

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 252 923

EA 017 410

AUTHOR Gable, Sherry K.; Kavich, Larry L.
TITLE Ethical Perspectives: Leadership Subscales Applied to Education.
PUB DATE 81
NOTE 17p.
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070) -- Viewpoints (120)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Behavior Theories; *Educational Administration; Elementary Secondary Education; *Ethics; *Leadership Qualities; *Models; Organizational Theories; School Administration

IDENTIFIERS *Contingency Theories; *Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire; *Path Goal Theory

ABSTRACT

Ethical perspectives are needed to gain insight into the history of leader behavior, especially as related to the current emphasis on contingency and Path-Goal Theories. An instrument to help select professionals who reflect ethical traits is the Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire with 12 leadership subscales (LBDQ, Form XII). Selected questions illustrate the LBDQ and the 12 subscales. Two major leadership subscales developed in relation to the LBDQ are "Initiation of Structure," the more formal classical bureaucratic subscale; and "Consideration," the more socially humanistically-oriented subscale. High scores on both Initiation of Structure and Consideration mean positive ethical perspectives for leadership potential. Therefore, if one were to use the LBDQ, Form XII and its 12 subscales, one could determine who is best qualified for leadership roles. The appendixes contain a synopsis of the instrument questions pertaining to Initiation of Structure and Consideration; a chart of how these two leadership dimensions are currently related to organization cohesiveness; and a summary of the work and applied theories of the following theorists: Fredrick W. Taylor, Max Weber, Abraham Maslow, Frederick Herzberg, Douglas McGregor, Andrew Halpin, Fred Fiedler, P. B. Evans, and R. J. House. A 22-item bibliography is included. (MLF)

 * Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
 * from the original document. *

TITLE: Ethical Perspectives: Leadership Subscales Applied to Education

BY: Sherry K. Gable and Larry L. Kavich, Department of Educational Psychology and Foundations, University of Northern Iowa

1981

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

- * This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
- Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent those of NIE or the Department of Education.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sherry Gable
Larry Kavich

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

ED252923

EA 017 410

TITLE: Ethical Perspectives: Leadership Subscales Applied to Education.

BY: Sherry K. Gable and Larry L. Kavich, Department of Educational Psychology and Foundations, University of Northern Iowa

It is the task herein to bridge the relationships between leadership theory and ethical perspective to help determine if changing leadership theories in education reflect existing leadership performance subscales for describing educational administration. Such considerations can generally be used to predict leadership behavior with the assistance of an educational instrument such as the LEDQ, Form XII (Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire) with twelve leadership subscales. (The Ohio State University, Bureau of Business Research: 1-5.) For this discussion, ethical perspectives for leadership subscales are defined as: The 20th century periodical study of educational leadership related to the science of human conduct. Ralph Stogdill, the pioneer researcher in leadership behavior states in his preface to the Handbook of Leadership that, "Five decades of research in leadership have produced a bewildering mass of findings" (Stogdill, 1974 VII). Indeed, the desire to know more about related ethical perspectives is in itself sufficient justification for undertaking a comprehensive analysis of leadership.

Robert Owens in his Organizational Behavior in Schools states that American education has moved in this century from administrative leadership theories of Classical theory (1900-1930) to Human Relations theory (1930-1950) to Behavioral theory (1950-1970); (Owens: 28). Chester Schriesheimer and Steven Kerr indicate in the Hunt and Larsen book, Leadership: The Cutting Edge that the primary leadership theories from 1970 to the present are: Fiedler's Contingency Theory of Leadership (Hunt and Larsen: 10-13) and Evans and House Path-Goal

Theory of Leadership (Bunt and Larsen: 13-18). The following chart is useful in further analysis of relating theory to theorist to applied theory to theory concept:

LEADERSHIP THEORIES: 1900-1980

<u>Leadership Theory</u>	<u>Leadership Theorist</u>	<u>Applied Leadership Theory</u>	<u>Leadership Theory Concepts</u>
Classical	Taylor	Man viewed as extension of factory machinery Lowering unitary cost of factory product	Line and staff, span of unity of command
	Weber	Produced idea of a well run bureaucracy	Line and staff, span of control and unity of command
Human Relations (1930-1950)	Mayo and Associates	Subordinate need of belonging, morale, group dynamics and democratic management	Morale, group dynamics and participative supervision
Behavior	Maslow	Hierarchy of needs, satisfaction of needs is motivation	Role, reference groups and leader behavior
	Herzberg	Two factory of motivation	Role, reference groups and leader behavior
	McGregor	X-Y Theory	Role, reference groups and leader behavior
Contingency and Path-Goal (1970-1980)	Fiedler	Situation plays an important role in leader behavior	Relations, task structure and position power
	P.B. Evans	Compensatory model, consistency model and mixture of the two	Relations, task structure and position power
	R.J. House	Path-Goal Theory is motivation by situation	Relations, task structure and position power

Briefly, the Classical Theory of leadership is a theory of organizational behavior (1900-1930) which adapted a human relations approach focused upon the needs of the group to provide group work effectiveness. Yet, the Human Relations Theory (1930-1950) needed Leader Behavior Theory for direction and joint goal consideration as found in the Behavioral Theory concepts. More currently, Contingency and Path-Goal Theories have organized goal structure and motivation. Two major leadership subscales have been developed in relation to the LEDQ and are related to these four basic aforementioned theories: 1) "Initiation of Structure" is the more formal classical bureaucratic subscale; and 2) "Consideration" is the more socially humanistically oriented subscale as indicated in the Human Relation Model.

Both the Behavior Model and the Contingency and Path-Goal models are combinations of Initiation of Structure and Consideration: The Behavior Model being more humanistic and the Contingency and Path-Goal Models emphasizing bureaucratic organizational role models. Perhaps, the primary difference between the democratic Human Relations Model and the bureaucratic Classical Model is the change of emphasis over the decades from leadership dialogue to contractual arrangements between the leader and subordinates. During the past thirty years, the emphasis from dialogue to contractual has increased.

The following is a brief explanation of these basic leadership subscale terms:

1. Initiation of structure refers to the leader's behavior in delineating the relationship between himself/herself and the members of his/her work group and in endeavoring to establish well-defined patterns of organizations, channels of communication, and methods of procedure.

2. Consideration refers to behavior indicative of friendship, mutual trust, respect, and warmth in the relationship between the leader and the members of his/her staff.

(Halpin: 86)

Thus, in terms of related ethical perspectives, can we afford a greater emphasis of Initiation of Structure than Consideration? Human conduct needs a balance of these two leadership dimensions (Owens: 120-125). Leon Tepper in a comprehensive study of leader behavior for a doctoral dissertation at Hofstra University from 1974-1976, concluded that union contract negotiations in public schools of New York State required balanced Consideration and Initiation of Structure at the bargaining table to prevent teacher strikes (Tepper: 292). Furthermore, Tepper concluded that LBDQ, Form XII indicated that "scores showed the principal most active in the area of Initiation of Structures and the teachers representative most active in the Consideration area, thus one finds a situation in which leadership can be shared," (Tepper: abstract p. 3) leaving time and opportunity for both leaders to analyze their combined leadership effectiveness to eliminate the strike potential.

To be as pragmatic as possible regarding ethical perspectives related to the Leadership Model, let us apply selected questions in the LBDQ, Form XII to the current choice of an educational leader; this will help to understand how Initiation of Structure and Consideration describe the current leadership models of Contingency Theory (leaders are motivated primarily by satisfaction from interpersonal relationships and task-goal accomplishment) and Path-Goal Theory (leaders function is often supplemental and the motivational impact of specific behavior is determined by subordinates pressures and demands). Next, we need to review the total

descriptive potential of the LEDQ, Form XII to show how one can determine leader productivity and follower satisfaction to yield organizational cohesiveness. (Appendix A is a synopsis of the LEDQ: Form XII questions pertaining to Initiation of Structure and Consideration; whereas, Appendix B is a chart of how these two leadership dimensions are currently related to organization cohesiveness.)

Even though we currently appear to be moving back toward the Classical bureaucratic leadership theory, this does not seem to be in tune with recent Contingency and Path-Goal Theories which are more collegial than hierarchial; this can be due to the rising ethical perspective of subordinates. Essentially, collegiality is strongly affected by social influence and the need for the individual to control himself/herself. Thus, one hopes the current trend in education is not only away from the autocratic exercise of power but toward a more effective personal involvement. In terms of organizational behavior theory, Halpin describes this collegiality as a combination of Initiation of Structure and Consideration. Such an ethical perspective for educational leaders would be more positive and functional in changing technological society.

In summary, ethical perspectives are needed to gain insight into the history of leader behavior especially as related to the current emphasis of Contingency and Path-Goal Theories. From ethical situations the education profession can analyze leadership potential traits expressed as moral outcomes. When and if this process takes place, we may be able to select professionals who reflect the ethical traits that are necessary for leadership behavior. Leadership should represent the positive relationship of the leader to the follower. Therefore, if one were to use the LEDQ, Form XII and its twelve subscales, one could determine who is best qualified for

leadership roles. High scores on both Initiation of Structure and Consideration mean positive ethical perspectives for leadership potential (See Appendix B, p. 3).

Education cannot become a finite appendage to business, corporation and government leadership behavior. Our ethics do not coincide with these aforementioned sectors. Therefore, ethical perspectives cannot allow us to become structured into computer systems and related advanced technological administrative procedures. We must maintain a high level of Consideration or the ethical values of education will be in a state of quandry and confusion.

-BIBLIOGRAPHY-

1. Aoranowitz, Susan. "The Principal of the Eighties: The Manager of Decline," NASSP Bulletin, (December 1979), 11-18.
2. Abrell, Ronald L. "Educational Leadership Without Carrot and Club," The Clearing House, 52, (February 1979), 280-285.
3. The Ohio State Leadership Studies. Leadership Behavior Descriptive Questionnaire - Form XII. Columbus, Ohio: College of Administrative Science, The Ohio State University, 1962.
4. Butler, Donald T. Four Philosophies: And Their Practice in Education and Religion, (revised ed.) New York: Harper B. Row Publishers, 1957.
5. Chazan, Barry I. and Jonas F. Soltis (eds), Moral Education. Columbia University: Teachers College Press, 1973.
6. Divoky, Diane. "Burden of the Seventies: The Management of Decline," Phi Delta Kappan, (October 1979), 87-91.
7. Gilligan, Arlene. "Elementary School Principals' Perceived Role Performance as it Relates to Analytic Style: A Study of Administrative Effectiveness," Doctoral Dissertation, Hofstra University, 1976.
8. Good, Carter V. (ed.); Winifred R. Mevial (assoc. ed.). Dictionary of Education, (3rd ed.) New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1973.
9. Halpin, Andrew. Theory & Research in Administration. New York: The MacMillan Company, 1960.
10. Hunt, James G., and Lars L. Larson (eds.). Leadership: The Cutting Edge. Carbondale and Edwardsville: Southern Illinois University Press, 1977.
11. Kneller, George F. Foundations of Education, (2nd ed.) New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1967.
12. Krajewski, Robert. "Role Effectiveness: Theory Into Practice," Theory Into Practice, XVIII, 1 (February 1979), 53-58.
13. March, James G., and Herbert A. Simon, (Harold Guetzkow, collaborator). Organization. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1958.
14. Owens, Robert G. Organizational Behavior in Schools. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1970.
15. Owens, Robert B. Organizational Behavior in Education, (2nd ed.) Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1981.
16. Pierson, Stephen L. "Democratic Administration: Another View," NASSP Bulletin, (January 1978), 21-24.

17. Price, Kingsley. Education and Philosophical Thought, (2nd ed.) Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1967.
18. Schneider, Stephen F. "The Effect of Four Basic Factors on the Leadership Behavior of High School Principals," Doctoral Dissertation, Hofstra University, 1978.
19. Sergiovanni, Thomas. "Rational, Bureaucratic, Collegial, and Political Views of the Principal's Rule," Theory Into Practice, XVIII, 1 (February 1979), 13-20.
20. Stogdill, Ralph M. Handbook of Leadership: A Survey of Theory and Research. New York: The Free Press, 1974.
21. Stogdill, Ralph M. Leadership: Abstracts and Bibliography, 1904-1974. Columbus, Ohio: College of Administrative Science, The Ohio State University, 1977.
22. Stogdill, Ralph M. Manual for the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire - Form XLI. Columbus: Ohio State University, Bureau of Business Research, 1963.
23. Tepper, Leon. "The Relationship Between District Negotiations on the Perceived Leader Behavior of the Principal and Teacher Representative in Selected New York State High Schools," Doctoral Dissertation, Hofstra University, 1976.

LEADER BEHAVIOR DESCRIPTION QUESTIONNAIRE-Form XII

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

DIRECTIONS:

- a. READ each item carefully.
- b. THINK about how frequently the leader engages in the behavior described by the item.
- c. DECIDE whether he/she (A) always, (B) often, (C) occasionally, (D) seldom or (E) never acts as described by the item.
- d. DRAW A CIRCLE around one of the five letter (A B C D E) following the item to show the answer you have selected.

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

- | | | | | | | |
|-----|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 4. | Lets group members know what is expected of them | A | B | C | D | E |
| 7. | Is friendly and approachable | A | B | C | D | E |
| 14. | Encourages the use of uniform procedures..... | A | B | C | D | E |
| 17. | Does little things to make it pleasant to be a member of the group..... | A | B | C | D | E |
| 24. | Tries out his/her ideas in the group..... | A | B | C | D | E |
| 27. | Puts suggestions made by the group into operation..... | A | B | C | D | E |
| 34. | Makes his/her attitudes clear to the group..... | A | B | C | D | E |
| 37. | Treats all group members as his/her equals..... | A | B | C | D | E |
| 44. | Decides what shall be done and how it shall be done..... | A | B | C | D | E |
| 47. | Gives advance notice of changes..... | A | B | C | D | E |
| 54. | Assigns group members to particular tasks..... | A | B | C | D | E |
| 57. | Keeps to himself/herself..... | A | B | C | D | E |
| 64. | Makes sure that his/her part in the group is understood by the group members..... | A | B | C | D | E |
| 67. | Looks out for the personal welfare of group members..... | A | B | C | D | E |
| 74. | Schedules the work to be done..... | A | B | C | D | E |
| 77. | Is willing to make changes..... | A | B | C | D | E |
| 84. | Maintains definite standards of performance..... | A | B | C | D | E |
| 87. | Refuses to explain his/her actions..... | A | B | C | D | E |
| 94. | Asks that group members follow standard rules and regulations..... | A | B | C | D | E |
| 97. | Acts without consulting the group..... | A | B | C | D | E |

Appendix B

LEADER BEHAVIOR DESCRIPTION QUESTIONNAIRE - Form XII

The Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ) was designed for use in obtaining descriptions of a leader by the group members whom he supervises or for use in describing his own behavior. It provides scores of subscales on twelve dimensions of behavior.

1. Representation - speaks and acts as the representative of the group. (5 items)
*Acts as the spokesperson of the group.
2. Demand Reconciliation - reconciles conflicting demands and reduces disorder to system. (5 items)
*Handles complex problems efficiently.
3. Tolerance of Uncertainty - is able to tolerate uncertainty and postponement without anxiety or upset. (10 items)
*Waits patiently for the results of a decision.
4. Persuasiveness - uses persuasion and argument effectively; exhibits strong convictions. (10 items)
*Makes pep talks to stimulate the group.
5. Initiation of Structure - clearly defines own role, and lets followers know what is expected. (10 items)
*Lets group members know what is expected of them.
6. Tolerance of Freedom - allows followers scope for initiative, decision, and action. (10 items)
*Permits the members to use their own judgment in solving problems.
7. Role Assumption - actively exercises the leadership role rather than surrendering leadership to others. (10 items)
*Is hesitant about taking initiative in the group.
8. Consideration - regards the comfort, well-being, status, and contributions of followers. (10 items)
*Is friendly and approachable.
9. Production Emphasis - applies pressure for productive output. (10 items)
*Encourages overtime work.
10. Predictive Accuracy - exhibits foresight and ability to predict outcomes accurately. (5 items)
*Makes accurate decisions.

- 11. Integration - maintains a closely knit organization; resolves intermember conflicts. (5 items)
*Keeps the group working together as a team.
- 12. superior Orientation - maintains cordial relations with superiors; has influence with them; is striving for higher status. (10 items)
*Gets along well with the people above him/her.

*Sample item from questionnaire

The twelve dimensions of behavior can be classified into two groups of behaviors; person-oriented and work oriented.

Consideration

Person-oriented Leader Behaviors

Work-oriented Leader Behaviors

Demand Reconciliation
 Tolerance of Uncertainty
 Tolerance of Freedom
 Consideration
 Predictive Accuracy
 Integration

Representation
 Persuasiveness
 Initiation of Structure
 Role Retention
 Production Emphasis
 Influence with Superiors

Group productivity is somewhat more highly related to structure than consideration.

Member satisfaction is somewhat more highly related to consideration than structure.

Group cohesiveness is related about equally to consideration and structure

Consideration and structure interact to influence productivity and satisfaction.

The most effective leaders tend to be described high on both scales.

Initiation of Structure

P
R
O
D
U
C
T
I
V
I
T
Y

Person-oriented behaviors, more often than work-oriented behaviors are negatively associated with productivity.

Group productivity tends to respond favorably to person-oriented leadership under conditions of medium structure and stress.

Work-oriented behaviors indicates that these styles of leadership are more often than not related positively to productivity

Group productivity tends to be enhanced by a work-oriented style of leadership under conditions of very low or very high structure and stress.

Consideration

- F S Person-oriented patterns of leadership tend to enhance employee satisfaction.
- O A
- L T
- L I Person-oriented leadership tends to increase member satisfaction in small, interaction-oriented groups.
- O S
- W F
- E A Work-oriented behaviors, with the exception of initiating structure, tend to depress satisfaction.
- R C
- T
- I Work-oriented leadership is associated with member satisfaction in large, task-oriented groups.
- O N

Initiation of Structure and Consideration

- C Person-oriented behaviors, with the exception of permissiveness, tend to strengthen group cohesiveness.
- O H
- E
- S Among the person-oriented behaviors, those providing freedom for member participation in group activities and showing concern for followers' welfare and comfort are consistently related to group cohesiveness.
- I
- V
- E
- N Among the work-oriented behaviors, the pattern that structures member expectations is uniformly related to group cohesiveness.
- E S
- S

Initiation of Structure and Consideration Axis

50 Point Maximum	3 - + A B	1 + + A B
38 M (IS)		
40 M (C)		
+ = M	4 - + A B	2 + - A B
- = M		

Summary: Theorist and Applied TheoryFredrick W. Taylor -

Fredrick W. Taylor was a Classical Theorist with a scientific and engineering background who was influenced by Woodrow Wilson. He was interested in lowering the unitary cost of factory production. His ideas led to time and motion studies. Frank B. Gilberth's book Cheaper by the Dozen was influenced by Taylor. Minimal interpersonal contacts were stressed. Man was viewed as an extension of factory machinery.

Max Weber -

Weber was a Classical Theorist who produced a useful durable, brilliant work on administrative systems - bureaucracy. He felt a well run bureaucracy would be fairer, more impartial, more predictable, and more rational than powerful individuals.

Abraham Maslow -

The concept of human need is central to Maslow's Theory. Maslow conceptualized a hierarchy of needs arranged in order of strength. The appearance of higher needs usually depends upon the satisfaction of lower needs. Maslow's list of human needs in order from 1-5 are:

1. Physiological needs.
2. Safety needs.
3. Love needs.
4. Esteem needs.
5. Need for self-actualization.

Frederick Herzberg -

Herzberg was a part of the Human Relations Movement in Administrative Theory. Herzberg feels the maturing of group dynamics in management has added to the range of available motivational inducements. Man's compelling urge to realize his own potentiality by continuous psychological growth. He/she places a great deal of emphasis on group morale.

Herzberg's two factory Theory of Motivation contained:
1) motivational factors that lead to job satisfaction; and 2) maintenance factors which must be present for motivational factors to come into play. When maintenance factors are not sufficiently present motivational blockage can occur and job dissatisfaction may follow.

Douglas McGregor -

McGregor's X, Y Theory drew heavily on Maslow's Theory.

McGregor's X Theory -

Average human being has an inherent dislike for work and will avoid it if he or she can. Because of this the human must be coerced, controlled, directed to force them to put adequate effort. The average human wants security above all else.

McGregor's Y Theory -

If work is satisfying, it is as neutral as play. If people are committed to the organizations goals, they will exercise self-direction and self-control toward the attainment of those goals. The average human being learns to seek and accept responsibility under proper conditions. Creativity, ingenuity and imagination are widespread.

Administrators who accept McGregor's X Theory will differ from those who accept Y in the way they deal with people.

X and Y are assumptions upon which individuals are likely to base their view of humankind.

Andrew Halpin -

Andrew Halpin was a Behavioral Theorist who believed personality was to the individual what organization's climate is to the organization. Behavior is a function of organizational role and personality. The concept of organizational climate is a useful way of viewing organizational behavior in schools. It allows for development of strategies for directing and controlling behavior more effectively. The person and the organizational environment are component parts of one situations. They are inseparable.

Fred Fiedler -

Reviews of research literature have shown that neither the structuring nor the considerate leader is consistently more effective. Participative management has been effective in some situations but not in others. Fiedler's Contingency Theory indicates the situation plays an important part in shaping leader behavior.

Fiedler sought to classify different situations in terms of favorableness to the leader. He believes that leadership performance depends as much upon the organization as it does on the leaders own attributes.

P. B. Evans

Evans identified three major types of leadership contingency models. The first of these, the compensatory model, proposes that certain aspects of organizational structure must be compensated by certain leadership style. The second is opposite: a consistency style. The third is a mixture of the two.

R. J. House

Characteristics of personality act in combination with situational factors to cause behavior.

The Path-Goal Theory proposed by House derived from earlier work of Evans, first states the leader's function is a supplemental one. Secondly, the motivational impact of specific leader behavior is determined by the situation.

The Path-Goal Theory is intended to explain the relationship between leader behavior and the motivations of subordinates.