hypothetically related to Group Morale. Lewin has described behavior as a function (f) of the person (P) and of his environment (E), thus $B = f(P,E)$[48] while Getzels and Guba expanded on this to describe behavior as a function of role (R) and personality (P), thus $B = f(R \times P)$.[49]

There are many theoretical models which attempt to explain behavior or the motivations "within" people, Croft looked at behavior in terms of perceptions of behavior. He worked with the major assumption "that the principal, to be effective, must be able to make accurate estimations of the perceptions that others have of his behavior."[50]

---

[48]Kurt Lewin, "Frontiers in group dynamics," Field Theory in Social Science, ed. D. Cartwright (New York: Harper, 1951), pp. 188-237.

[49]Getzels and Guba, p. 429.

[50]John C. Croft, Open and Closed Mindedness and Perceptions of Leader Behavior. (HEW: Office of Education, 1964), p. 60.

Croft felt that how the administrator actually behaves was less important than how his teachers and superintendent perceived that he behaved. He found, however, no significant difference in dogmatism, self-perception, principal perceptions of the way their teachers and superintendents viewed their behavior or in the actual perception of them by their superintendents.[51] Which raises questions: Do administrators actually behave differently, and does such behavior affect group morale?

What the leader does, and how he manages the group can be expressed in either of two ways. He can:

(1) Tell people what to do, and how to do it, or

(2) Share responsibilities with group members and involve them in planning and executing the task.[52] His own behavior in telling people what to do is structuring, or task oriented. In sharing responsibilities, he is employee oriented.

In terms of effective leadership and teacher satisfaction, principal leadership style was significantly related to teacher perceptions of decision-making involvement by Ambrosie and Heller:

> A principal's decision-making behavior, a manifestation of the degree to which teachers are allowed to participate in the decision-making process, was perceived as being essential to the principal's occupational role behavior leadership style.[53]

However, the authors found no correlation between the nonauthoritarian personality (a variable) and perception of involvement in

---

[51]Croft, p. 152.

[52]Fred E. Fiedler, "Engineer the Job to Fit the Manager," Harvard Business Review, 43 (Sept., 1965) 116.

[53]Frank Ambrosie and Robert W. Heller, "The Secondary School Administrator and Perceived Teacher Participation in the Decision Making Process," Journal of Experimental Education, 40 (Summer, 1972), 12.

decision making. Under study here were the administrators' perceptions of group atmosphere, a measure of morale, climate, and support for the administrator. This study attempted to define the effect of leadership style upon morale.

Michael and Jones summarize best the current research:

> Much of the recent research was based upon the notion that a direct relation existed between leader behavior, its impact upon group morale, and subsequent group performance. Unfortunately, it has been difficult to positively confirm such a simple notion, and the relation between the behavior of the leader and the performance of his subordinates has proven to be extremely involved. The provision of "good leaders" or of high group morale, or both does not assure that high levels of performance will prevail. These discrepancies may in part be explained by variations in leader styles of behavior, the motivation of subordinates, the administrative proficiency of the leader, the capabilities of subordinates, and the variations in performance measures. Differences in any of these considerations may obscure the relationship between leader behavior and group performance and lead to contradictory research conclusions.[54]

---

[54]Stephen R. Michael and Halsey R. Jones. Organizational Management (New York: Intext Educational Publishing, 1973) p. 289

Chapter Three

RESEARCH DESIGN

Chapter Three presents the research design, an overview of the research method, the instruments used for data collection, and the method of data analysis.

RESEARCH METHOD

The intention of this study, in its design, was to hold one variable, task structure within school districts, relatively homogeneous. "Groups in previous studies were tentatively classified on the basis of three dimensions. These were, in order of importance, (a) the affective leader-member relation, (b) the task structure, and (c) the power of the leadership position."[1] The assumption of the study was that, among school districts limited to three administrators, the size of the district would be relatively homogeneous, and that the task structure, as a variable, would then be relatively similar among these homogeneously sized districts.

Design

This study was designed to research "Leader-member" relations, or Group Atmosphere, and its relationship to task and employee oriented

[1]Fred E. Fiedler, "The Effect of Leadership and Cultural Heterogenity on Group Performance," Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 2 (July, 1966) 250.

administrators in three positions: superintendent, elementary and secondary principals. From an alphabetical list of all districts limited to three administrators, a 50% random sample of these districts was drawn, and the three administrators in each of these districts became the subjects of the study. Subjects were then asked to complete and return the data instruments (described below) from which the analysis of Group Atmosphere, Task and Employee Orientation, and other variables was made.

Data Needed

The data needed for the study included a) an averaged score on the Least Preferred Coworker scale, b) an averaged score on the Group Atmosphere scale, c) Years of administrative experience, d) Years in the current position, e) Subject age, and f) An estimate of weekly hours spent in conferences. Additionally, each subject listed his position within the district and the numbers of teachers and students for whom he was responsible.

Sources of Data

The subjects of this research were 304 Minnesota school administrators selected randomly by districts, representing 71.5 per cent return of the mailed research instrument. These administrators and their orientation in behavioral style were analyzed both by groups of task and employee oriented administrators and by position within the district. The normative data for each of the subjects within the study population (numbers of teachers and students) were examined for statistical difference (discussed in Chapter Four, "Normative Data").

INSTRUMENTS

Biographical Questionnaire

A Biographical Questionnaire for completion by each of the subjects was appended to the two research opinionnaires. It was felt that these biographical factors, as reflected in hypothesis two, could be influential in affecting the administrator's behavioral style. These data requested in the Biographical Questionnaire (page 3, Appendix A) included the subject's response to questions on 1) S's position in the district, 2) numbers of teachers and students, 3) total years of administrative experience, 4) years in the current position, 5) S's age, and 6) weekly hours spent in conferences.

Least Preferred Coworker Scale

The Least Preferred Coworker Scale, a 16 item Semantic Differential or bi-polar adjective scale, was completed by each subject. The Ss were asked to rank "the employee of your school district with whom you work least well," "With whom you had the most difficulty in getting a job done." The scores on each of the 16 items were then totalled and an average score ranging from 1.0 (low LPC) to 8.0 (high LPC) was then derived.

Due to the sensitive nature of the request to rate a least preferred coworker, the device was printed under the heading of Opinionnaire One, to avoid the halo effect or influence of deliberately rating a least preferred coworker either high or low.

The individual subjects of the study who fell in the first or fourth Quartile of the distribution were then placed in the low LPC

(task oriented) or high LPC (employee oriented) groups, respectively, for analysis. A subject who viewed his least preferred coworker in a relatively favorable manner produced a high LPC score, while the subject who viewed his least preferred coworker in a relatively unfavorable manner produced a low LPC score.

Group Atmosphere Scale

Each of the study subjects was then asked in Opinionnaire Two to "describe the atmosphere of your group of employees in your school(s)." The subjects then rated the atmosphere of their school(s) on a ten item bi-polar adjective scale which included questions such as "distant-close," "pleasant-unpleasant," or "friendly-unfriendly." From the S's total score an averaged score was derived ranging from 1.0 (low GA) to 8.0 (high GA).

The study recognized the following limitation: the quality of leader-member relations, interpreted as group morale, was limited to group atmosphere (GA score) as perceived by the administrators within the district.

ANALYSIS OF DATA

The study produced nine sets of data for each of the 304 subjects. Where the data was missing for one of the variables under analysis, the case was removed from computation and analysis by the SPSS Statistical Package for the Social Sciences, utilized by the computer center at Mankato State University.

Analysis of Variance

Due to the unequal number of S's in resulting analysis cells, t-tests and One Way Analysis of Variance were applied in analyzing the data. In examining the statistical difference between administrator positions for numbers of teachers and students, t-tests and One Way Analysis of Variance were applied to examine the statistical difference between districts viewed hypothetically as homogeneous in size (discussed under Normative Data, Chapter 4). For the remaining variables, Administrative Experience, Current Position Years, Time in Conferences, t-tests and One Way Analysis of Variance were applied between the Task and Employee Oriented (low and high LPC) groups of administrators, as a total group and broken down into positions.

For Hypothesis One, "no significant difference in group morale between task and employee oriented administrators," a Chi-square test of significance was applied to the data broken down into task, integrative, and employee orientation versus group morale in four Quartiles based on the national mean and Standard Deviation, producing a 3 by 4 table.

Analysis of CoVariance

One of the factors, Age, was felt to contribute significantly to another factor, Administrative Experience. As a result, an analysis of covariance was applied to age and experience. Hypothetically, it was seen as possible that a high correlation of age with experience would show that any relationship of experience to task or employee orientation was partially a result of age as a percentage of the variance determined to be present between task and employee oriented administrators.

Chapter Four

RESEARCH FINDINGS

Chapter Four, Research Findings, presents the data and results of analysis, grouped into four areas: 1) Normative data for the study; 2) Hypothesis One; 3) Hypothesis Two; and 4) Hypothesis Three.

The population or universe for this study was all Minnesota school districts limited to three administrators, numbering 284 such districts. To produce the research population, a 50 per cent random sample was drawn of all school districts with three administrators. Subjects of the study were 304 school administrators, respondents to two opinionaires. Subjects were asked to rate their least preferred coworker (LPC) and the group atmosphere (GA) within their group of employees. The total study population produced a mean LPC of 3.90 with 1.14 Standard Deviation, as compared to a national LPC mean of 3.71 with 1.05 S.D. The subjects were then divided into Quartiles, First Quartile (1.00-3.09 LPC) being Low LPC, Task Oriented; Second and Third Quartiles (3.10-4.71 LPC) being the middle group, is referred to as Integrative Oriented; and the Fourth Quartile (4.72-8.00 LPC) became High LPC, Employee Oriented group of subjects (Ss). The Group Atmosphere variable produced a population mean of 6.25 GA with 0.94 S.D., as compared to a national mean 6.49 GA with 1.52 S.D. For purposes of analysis of variance, the middle or integrative group, was included in the analysis, tables, and discussions.

NORMATIVE DATA

The study accepted one assumption: the variables affecting each task within a school district are assumed to be homogeneous among similarly sized school districts. Accordingly, the numbers of teachers and students for which each administrator was responsible, were accepted as the normative data by which to compare the similarity of school districts.

Table One presents the teachers for which each administrator was responsible, by administrative positions. T-tests compared the number of teachers for task and employee oriented administrators in all three positions and found none of the differences in numbers of teachers to be significant. However, Analysis of Variance in the superintendent position between all three orientations showed the number of teachers to be significantly different at the .05 per cent level of confidence. Task oriented superintendents, significantly, have an average of 10 more teachers than employee oriented superintendents, and an average of 14 more teachers than integrative superintendents. The number of teachers, however, as used in this study, appeared to be largely a matter of chance, and there was no significant difference in the number of teachers under elementary and secondary principals, when separated by orientation.

Table Two presents the number of students by orientation for three administrative positions. T-tests compared the number of students for task and employee oriented administrators and found no significant difference. Analysis of Variance for the three orientations for each of the three positions also found no significant difference in number of students. However, the greater mean students for superintendents,

Table 1

Number of Teachers by Orientation
for Three Administrative Positions

Position			Mean	S.D.	(N)	df	F
Superintendent	(S)	TO*	56.5	24.9	19		
		IO	42.2	19.1	62	2/	3.13**
		EO	46.2	23.9	28	106	
Elem. Principal	(Pe)	TO*	19.5	9.7	25		
		IO	21.2	11.3	53	2/	1.88
		EO	16.1	6.5	20	95	
Sec. Principal	(Ps)	TO*	24.9	8.6	26		
		IO	23.3	10.8	49	2/	0.31
		EO	22.7	9.9	19	91	
Population Totals			30.0	19.6	301		

*Task Oriented (1.00-3.09 LPC); Integrative (3.10-4.71 LPC); Employee (4.72-8.00 LPC).
**F >3.09 = 0.05

does suggest that task oriented superintendents have, as with teachers, a larger number of students within their districts, than do integrative or employee oriented superintendents.

The t-tests showed no significant difference in the numbers of teachers or students between task and employee oriented administrators. Each of the randomly selected districts from which the subjects responded had three administrators, and were similarly sized in teachers and students.

HYPOTHESIS ONE

Hypothesis One: There will be no significant difference in group atmosphere as perceived by task or employee oriented administrators. The entire research population, subdivided into task, integrative, and employee oriented administrators produced a mean GA score of 6.25 with 0.94 S.D., as compared with a national 6.49 mean GA with 1.05 S.D. This

Table 2

Number of Students by Orientation for Three Administrative Positions

Position		Mean	S.D.	(N)	df	F
	TO*	966	503	19		
Superintendent (S)	IO	764	570	62	2/	1.03
	EO	803	472	26	104	
	TO*	344	166	23		
Elem. Principal (Pe)	IO	394	236	53	2/	1.77
	EO	297	127	20	93	
	TO*	380	143	26		
Sec. Principal (Ps)	IO	368	214	49	2/	0.09
	EO	355	188	19	91	
Population Totals		512	420	297		

*Task Oriented (1.00-3.09 LPC); Integrative (3.10-4.71 LPC); Employee (4.72-8.00 LPC).

smaller total group distribution, when compared to the national distribution, indicates a tendency toward higher consistency in rating the group atmosphere (GA) of employees, within the research population of administrators.

Table Three presents group atmosphere by orientation. The means for task and employee oriented administrator groups appear relatively close, yet .25 (25/100) higher than the mean for integrative administrators.

Table 3

Group Atmosphere by Administrator Orientation

Orientation	Mean	S.D.	(N)	df	F
Task Oriented Administrators	6.38	1.21	70		
Integrative Oriented Administrators	6.13	.83	166	2/	3.18**
Employee Oriented Administrators	6.43	.85	68	301	
Population Totals	6.25	.94	304		

** $F > 3.00 = 0.05$

The Standard Deviation for task oriented Ss, however, is .36 (36/100) wider than for employee oriented Ss, which indicates a tendency to rate group atmosphere both higher and lower than the ratings of GA by integrative and employee oriented Ss. Analysis of Variance produced a significant difference ($F > 3.00 = 0.05$) at the .05 per cent level of confidence between task and employee oriented Ss, and a significant difference between task and integrative Ss, and between employee and integrative Ss. The wider distribution of GA ratings by task oriented subjects explains the closeness of means between employee and task oriented Ss, and explains the significant difference in Group Atmosphere between task and employee oriented subjects.

Hypothesis One, no significant difference between task and employee oriented administrators in ratings of group atmosphere, is rejected at the 0.05 per cent level of confidence. The alternative hypothesis is accepted: there is a significant difference in group atmosphere of employees between task and employee oriented administrators.

An additional analysis, Chi Square (X^2) test for significance, was run to locate the group atmosphere trends within each of the three orientations, producing Table A, Appendix B: Group Atmosphere Distribution by Orientation. The Chi Square test, a measure of the variance within the distribution, produced a chi square value significant at .05 level of confidence, indicating significant differences exist in the collected subject ratings of group atmosphere. Examination of Table A indicates that 87 per cent of the integrative oriented administrators rated their groups of employees in Quartiles I, II, and III while 83 per cent and 82 per cent respectively of the task and employee oriented administrators rated their group atmosphere in the <u>upper</u> three quartiles. This shift in the GA distribution explains the significant difference in

GA ratings. Additionally, 68 per cent of TO subjects rated their groups in the middle two quartiles, 18 per cent more than either task or employee oriented subjects. The significant difference between task and employee oriented subjects is in their actual rating of group atmosphere, which produced a negative correlation. Task oriented subjects tended to rate their groups lower (with greater variance from the TO group mean) than did the employee oriented (EO) subjects, who tended to rate their groups more consistently and with less variance within the EO group and within the total group (EO group Standard Deviation was closer to total group S.D.).

HYPOTHESIS TWO

Hypothesis Two: There will be no significant difference in administrative experience between task and employee oriented administrators. To test this hypothesis, the total years of administrative experience and years in the current position were collected for each S in the study. The study population produced a mean of 13.0 years of administrative experience, and a mean of 7.5 years in the current position.

Table Four presents administrative experience in years by administrative position. There was no significant difference in years of administrative experience between task and employee oriented superintendents or secondary principals. Elementary principals, however, produced a significant difference (.05 level of confidence) in administrative experience. Employee oriented elementary principals have significantly three years more experience than task oriented, and five

Table 4

Administrative Experience in Years
by Administrative Position

Position			Mean	S.D.	(N)	df	F
		TO*	17.4	5.7	19		
Superintendent	(S)	IO	17.5	8.5	60	2/	0.966
		EO	20.0	9.0	29	105	
		TO*	10.0	6.5	25		
Elem. Principal	(Pe)	IO	8.4	6.0	54	2/	3.764**
		EO	13.2	8.0	19	95	
		TO*	11.3	7.7	26		
Sec. Principal	(Ps)	IO	11.5	9.8	50	2/	0.571
		EO	9.1	6.2	19	92	
Population Totals			13.0	8.8	301		

*Task Oriented (1.00-3.09 LPC); Integrative (3.10-4.71 LPC); Employee (4.72-8.00 LPC).
**F > 3.11 = 0.05

years more experience than integrative oriented elementary principals. The null hypothesis is accepted for superintendents and secondary principals, and rejected for elementary principals.

Table 5

Current Position Experience in Years
by Administrative Position

Position			Mean	S.D.	(N)	df	F
		TO*	7.5	5.8	19		
Superintendent	(S)	IO	8.5	6.3	61	2/	0.182
		EO	7.9	6.3	29	106	
		TO*	7.5	4.7	25		
Elem. Principal	(Pe)	IO	6.5	5.3	54	2/	5.356***
		EO	11.1	6.3	20	96	
		TO*	6.0	5.2	26		
Sec. Principal	(Ps)	IO	7.5	7.5	50	2/	0.601
		EO	6.0	5.5	19	92	
Population Totals			7.5	6.2	293		

*Task oriented (1.00-3.09 LPC); Integrative (3.10-4.71); Employee (4.72-8.00 LPC).
***F > 4.87 = 0.01. F > 3.11 = 0.05.

Table Five presents current position experience in years by administrative position. There was no significant difference in current position years between task and employee oriented superintendents and secondary principals. Elementary principals, again, produced a significant difference (.01 level of confidence) in current position years. Employee oriented elementary principals have significantly 3.6 years more experience than task oriented, and 4.6 years more current position experience than integrative oriented elementary principals. The null hypothesis is accepted for task and employee oriented superintendents and secondary principals, and rejected for elementary principals.

HYPOTHESIS THREE

Hypothesis Three: There will be no significant difference in time spent in conferences between task or employee oriented administrators. In order to evaluate this hypothesis, each S was asked to estimate the hours spent weekly in conference situations with other administrators. The study population produced a mean of 3.6 hours spent weekly in conferences.

Table 6

Weekly Conference Hours by Administrator Orientation

Orientation	Mean	S.D.	(N)	df	F
Task Oriented Administrators	3.6	2.0	70		
Integrative Oriented Administrators	3.5	1.9	161	2/	0.188
Employee Oriented Administrators	3.7	2.2	63	291	
Population Totals	3.6	2.0	294		

Table Six presents weekly conference hours by administrative orientation. Analysis of Variance showed the differences between task

and employee orientation to be minimal, and not significant. Hypothesis Three was accepted: there was no significant difference in time spent in conferences as reported by task and employee oriented administrators.

AGE AS COVARIANT OF EXPERIENCE

Initially, within the design of the research study, it was felt that age as a variable probably represented a portion of any variance within administrative experience and current position experience. Accordingly, respondents were asked to indicate their age in the biographical questionnaire. The research population of administrators from districts limited to three administrators produced a mean age of 44.6 years and S.D. of 10.4 years. One standard deviation indicates that 68 per cent of the 304 Ss were between 34 and 55, while 95 per cent of the population was between 24 and 65 years of age.

Table Seven presents administrator age by orientation in three administrative positions. The mean age for superintendents indicates a trend from task to employee orientation with increasing age, which was not significant. Secondary principals in all three orientations have exactly the same mean age: 42.0 years, also not significant. Analysis of Variance for the age of elementary principals produced differences significant at the .01 per cent level of confidence. The age of elementary principals indicates a significant trend from integrative (39.7 years) to task (45.1) to employee orientation (48.8) with increasing age.

Examination of Tables 4 and 5, Administrative Experience and Current Position Years, indicates exactly the same trend: the behavioral style of elementary principals changes from integrative, to task, to employee orientation with increasing years of administrative

Table 7

Administrator Age by Orientation
for Three Administrative Positions

Position			Mean	S.D.	(N)	df	F
Superintendent	(S)	TO*	45.0	6.6	19		
		IO	49.0	9.5	61	2/	2.821
		EO	51.2	8.6	29	106	
Elem. Principal	(Pe)	TO*	45.1	11.8	25		
		IO	39.7	9.0	54	2/	6.528***
		EO	48.8	11.0	20	96	
Sec. Principal	(Ps)	TO*	42.0	9.5	26		
		IO	42.0	9.7	50	2/	0.000
		EO	42.0	8.5	19	92	
Population Totals			44.6	10.5	303		

*Task Oriented (1.00-3.09 LPC); Integrative (3.10-4.71 LPC); Employee (4.72-8.00 LPC)
***$F > 4.87 = 0.01$; $F > 3.11 = 0.05$.

experience. This trend, and non-significant trends among superintendents and secondary principals, acts to support age as a covariant of experience.

Analysis of Covariance for age as a covariant of administrative experience produced a relationship statistically significant at .01 level. Results of the analysis are presented in Tables B and C, Appendix B. The same analysis of covariance with current position years produced a relationship significant at .10 per cent level of confidence. These analyses showed age contributes to 60 percent of the variance within administrative experience, and 34 per cent of the variance within the current position data for the 304 subjects of the study.

Variance is the difference in administrative experience for comparably aged subjects, and thus any difference in administrative experience between the various orientations is contributed to by age as a covariant of experience.

Chapter Five

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Chapter Five presents first a summary of the research project, which reviews the research problem and findings. Conclusions and their implications then precede a final section of Recommendations.

SUMMARY

The study proposed to examine task and employee oriented administrators from randomly selected Minnesota public schools. The dependent variable, orientation (style of administrative behavior) was compared with independent variables: group morale (or atmosphere), administrative experience, and time spent in conference situations. The measure of leadership style (orientation) used in this study was based on a sixteen item semantic differential scale indicating the degree to which school administrators described, either favorably or unfavorably, their least preferred coworker (LPC). Group morale, as perceived by administrators, was determined from ratings on a ten item semantic differential, the Group Atmosphere scale. Administrative experience, current position years, subject age, time spent in conference situations, and number of teachers and students were taken from subjects' responses to questions on a biographical questionnaire.

Major emphasis of the study was to determine how task and employee oriented styles of behavior would affect group morale, with secondary emphasis on administrative experience and conference time as related to

task and employee oriented styles of behavior. The purpose of the study was to provide a description of leadership styles among varying conditions of group morale which could be applied to school motivation practices, personnel management, and participatory decision making.

The 304 subjects of the study were school administrators in three positions, from randomly selected districts limited to three administrators. There were no significant differences between task and employee oriented administrators in either numbers of teachers or students for whom they were accountable. It was assumed, therefore, that the districts were relatively similar in size and task structure. However, when integrative superintendents were included, the Analysis of Variance determined that task oriented superintendents had significantly more teachers than integrative or employee oriented superintendents.

Analysis of group atmosphere produced a significant difference in GA score between task, integrative, and employee oriented administrators ($F > 3.00 = 0.05$). Chi Square analysis indicated a significant difference: integrative oriented Ss rated GA significantly lower than either task or employee oriented Ss, while task oriented Ss rated the GA of their employee group significantly lower than employee oriented subjects.

Significant differences in administrative experience were found to exist for elementary principals only. The differences in mean years of administrative experience and current position experience indicated a significant trend from integrative to task to employee orientation in the styles of elementary principal behavior with increasing years of experience. Analysis of age as a covariant of experience found age to be contributing 60 per cent and 34 per cent of the variance in administrative experience and current position experience.

Time spent in conference or decision making situations, was not significantly related as a variable to the S's task or employee orientation.

CONCLUSIONS

I. The relatively homogeneous means between the three orientations for time spent weekly in conferences (3.5, 3.7, and 3.6 hours as reported by administrators) leads to the conclusion that an administrator's personal style of behavior is not affected by increasing or decreasing the hours spent with subordinates or superiors.

II. Analysis of experience as a variable leads to the following conclusions: a) employee oriented elementary principals tend significantly to have more administrative experience than either task- or integrative-oriented elementary principals. b) Secondary principals tend to be more task oriented with increasing experience. c) Superintendents tend to be more employee oriented with increasing experience. d) Age contributes 60 per cent and 34 per cent of the variance in administrative experience and current position experience, respectively. e) Table Five, Chapter Four, presents perhaps a contradictory conclusion: superintendents and secondary principals tend to become integratively oriented with increasing years in the current position, which leads to a very important conclusion: administrators who achieve security, and confidence in their current position apparently tend to modify their orientation from the extremes (task or employee oriented) toward a middle of the road approach in which concern is integratively expressed for both the expectations of employees and the requirements of the job and institution.

III. The atmosphere or climate of a group of employees is affected by the style of administrative behavior displayed by the school

administrator. A person who describes his least preferred coworker favorably, tends to be permissive, human relations oriented, and considerate of the feelings of his men. But a person who describes his least preferred coworker in an unfavorable manner (Low LPC)--- tends to be managing, task controlling, and less concerned with the human relations aspects of the job. Such divergent styles of behavior, as determined by this study, lead to lower levels of support for the task oriented administrator, as perceived within the Group Atmosphere scale. Employee oriented administrators have higher levels of support (GA) for their particular style of behavior. Integrative oriented administrators, on the other hand, have significantly lower group atmosphere, leading to the conclusion that lack of definitive control (task orientation) or visible human concern (employee orientation) may lead to diminished support and diminished group morale among employees.

IV. Fred E. Fiedler suggests that "the low LPC person's feeling of satisfaction and adjustment is closely linked to task performance, while the high LPC's feelings of satisfaction and adjustment are associated with good interpersonal relations."[1] One could conclude, therefore, that the low LPC leader's feeling of being accepted and liked (GA score) would be closely related to his satisfaction with his work performance. The high LPC leader's feeling of being accepted and respected (GA score) would be related to his interpersonal relations with members of his group.

V. Within each of the three positions, regardless of the administrator's orientation, factors such as teacher militancy, legal

---

[1]Fred E. Fiedler, "Personality, Motivational Systems, and Behavior of High and Low LPC Persons," Human Relations, 25 (November, 1972), 398.

constraints, lack of employee rewards, and the growing demand for school district accountability apparently result in the noticeably lower group atmosphere mean for the entire group of administrators. The national GA mean of 6.49 was based on military, industrial, and business studies of group atmosphere of employees and managers, and represents the mean GA of employees in situations more favorable for a) rigidly defined roles in executives, and b) freedom to reward employees. Such a difference, perhaps, explains the lower GA mean (6.25) within the group of public school administrators.

VI. Task oriented superintendents have significantly more teachers, and task oriented administrators have significantly differing Group Atmosphere than employee oriented administrators. No conclusion can be drawn that a larger number of teachers for which an administrator is accountable is related to a lower group atmosphere.

However, the trend appears to suggest that increasing the span of control for which an administrator is responsible may result in a gradual change through the years to task orientation in that administrator's style of behavior.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendations to School Administrators

I. If there were some measure of an administrative position's orientation resulting from span of control, role expectations attaching to the position, and personal need-dispositions which might reasonably be fulfilled by the position and satisfaction resulting from accomplishment, it could therefore be recommended that superiors hire administrators and teachers whose orientation matches the job.

II. Getzels suggests the transactional style moves from one style of orientation to the other (nomothetic or idiographic). The transactional style makes roles and expectations explicit, but takes into account the needs of people. "There is sensitivity to all types of conflicts---role, personality, and role-personality conflicts being recognized and dealt with. The mode of individual-institutional integration is socialization of personality and adaptation, and personalization of role and self-actualization. The standard of administrative excellence is both effectiveness and efficiency."[2] It is recommended that a) administrators seek to achieve a standard of administrative excellence combining both effectiveness and efficiency, and b) research and behavioral studies should investigate the viability of the transactional style in the realm of behavioral theory. The test-retest validity of the LPC scale suggests there is no such thing as a vacillating motivation producing vacillating behavior. It is therefore recommended that integrative be accepted as a point on the orientation spectrum in which the integrative oriented administrator displays behavior consistent with and integration of role expectations and personal need-dispositions, both in his behavior and in the performance of his employees.

III. The several characteristics and uses of systems theory have been listed and discussed by Griffiths.[3] Systems theory is an attempt to develop a general theory which aids the description, explanation, and prediction of a wide range of human behavior within organizations. The

---

[2]Jacob W. Getzels, James M. Lipham, and Roald F. Campbell. Educational Administration as a Social Process. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1968. pp. 148-9.

[3]Daniel E. Griffiths, "The Nature and Meaning of Theory," Behavioral Science and Educational Administration. (Chicago: National Society for the Study of Education, Yearbook LXIII, Part II, 1964), pp. 116-18.

present study has dealt with leadership style and group atmosphere (morale) within the organization. The integration of these concepts into a general systems theory of administrative or executive behavior would be a significant theoretical accomplishment.

IV. And finally, it is recommended to all administrators that they recognize the evident difficulty in making any but small changes in their own style of behavior. Where the role expectations attached to a position necessarily conflict with the administrator's personal needs, it is recommended that actions be taken to change policies, or failing this, the administrator should actively seek any other position which might, in its attached role expectations, facilitate the match between style of behavior and the job.

Recommendations for Further Research

I. Further replication of this experiment should focus on individual districts, to eliminate administrators in positions longer than their superiors, in order to analyze the cumulative effect on group morale where the superintendent hires an administrator with a similar orientation. Further, it is suggested that such districts be compared with districts having subordinates in positions longer than their superiors, in order to isolate the variance in group atmosphere created by differing administrative orientations between administrators. The Organizational Climate Questionnaire should be used with a random sample of teachers in any subject district, to quantify differences between administrator's perception of support (GA score) and the teacher's perception of group morale. And lastly, a longitudinal study of administrator style of behavior over a number of years is recommended.

II. Another recommended replication study would be the examination of Integrative Orientation, the middle of the LPC

distribution. Within the present research, the significantly lower number of teachers within the districts of integrative superintendents tends to suggest that a smaller total district span of control produces an integrative style of behavior.

III. In any replication of the present experimental research, it is recommended that the researcher create a span of control measurement device---in order to quantify the task structure for each administrator, or as Fiedler describes it, to measure the situational favorableness of the administrator's environment.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Periodicals

Ambrosio, Frank, and Robert W. Heller, "The Secondary School Administrator and Perceived Teacher Participation in the Decision-Making Process," Journal of Experimental Education, 40 (Summer, 1972), 6-13.

Blumberg, Arthur, and Wilford A. Weber, "Teacher Morale as a Function of Perceived Supervisor Behavioral Style," Educational Administration Abstracts, 4 (Spring, 1969), 37.

Chemers, Martin M., and George J. Skrzypek. "Experimental Test of the Contingency Model of Leadership Effectiveness," Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 24 (November, 1972), 172-77.

Doyle, Wayne J., and William P. Ahlbrand. "Hierarchical Group Performance and Leader Orientation," Educational Administration Abstracts, 9 (Winter, 1974), 45.

Eriksen, Walter B. "A Critical Evaluation of the Superintendent-Principal Administrative Relationship in the Elementary Schools of Southern California," Dissertation Abstracts, 21 (1960), 1434.

Fishbein, Martin, et. al. "A Consideration of Two Assumptions Underlying Fiedler's Contingency Model for Prediction of Leadership Effectiveness," American Journal of Psychology, 82 (December, 1969), 457-73.

Fiedler, Fred E. "The Effect of Leadership and Cultural Heterogeneity on Group Performance," Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 2 (July, 1966), 237-64.

_____. "Engineer the Job to Fit the Manager," Harvard Business Review, 43 (September, 1965), 115-22.

_____. "Personality, Motivational Systems, and Behavior of High and Low LPC Persons," Human Relations, 25 (November, 1972), 391-412.

Getzels, J.W., and E.G. Guba. "Social Behavior and the Administrative Process," School Review, 65 (Winter, 1957), 423-441.

Grassie, McCrae C., and Brian W. Carss. "School Structure, Leadership Quality, and Teacher Satisfaction," Educational Administration Quarterly, 9 (Winter, 1972), 15-26.

Grassie, McCrae, C., and Brian W. Carss. "The Organizational Climate of High Schools," Educational Administration Abstracts, 8 (Spring, 1973), 58.

Gruenfeld, L.W., and D.E. Rance, P. Weissenberg. "The behavior of task-oriented (Low LPC) and socially oriented (High LPC) leaders under several conditions of social support," Journal of Social Psychology, 79 (1969), 99-107.

Harrell, Lloyd W. "Innovative Tendencies of Elementary School Principals as Related to Self-Perception of their Leadership Style, Belief System, Reference Group Identification, and Value System Orientation," Dissertation Abstracts, 33A (1972), 2647.

Haythorn, W., et. al. "The effects of varying combinations of authoritarian and equalitarian leaders and followers," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 53 (1956), 210-19.

Holland, Howard K. "Democratic Leadership, Does It Abrogate Executive Responsibility?" School Executive, 79 (November, 1959), 76-7.

Juilfs, Erwin J. "Are Administrative Competence and Democratic Administration Compatible?" NASSP Bullotin, 43 (April, 1959), 78-84.

Lewin, Kurt, and Ronald Lippitt. "An Experimental Approach to the Study of Autocracy and Democracy: A Preliminary Note," Sociometry, 1 (January-April, 1938), 292-300.

Mahor, Edward J. "An Analysis of the Leadership Behavior of Elementary School Principals as Perceived by School Personnel in Selected Collective Negotiations Situation," Dissertation Abstracts, 33A (1972), 2659-60.

Murphy, Marcus Dean. "Some Dimensions of Leadership Behavior of School Superintendents in Selected Texas School Districts," Dissertation Abstracts, 30A (1969), 5203.

Peterson, Gary D. "Personality Authoritarianism and the Perceived Leadership Behavior of North Dakota Administrators," Dissertation Abstracts, 29A (1968), 3812.

Posthuma, A.B. "Normative data on the least preferred coworker scale (LPC) and the group atmosphere questionnaire (GA)," National Technical Information Service: Organizational Research, University of Washington, 1970.

Sampson, Edward E. "Leader Orientation and T-Group Effectiveness," Educational Administration Abstracts, 8 (Spring, 1973), 59.

Sergiovanni, Thomas J., and Richard Metzcus, Larry Burden. "Toward a Particularistic Approach to Leadership Style: Some Findings," Educational Administration Abstracts, 4 (Fall, 1969), 54.

2. Articles in Collections

Griffiths, Daniel E. "The Nature and Meaning of Theory," Behavioral Science and Educational Administration, ed. Daniel E. Griffiths. Sixty-third Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part II (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1964).

Hemphill, John K., and Alvin E. Coons. "Development of the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire," Leader Behavior: Its Description and Measurement, eds. Ralph M. Stogdill and Alvin E. Coons. (Research Monograph 88, Bureau of Business Research, Ohio State University, 1957), 6-38.

Lewin, Kurt. "Frontiers in group dynamics," Field Theory in Social Science, ed. D. Cartwright. (New York: Harper, 1951), 188-237.

Lipham, James M. "Leadership and Administration," Behavioral Science and Educational Administration, ed. Daniel E. Griffiths. Sixty-Third Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part II (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1964).

Seeman, Melvin. "A Comparison of General and Specific Leader Behavior Descriptions," Leader Behavior: Its Description and Measurement, eds. Ralph M. Stogdill and Alvin E. Coons. (Research Monograph 88, Bureau of Business Research, Ohio State University, 1957), 86-102.

3. Books

Becker, Gerald et al. A Review of Related Literature to Issues and Problems in Elementary School Administration. Corvallis, OR: Center for Educational Research, Oregon State University; and U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 040 512, May, 1970.

Blake, Robert R., and Jane S. Mouton. The Managerial Grid. Houston: Gulf Publishing Co., 1964.

Campbell, Roald F., John E. Corbally, Jr., and John A. Ramseyer. Introduction to Educational Administration. 3rd. ed. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1966.

Croft, John C. Open and Closed Mindedness and Perceptions of Leader Behavior. U.S., H.E.W., Office of Education, 1964.

Cummings, L.L., and Donald P. Schwab. Performance in Organizations. Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman and Co., 1973.

Eidell, Terry L. et al. Innovativeness and the Organizational Attributes of Schools. Eugene, OR: Center for Advanced Study of Educational Administration. Paper presented at Symposium 1.6 Innovativeness and the Organizational Attributes of Schools, AERA Annual Meeting, Los Angeles, CA, 1969. U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 027 619, February, 1969.

Fiedler, Fred E. A Theory of Leadership Effectiveness. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1967.

_____, and Martin M. Chemers. Leadership and Effective Management. Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman and Co., 1974.

Fietler, Fred C. A Study of Principal Leader Behavior and Contrasting Organizational Environments. Paper presented at American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting, 57th, Chicago, IL, 1972.

Getzels, Jacob W., James M. Lipham, and Ronald F. Campbell. Educational Administration as a Social Process. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1968.

Helwig, Carl. Democratic Supervision and Creative Supervision: Are They Possible Mismomers? U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 055 324, June, 1968.

McGregor, Douglas. The Human Side of Enterprise. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1960.

Michael, Stephen R., and Halsey R. Jones. Organizational Management. New York: Intext Educational Publishers, 1973.

Morphet, Edgar L. et al. Basic Principles, Concepts, and Issues. Part One: Educational Organization and Administration: Concepts, Practices, and Issues. 2nd ed. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1967.

Olson, Gary F. Congruence and Dissonance in the Ecology of Educational Administration as a Basis for Discriminating Between Patterns of Leadership Behavior. U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 018 002, September, 1967.

Onofrio, John E. The Public School Principal in Terms of Today's Leadership Role Expectations. U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 025 024, September, 1968.

Sergiovanni, Thomas J., and Fred D. Carver. The New School Executive: A Theory of Administration. New York: Dodd, Mead & Co., 1973.

Vroom, Victor H. Some Personality Determinants of the Effects of Participation. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1960.

APPENDICES

A. RESEARCH DEVICE

1. Cover Letter. 58

2. Opinionnaire One (Least Preferred Coworker Scale. 59

3. Opinionnaire Two (Group Atmosphere Scale) 61

4. Biographical Questionnaire. 61

B. SUPPLEMENTARY TABLES

Table A:
Group Atmosphere Distribution by Orientation 62

Table B:
Analysis of Covariance for Age with Administrative Experience 63

Table C:
Analysis of Covariance for Age with Current Position Years. 64

Mankato State College
Mankato, Minnesota 56001

VICE PRESIDENT FOR ACADEMIC AFFAIRS and DEAN OF THE COLLEGE(507)389-1312

To the Superintendent, and
Elementary and Secondary Principals

Dear

One of the very important questions being asked among today's public school administrators is: should we as administrators operate by concensus of opinion or should we direct and control the actions of our subordinates?

To answer this question, I have designed a research study which looks at the decision-making situation among you and your fellow administrators. Its purpose is not to evaluate your decisions, but to examine the situation or conference in which you sit down over coffee and make decisions about those problems confronting your district.

Would you take FIVE MINUTES at the most to answer two short, nationally known and used, statistically verified opinionnaires (reprinted by permission of McGraw Hill)? Participating school districts were selected at random, and all information and opinions will be handled with complete anonymity. Each school district will receive a printed abstract of the results, in June. But it is very important that we get the in-put from each of you.

So, please complete the checklists and biographical information and return in the stamped envelope.

With our thanks, we remain

Marty Duncan

Marty Duncan
115 Armstrong Hall
Dept. of Ed. Ad.
Mankato State College
Mankato, MN 56001

Members of committee:
Dr. P.O. Brunsvold
Dr. C.J. Salek
Dr. V.E. Beckman

IMPORTANT: SEPARATE AND DO NOT RETURN LETTER WITH THE OPINIONNAIRES

"an equal opportunity employer"

OPINIONNAIRE ONE

People differ in the ways they think about those with whom they work. This may be important in working with others. Please give your immediate, first reaction to the items on the following page.

On the following page are pairs of words which are opposite in meaning, such as Very Neat and Not Neat. You are asked to describe someone with whom you have worked by placing an "X" in one of the eight spaces on the line between the two words.

Each space represents how well the adjective fits the person you are describing, as if it were written:

Very Neat								Not Neat
____	X	____	____	____	____	____	____	
8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	
Very Neat	Quite Neat	Some-what Neat	Slightly Neat	Slightly Untidy	Some-what Untidy	Quite Untidy	Very Untidy	

For example: If you were to describe the person with whom you are able to work least well, and you ordinarily think of him as being quite neat, you would put an "X" in the second space from the words Very Neat, as done with "X" above.

If you ordinarily think of the person with whom you can work least well as being only slightly neat, you would put your "X" as follows:

Very Neat								Not Neat
____	____	____	X	____	____	____	____	
8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	
Very Neat	Quite Neat	Some-what Neat	Slightly Neat	Slightly Untidy	Some-what Untidy	Quite Untidy	Very Untidy	

If you think of him as being very untidy, you would use the space nearest the words Not Neat:

Very Neat								Not Neat
____	____	____	____	____	____	____	X	
8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	
Very Neat	Quite Neat	Some-what Neat	Slightly Neat	Slightly Untidy	Some-what Untidy	Quite Untidy	Very Untidy	

Look at the words at both ends of the line before you put in your "X". Please remember that there are no right or wrong answers. Work rapidly; your first answer is likely to be the best. Please do not omit any items, and mark each item only once.

Now, think of the employee of your school district with whom you can work least well, in your job situation. He may be someone you work with now, or he may be someone you know in the past.

He does not have to be the person you like least well, but should be the person with whom you had the most difficulty in getting a job done. Describe this person as he appears to you:

Pleasant	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	Unpleasant
	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	
Friendly	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	Unfriendly
	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	
Rejecting	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	Accepting
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Helpful	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	Frustrating
	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	
Unenthusiastic	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	Enthusiastic
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Tense	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	Relaxed
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Distant	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	Close
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Cold	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	Warm
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Cooperative	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	Uncooperative
	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	
Supportive	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	Hostile
	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	
Boring	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	Interesting
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Quarrelsome	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	Harmonious
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Self-assured	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	Hesitant
	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	
Efficient	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	Inefficient
	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	
Gloomy	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	Cheerful
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Open	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	Guarded
	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	

OPINIONNAIRE TWO

Describe the atmosphere of your group of employees in your school(s):

Pleasant	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	Unpleasant
	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	
Friendly	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	Unfriendly
	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	
Bad	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	Good
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Worthless	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	Valuable
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Distant	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	Close
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Warm	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	Cold
	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	
Quarrelsome	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	Harmonious
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Self-Assured	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	Hesitant
	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	
Efficient	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	Inefficient
	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	
Gloomy	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	Cheerful
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	

PLEASE FILL IN THIS INFORMATION:

Circle A B or C and complete information behind your present position:

A. Superintendent _____Enrollment and _____Teachers (District Total)

B. Elem. Principal_____Enrollment and _____Teachers (Your Building)

C. Sec. Principal _____Enrollment and _____Teachers (Your Building)

Your total years of experience as an administrator _____Count 74-75 as 1

Your age _____ Years in your current position _____Count 74-75 as 1

FOR SUPERINTENDENTS: How many hours per week would you estimate you spend in informal and formal conferences with your principals? Circle one below.

FOR PRINCIPALS: How many hours per week would you estimate you spend in informal and formal conferences with your superintendent? Circle one below.

Hours per Week in Conferences 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 or more

DON'T FORGET TO DETACH COVER LETTER BEFORE RETURNING.

Table A

Group Atmosphere Distribution
by Orientation

Orientation	Count Row Pct Col Pct Tot Pct	GROUP ATMOSPHERE BY ORIENTATION I	II	III	IV	Row Total
Task Oriented		12 17.1 21.8 3.9	17 24.3 20.2 5.6	18 25.7 17.8 5.9	23 32.9 35.9 7.6	70 23.0
Integrative Oriented		31 18.7 56.4 10.2	53 31.9 63.1 17.4	60 36.1 59.4 19.7	22 13.3 34.4 7.2	166 54.6
Employee Oriented		12 17.6 21.8 3.9	14 20.6 16.7 4.6	23 33.8 22.8 7.6	19 27.9 29.7 6.3	68 22.4
	Column Total	55 18.1	84 27.6	101 33.2	64 21.1	304 100.0

Chi Square = 15.272 with 6 Degrees of Freedom; Significance = .0182

$X^2 > 14.45 = 0.025$ (0.05 level of significance for two-tailed test)

Table B

Analysis of Covariance for Age
with Administrative Experience

Source	df	YY	Sum/Squares (Due)	Sum/Squares (About)	df	Square
Treatment (Between)	2	4096.1				
Error (Within)	301	19325.6	9284.8	10040.8	300	33.5
Treatment & Error (Total)	303	23421.7	12026.1	11395.6	302	
Difference for Testing Adjusted Treatment Means:				1354.9	2	677.4

NULL HYPOTHESIS: NO DIFFERENCE AMONG TREATMENTS AFTER ADJUSTING WITH COVARIANTES.

F (2,300) = 20.240 F > 4.61 = 0.01

TABLE OF COEFFICIENTS WITH AGE

	Coefficient	Stand. Error	T-Value
Treatment (Between)	1.2168		
Error (Within)	.5516	.0331	16.6558
Treatment & Error (Total)	.6030	.0338	17.8524

Table C

Analysis of Covariance for Age
with Current Position Years

Source	df	YY	Sum/Squares (Due)	Sum/Squares (About)	df	Mean Square
Treatment (Between	2	88.0				
Error (Within)	301	11256.8	3942.6	7314.2	300	24.4
Treatment & Error (Total)	303	11344.8	3900.9	7443.9	302	
Difference for Testing Adjusted Treatment Means:				129.8	2	64.9

NULL HYPOTHESIS: NO DIFFERENCE AMONG TREATMENTS AFTER ADJUSTING WITH COVARIATES.

F (2,300 = 2.661; F > 2.30 = 0.10

TABLE OF COEFFICIENTS WITH AGE

	Coefficient	Stand. Error	T-Value
Treatment (Between)	.1524		
Error (Within)	.3594	.0283	12.7166
Treatment & Error (Total)	.3434	.0273	12.5801