

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 411 569

EA 028 164

AUTHOR Thomas, Vernadine  
TITLE What Research Says about Administrators' Management Style, Effectiveness, and Teacher Morale.  
PUB DATE 1997-01-00  
NOTE 44p.  
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070)  
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.  
DESCRIPTORS Academic Achievement; Administrator Effectiveness; Administrator Role; Elementary Secondary Education; \*Leadership; \*Leadership Styles; Participative Decision Making; \*Principals; \*Teacher Administrator Relationship; \*Teacher Morale

ABSTRACT

Over the past 50 years, theoretical and methodological problems have plagued the study of leadership. This paper reviews the literature in the areas of leadership; leadership theories; leadership styles; and the effect of principal leadership on teachers' morale, performance, and student achievement. The literature shows that principal leadership styles and leadership effectiveness are related to teachers' morale and performance; and that leadership styles and principal effectiveness affect teachers' job dimensions, which in turn mediate low teacher morale. Teachers are uplifted by principals who effectively define the school mission, manage the instructional program, and promote a positive school-learning climate. In addition, a collaborative leadership style has the greatest impact on teacher morale. (Contains 126 references.) (LMI)

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

ED 411 569

WHAT RESEARCH SAYS ABOUT ADMINISTRATORS' MANAGEMENT STYLE,  
EFFECTIVENESS AND TEACHER MORALE

Vernadine Thomas

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
Office of Educational Research and Improvement  
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 docu-  
ment do not necessarily represent official  
OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND  
DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL  
HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

*V. Thomas*

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES  
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

A 088 164



# WHAT RESEARCH SAYS ABOUT ADMINISTRATORS' MANAGEMENT STYLE, EFFECTIVENESS AND TEACHER MORALE

Vernadine Thomas

The review of related literature for this study covers four major sections. The first section of the chapter is an overview of leadership. The second section is the background of leadership theories. The third area includes a review of the research and definitions of the leadership styles. Lastly, the review on the effect of principal leadership will be discussed, as well as the impact on teachers' morale, performance and students' achievements.

## Leadership

Over the past 50 years, theoretical and methodological problems have plagued the study of leadership. The majority of the studies on leaders were done in industrial and military settings. Scholars have spent considerable time and energy trying to identify the characteristics of effective leaders. One indication of this work is Stogdill's Handbook of Leadership compiled by Bass (1981). The early principal studies borrowed heavily from the leadership studies in industrial and organizational psychology. The principal has undergone a gradual transition from that of principal - teacher to general administrative agent of the school (Stronge, 1990, p.1). Goodlad (1978) surmised that prior to 1950, principal's work was characterized by an orientation toward instructional management (pp.322 - 331). However, the more recent studies of principals have emphasized the special context and mission of schools which give policymakers and others more time on programs which have been designed to improve leadership skills (Bolman and Deal, 1990).

School leadership emerges from a variety of sources. These effects can be seen in the awakening in much of industry to the people side of its enterprise, in corporate mission statements, in professional education, and in the established community programs dedicated to leadership. Acknowledgment of the impact of principals' leadership behaviors on school outcomes has generated an extensive body of research over the past decade (Leithwood, Begley, and Cousins, 1991).

Due to extensive research, the principalship has been recognized as a critical element in school improvement and reform (Fullan, 1991; Saskin, 1988). Fullan states that school reform legislation echoes the new view of leadership that was being addressed by corporate America and believes that this reform and restructuring movement calls for more accountability which utilizes participating decision-making and collaboration techniques.

Recent research by Leithwood and Jantz (1990); and Leithwood, Jantz, Silins, and Dart (1992) indicates that school leadership is mediated in its effects on school and student outcomes by in-school processes such as school goals, school culture, and teachers. Direct impact of leadership on school and student outcomes was found to be insignificant, whereas the mediated effects were quite significant.

### **Leadership Theories**

The literature on leadership theory is vast. There are a variety of leadership theories on the selection of administrators for positions at all levels. Still leadership itself is a hazy and perplexing phenomenon (Bennis, 1959). This was shown by the number of definitions of

“leadership” (Cummings 1971). Leadership descriptions support this writer’s study as the process of influencing thoughts, behaviors and feelings of others in pursuit of common goals.

Barnard (1938) was one of the earlier theorists to state that the behavior of an individual in a formal organization can be evaluated from the perspectives of the individual and the organization. He contends that an action is effective if it accomplishes its specific objective, and efficient, if it satisfies the motives underlying the immediate objectives. Personal behavior can be effective and not be efficient, if the objective is accomplished without satisfying the personal motives behind it.

Beginning in the 1950’s, a growing number of studies turned their attention also to leadership behavior. This increased attention paralleled the powerful behavioral movement in psychology and education which asserted that all observable phenomena could be understood by being divided into components that would then be individually studied (Tye, 1994).

According to Tye (1994), behavioral studies in the area of leadership lead to a number of useful models. A key point in the early development of models and theories of leadership was made by Lewin and Lippitt in 1938. They suggested that three different approaches to leadership can be distinguished: (1) autocratic, which is characterized as directive and task-oriented; (2) democratic, which is seen as participative and process and relationship-oriented; and (3) laissez-faire, which is said to be non-directive and lacking formal leadership (Lewin, Lippitt, and White, 1960).

Another major model of thinking about leadership emerged out of the work of Getzels and Guba in the 1950s. In their approach to thinking about organizations, they suggested two major dimensions: the idiographic and the nomothetic. Getzels and Guba (1957) theorized that

an organization should be considered in terms of the needs of the organization, its tasks and its production structures, and the personal needs and values of its members. This model of organizations resulted in the establishment of the two-dimensional paradigm for analyzing and theorizing about leadership phenomenon.

Many studies in the 1950s and 1960s, especially doctoral dissertations in educational administration, were based on the work of Hemphill (1950) and the Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire. In this work, the two factors were titled, Consideration and Initiation of Structure. Consideration deals with the extent of the leader's concern for the welfare of group members. Initiation of structure addresses the extent to which the leader organizes and defines the work of the group.

McGregor (1960) developed the Theory X / Theory Y Model in which he states that Theory X leadership resembles authoritarian behavior and is based on the assumption that the power of the leader comes from the position he or she occupies, and that people are basically lazy and unreliable. Conversely, Theory Y leadership resembles democratic behavior and assumes that the power of leaders is granted to them by those they are to lead, and that people are basically over self-directed and creative if properly motivated.

Teacher performance may be contingent on leadership style and the degree to which the leader has control and influence in a particular situation. The effectiveness of a leader's style depends on the interaction of the leader's behavior with more than one situational variable.

Fiedler (1967) developed a leadership contingency model from which three major situational factors were derived. These factors in interaction with one another, determine the best leadership style for a situation. The first factor, leader-member relations, refers to a leader's

personal relations with subordinates. Teacher-principal relations can affect performance outcomes.

The second of Fiedler's situational factors is task structure, which is discussed specifically as the degree of structure in the task that the group has been assigned to perform. Faculties overburdened with paperwork and reporting mechanisms often described their work as structured.

Fiedler's third factor is leader position power. It is the power of the position itself. In this case, the position is the power of the principalship within a given school, not the power of the principal.

The above researchers stated that different leadership styles work better with different combinations of the three factors and rather than seeing a leader as constant. They hypothesized that the leader must be able to "adapt" his or her approach to a particular situation.

In education, the contingency theory has been advocated and spread by Hershey and Blanchard (1977) and their Situational Leadership Model. In this model, the two-dimensions of task and relationship are again used; however, the grid established by these two dimensions is divided into four quadrants. Then another dimension is added, which is an estimate of the "maturity" of the organization. In the situational leadership model, it is proposed that the leader's behavior needs to be different in terms of the emphasis reflected in each quadrant, depending on the maturity of the followers.

With each model, there is an assertion that leaders range along the dimensions of task and relationship, from having a little to a lot of each dimension. The scaling in the Blake and Mouton model goes from 0 to 10, with the "10/10" leader having a high emphasis on both the

task and relationship dimensions. Contingency theorists suggest that the balancing of what is optimal needs to be adjusted according to the situation, yet they still scale each dimension from a little to a lot. A key assumption in these models is that the leader is able to change his or her overall style to fit a particular situation. This assumption was questioned several years ago (e.g., Rutherford, Hord, Huling, and Hall, 1983). However, this assumption also leads to one of the hypotheses in this study.

The transformational and transactional leadership model (Bass, 1985; Bass and Avolio, 1988, 1990) offers a range of leader behaviors that have been shown to promote change and desired outcomes outside of educational settings (Bass, 1985; Waldman, Bass, and Einstein, 1987; Yammarino and Bass, 1990). The proponent of this model, Bass, has advocated transformational leadership for successful organizational change and improved performance.

The transformational leader is one who motivates followers to perform above expectations. Three factors determine the behavioral components of transformational leadership and define it (Bass, 1985, Waldman et al., 1987):

- (1) Charisma/inspiration--This is the degree to which the leader creates enthusiasm in followers, sees what is really important, and transmits a sense of mission to the organization.
- (2) Intellectual Stimulation--This is the degree to which the leader provides intellectual and problem-oriented guidance. The leader arouses followers to think in new ways (Bass, Waldman, Avolio, and Bebb, 1987).
- (3) Individual consideration--This is the degree to which the leader is concerned with the individual needs of followers.



The transactional leader is one who motivates followers to perform at their levels of expectation and to achieve satisfaction of basic needs. Two factors determine the behavioral components of transactional leadership and define it (Bass, 1985; Waldman et al, 1987):

- (1) Contingent reward--This is the degree to which the leader makes clear what the follower must accomplish in order to be rewarded.
- (2) Management-by-exception--This is the degree to which the leader provides negative feedback for failure to meet agreed-upon standards.

Bass's model of transformational and transactional leadership has a number of implications for the current reform movement in education. According to the model, principals exhibiting transformational leadership behaviors will be more effective in bringing about desired outcomes, such as faculty development, improved teaching and learning, collaborative decision making, and responsive and innovative environments, than those exhibiting predominantly transactional leadership behaviors.

### **Leadership Styles**

A long history of research on leadership and leadership style has resulted in many theories with respect to the behaviors associated with it. To some degree, all research on leadership styles prior to Burn's (1978) introduction of the concepts of transformational versus transactional leadership could be conceived of as being about democratic, autocratic, or laissez-faire leadership, which takes us back to where it all began in 1938 with Lewin and Lippitt's seminal experiment. Each of these three styles is described by either the amount of overall

activity of the leaders or the extent to which the leaders are leaning toward being completely work oriented or completely person oriented.

The results of the studies clearly showed democratic leadership to be superior to autocratic and laissez-faire leadership. Although autocratic leadership produces the greatest quantity of product, the product tends to be of such poor quality as to be nearly useless. Laissez-faire leadership produces both poor quality and quantity (Lippitt and White, 1938). The importance from the above study showed an increased interest in the leadership behavior studies in contrast to leadership trait studies which resulted in divergence from the one-continuum model of Lippitt and White to the development of the two-dimensional leadership model for which Halpin is famous (Halpin, 1959). Halpin's model, as stated earlier, identified two major dimensions of leadership behavior that predict subordinate performance.

Leithwood and Montgomery (1986) identified four levels of leadership behavior, each with a different focus and style and each with different consequences for principal effectiveness. They found that the "higher" the level of principal behavior the more effective the school. Effectiveness was defined as gains in student achievement in the "basics" and increases in student self-direction and problem solving.

Each of the levels represents increasingly complex and effective principalship behaviors. For example, principals functioning at level one - the Administrator, believe that it is the teacher's job to teach and the principal's job to run the school. Principals functioning at level two - the Humanitarian, believe that the basis of a sound education is a good interpersonal climate. Principals functioning at level three - the Program Manager, believe that their job is to provide the best possible programs for students. Principals functioning at level four - the

Systematic Problem Solver, are committed to doing whatever is necessary by way of invention and delivery in order to give students the best possible chance to learn.

Important to Liethwood and Montgomery's formulation is the concept of level. What administrators do at level one is not necessarily ineffective, only less effective than the other three levels if this behavior pattern is dominant. They contend that Humanitarians at level two carry with them some of the Administrator's style but focus primarily on more complex behaviors that emphasize human relationships. The researchers continue to state that Humanitarians are more effective than Administrators, but not as effective as Program Managers. And, finally, the Strategic Problem Solvers focus primarily on student's success.

Leithwood and Montgomery's research suggest that as principals come to view their jobs in more complex ways they become more effective operating at higher levels of practice.

More recently, in contrast, Hall (1987) has hypothesized that the two-dimensional model of leadership is not complete. He has described a third dimension of leadership called maturity dimension which is utilized by the Initiator style principals.

The Initiator style principals seem to be driven in many ways to obtain their vision, working towards the vision being the priority. Their efforts are centered on what they see as being best for student learning and the school as a whole. At the same time, in the self critiques of the steps they have taken, they have moments of remorse for the feelings of teachers that have been hurt and wonder about whether or not they are doing the "right" thing. Yet their longer term vision of school priorities provides an overriding absoluteness to the images of where they are heading rather than becoming paralyzed with uncertainties (p.5).

In Wood's (1979) version of the three leadership styles, he states that a school with an autocratic principal leaves little or no provision for the organization of committees to participate in decision-making. He contends that the autocratic leadership works against our society's concept of the importance of the individual. Secondly, that the principal under laissez-faire leadership provides no guidelines for such established committees. Thirdly, that the democratic leader is not one who sits on his hands every time a decision must be made, but rather utilizes his or her own competencies as an educational leader as well as the opinions of the well-informed.

Woods is also in agreement with the earlier researchers Lippitt and White, whose 1930 study states that the most promising leadership style belong to teachers who expect to work in an atmosphere of democracy. While, on the other hand, Knezevich (1969) argues that teachers find it difficult to accept the democratic style of leadership, if most of their professional career has been spent under an autocratic or manipulative style of leadership.

In contrast, the accent on democracy is especially poignant for school principals who have faced a reform agenda for nearly a decade, and who are currently being asked to restructure the form and content of the school (Calabrese, 1994). He also states that principals can play a critical role in the process by leading faculty members and students in rediscovering the meaning of democracy.

Grumet (1989) has also noted that teachers, more than ever before, are interested in professional control over the content and methods of teaching those youngsters with whom they work. According to Grumet, burnout "is less about being overworked than about feeling responsible for the experiences of children and forbidden to shape that experience" (p. 21).

Maxcey concludes that the teachers and administrators, as a new breed of intellectuals, must link creative design and rational, reflective deliberation so that the goals of education are achieved and students profit from the enterprise.

Kaiser (1985) describes autocratic leadership as characterized by close supervision, task orientation, criticism, and punishment for poor performance (p.19). This leads to Gallmeir (1992) who cites a literature review which reveals that the early organization-behavior theory is dominated by the scientific management movement in which the worker is viewed as a passive instrument of management which leads to one of increased concern of human motivations in organizations.

Hadley and Andrews (1978) surveyed the psychological backgrounds of leadership style. According to the authors, they used instruments to focus on the leadership style needed for authority and focus of control. Comparisons were made to determine the extent to which leadership styles were similar and to discover what intellectual processes were used in decision-making. The data demonstrates that the administrators generally have a strong need for power, have authoritarian personalities, have an internal focus of control, and have cognitive processes based upon personal ideology. A literature review provides background on administrator characteristics and leadership, and the survey instruments are appended. Evidence seems to indicate that the authoritarian personality may be fundamentally insecure.

The laissez-faire style of leadership grants complete freedom to group or individual decision making without leader anticipation or direction. Laissez-faire is a "leaderless" social situation. For example, in the autocratic style of leadership the leader determines policy and

assigns tasks to members without consulting them. Wood (1979) contends that the principal under laissez-faire leadership would provide no guidelines for such established committees.

Earlier researchers such as Moser (1957) seem to have coined the term “transactional” to describe the style where there is recognition that social system goals must be carried out. The researcher earlier examined the leadership behavior of principals. School superintendents and principals were interviewed throughout the twelve school systems. Findings were that teachers and superintendents have markedly different leadership expectations for the principal and the principal's behaviors varies depending on whether she or he is interacting with superiors or subordinates. With superiors, she or he stressed nomothetic behaviors (organizational dimension) and with subordinates she or he stressed idiographic behavior (personal dimension). The findings relate towards the idiographic behavior (personal dimension).

The findings relate towards the idiographic of the present study being written. In agreement with Moser, Knezevich (1969) seems to feel that the transactional leader appreciates the need to achieve institutional goals, but at the same time hopes that individual personalities will not be violated as they strive toward these goals.

However, Getzels and Guba (1957) contend that the interplay between task and relationship affects each leadership behavior. They describe these behaviors as transactional tasks assigned to them by the organization. This was seen as a possible way to explain different levels of leadership effectiveness, depending on how well the needs of both the organization and individual were met. Getzels and Guba viewed these two dimensions as interdependent in terms of convincing followers to accomplish institutional goals, with the leader motivating followers by matching individual's needs.

A current researcher Silins (1992) states that transactional leadership leads to change in schools. The author suggested, however, that transactional leadership may become a component of transformational leadership when used in a charismatic or inspirational manner.

Silins also suggests that the transactional construct could be more useful in explaining leadership in education, if redefined in terms of managerial and instructional tasks together with teacher empowerment, rather than by exchange theory. It was concluded that, regardless of the leadership constructs employed in studying school improvements, a more fundamental problem may exist, if the model of leadership for school reform does not take into account processes within the school that operate to mediate the impact of school leadership on school outcomes.

Two factors determine the behavioral components of transactional leadership (Bass, 1965; Waldman, 1987): contingent reward and management-by-exception. The former, according to Bass (1988) is the degree to which the leader makes clear what the follower must accomplish in order to be rewarded. He defines management-by-exception as the degree to which the leader provides negative feedback for failure to meet agreed upon standards.

Bass (1985), however, contended that most leaders exhibit both transformational and transactional leadership in varying degrees. Transformational leadership augments transactional leadership by focusing on the development of followers as well as addressing the goals of the leader, follower, group, and organization.

Etzioni (1961, 1975) in her studies, showed that in normative organizations, such as schools, the use of strategies based on positive normative power by administrators may enhance teachers' moral involvement. The analysis of the data in the study provides substantial evidence of deeper levels of teachers' affective, cognitive, and behavioral involvement in their work. The

critical importance of teachers' strong moral involvement to achieving educational and social goals with students has been recognized by others (Dreehen, 1968; Greenfield, 1991; Lortie, 1975; Waller, 1932; and Wynne, 1987).

A comparison of normative - instrumental leadership with Burns' (1978) discussion of transactional and transformational (moral) leadership styles reveals important conceptual differences on both counts. In transactional leadership, Burns states that leaders and followers both work to achieve individual and separate goals. In contrast, transformational leadership, which is fundamentally moral, emerges from the needs, aspirations and values of followers and results in mutuality of purposes between leaders and followers.

Burns (1978) also contended that "transforming leadership is ultimately a relationship of mutual stimulation and elevation that converts followers into leaders" (p. 4). As stated by the researcher, analysis of the present data set indicates that reported relationships between open/effective principals and teachers in the study were grounded largely in the goal of control and that such control was enacted primarily through a process of exchange. This conclusion is consistent with Burns' notion of transactional leadership. However, it was also argued that the control goal and process of exchange do not fully explain the political efficacy of open/effective principals and their positive impact on teachers. Conceptually most of the data fell between the idea of transactional leadership, in which exchanges serve the "separate" interest of leaders and followers, and the idea of transformational leadership, in which actions transform teachers into leaders, who possess decisional authority and responsibility.



On the one hand, the concept of normative - instrumental leadership, by emphasizing teachers' moral involvement (Etzioni, 1961, 1975), extends well beyond Burns' (1978) idea of transactional leadership.

In the past, instructional leadership by the principal has been the subject of numerous educational writings. Current literature on leadership presents a newer understanding of the principal's role as a transformational leader. Sergiovanni (1991) states that initially, transformative leadership takes the form of leadership by building. "Here the focus is on arousing human potential, satisfying higher order needs, and raising expectations of both the leader and follower in a manner that motivates both to higher levels of commitment and performance" (Sergiovanni, 1991, p. 126).

According to Bass, principals exhibiting transformational leadership behaviors will be more effective in bringing about desired outcomes, such as faculty development, improved teaching and learning, collaborative decision-making, and responsive and innovative environments, than those exhibiting predominantly transactional leadership. Schools with predominantly transformational leadership are expected to be purposeful and collaborative, with a greater number of staff and faculty operating in an empowered and leaderlike manner, than those with predominantly transactional leadership (Bass, 1987).

The principal has been identified as the determining factor in whether or not shared decision making can become a successful approach to school improvement (Littlefield, 1991).

Research supports the thought that with more decision-making opportunities, teachers' morale and productivity improve (Johnston & Germinario, 1985). The traditional opportunities for decision making afforded teachers have done little to advance the professionalism of teachers,

or to involve teachers in critical educational concern. Still, another researcher investigated the relationship between principal leadership style and teacher participation in decision making. Braddy (1991) states that a teacher perception of the strength of leadership style was a factor in teacher participation in the decision making. The researcher also states that the stronger the teacher's perception of the effectiveness of the principal's leadership, the greater the teacher's participation in decision between desired and actual participation. This finding indicates that the teacher's perception of the strength of the leadership style of the principal is related to the amount of participation the teacher experiences in decision making.

In a study which Littlefield conducted to identify factors which administrators and teachers perceive to be supportive in the implementation of shared decision making, the most important factor to both groups was the support of the principal.

This finding could also be considered important to this writer's current hypothesis. While in the same vein, Mitchell and Varner (1990) see organizational transformation in which there is an empowerment - effectiveness connection as a requirement for change in the decision making process.

Several researchers have examined effects of transformational leadership styles on educational institutions. These reports (Leithwood, 1990, 1992; Sagor 1992; Rogers, 1992) describe positive changes in the interaction of teachers and administrators resulting from the implementation of transformational leadership practices within schools. Many studies in the affective domain (Blaise & Blaise, 1994; Kirby, 1991; Heck & Marcoulides, 1993) note changes in teacher attitudes relating to schools which can be directly or indirectly linked to transformational leadership practices. Transformational leadership by contrast, arises when

leaders are more concerned about gaining overall cooperation and energetic participation from organization members than they are in ascertaining whether or not particular tasks are performed. Leithwood, Kenneth, et al, (1992) state “school leadership is operationally defined by transformational and transactional concepts” (p. 10).

Brown (1993) discusses the characteristics of transformational leadership and its impact on the organizational culture and effectiveness of schools while, Mitchell and Tucker (1992) state that high performance depends on transforming student and teacher attitudes and beliefs in order for leadership to become dominant in school improvement. There is hard evidence that transformational leadership makes a difference. The evidence is both substantial and positive in noneducational organizations, but only a handful of studies in educational settings, in addition to the author’s own have been reported (Kirby, et al, 1991).

In a seeming extension of both Burns’ transformational leader concept and of the notion of creative insubordination, Vanderstoep, Anderson and Midgley (1991) studied the relationship of principal venturesomeness to school culture, to teacher commitment, and to student commitment. Venturesomeness was defined as the extent to which a teacher saw the principal as displaying risk-taking behavior, courageous decision making, or other activities indicative of an achievement-oriented leader.

Vanderstoep and colleagues argued, that principals who often take risks and are goal-oriented would be more likely to stress accomplishment, mastery, and high achievement than principals who take risks and work to maintain the status quo.

The writers state that while a not significant relationship was found between teacher commitment and student commitment, principal venturesomeness was a strong predictor of an

“accomplishment culture” (stress on excellence, peer pressure to do a good job, encouragement to make suggestions about how the school could be improved); and that, in turn was a strong predictor of teacher commitment (identifying with the school, taking pride in being a part of the school, and having a strong sense of ownership in the school). This will certainly give impetus to the leadership styles and hypotheses of this study which will add to the rich genre of leadership style.

### **Instructional Leadership Behavior**

Earlier researchers state that the idea that different leadership behaviors are associated with different organizational outcomes has appeared in the writing of Stogdill (1974), Gross and Herriot (1965), Getzels, Lipham and Campbell (1968), Tennenbaum and Massarik (1968), Sanford (1974) and others. In school settings the performance and satisfaction of teachers may be influenced by the leadership behavior of the principal (Grassie and Caress, 1972; Carpenter, 1971).

Lipham (1976) stated that the principal is a key figure in the decision to adopt any educational innovation in the schools. After his review of principals' roles in the Individually Guided Educational Leader, most develop the understandings and skills required to initiate, manage and sustain the educational change process. Goodlad (1976) states that principals probably can do more than any other to encourage and support the kind of school-by-school reconstruction we need. The principals are the key to change.

The principal is but one of many people in the school who exert an influence upon the school's learning climate. This dimension focuses on the ways in which the principal can influence the attitudes and beliefs of others in the school with respect to student achievement. It

is comprised of several functions: establishment of high expectations for students, establishment of academic standards and incentives for learning, protection of instructional improvement and professional development (Hallinger, Murphy, Weil, Mesa and Metman, 1983, p. 83-91).

The principal has control over several policy areas that have an impact upon the staff's expectations: student grouping, remediation, grading, reporting student progress and classroom instructional practices (p. 88)

The National Principalship Study by Gross and Herriot (1965) investigated the Executive Professional Leadership (EPL) of elementary school principals. This study found a definite connection between elementary school principals and three criteria of the principal's effectiveness: (1) staff morale; (2) professional performance of teachers; and (3) pupil learning. This study was based on a study which sought to measure the degree to which the number of curriculum innovations in selected Michigan public junior high schools were associated with administrative leadership. Jacobs (1965) concluded that the most significant factor in encouraging curriculum change is the behavior that the principal employs in his relationship with the other staff members. The implication of this study emphasized that one of the important factors instituting educational change is the leadership behavior of the principal (Jacobs, 1965).

For Barth (1984), the principal has a critical effect on school climate and productivity by way of interaction with teachers. He considered the relationship of the principal and teachers as having the greatest effect on the quality of life in a school.

Current researchers such as Lewellen (1990) included four essential characteristics for effective leadership:

1. Strategic planning: employing both short-term and long-term goals,

2. Shaping change: being active instead of reactive to change, thus helping to shape changes,
3. Constant communication: listening, seeking, and sharing information with various constituencies, and
4. Timely decision making.

NASSP's Assessment Center project has identified 10 key skills every principal should possess in order to be successful. The skills are:

- Problem analysis
- Judgement
- Organizational ability
- Decisiveness
- Leadership sensitivity
- Stress tolerance
- Oral communication
- Range of interest
- Personal motivation
- Educational values (1990, p.48-65)

According to Lipham and Fruth (1976), instructional leadership is defined as those behaviors of an individual which initiate new goals, structures and relationships in the instructional programs (p. 63).

Reitzus (1989), in examining the syntheses of the research on instructionally effective schools, (high-achieving inner-city schools attended predominately by students from low-income

families) states that there are several characteristics pertaining to principals in these schools that consistently emerge. Principals in instructionally effective schools

1. are instructional leaders;
2. have clearly communicated and frequently emphasized goals for their schools;
3. communicate high expectations for both teachers and students (see, e.g. Bossert et al., 1982; Clark et al., 1980; Persell et al., 1982; Parkey and Smith, 1982; Shoemaker and Fraser, 1981).

Specifically examined were principal-teacher interactions in instructionally effective schools and in ordinary elementary schools.

The characteristics of instructional leadership interactions in effective schools were compared with those from ordinary schools. Quantitatively, there were more principal-teacher-instructional leadership interactions and a greater amount of time spent in such interactions in the instructionally effective school. The principal teachers in the instructionally effective school had 51.5% more instructional leadership interactions and spent over twice as much time in such interactions.

In the effective school, principal support for teachers was evident in 56.0% of the interactions while it was present in only 18.2% of the instructional leadership interactions in the ordinary school. Reitzus (1989) contends that a large quantity of principal-teacher interaction may be necessary for a principal to influence the activities that take place in an organization.

The findings of this study indicated that there was substantially more interaction in the effective school than in the ordinary school. The effective school was characterized by a high degree of support and necessity of the principal for the teachers.

The importance of this research relates to the writer's current study. To have an effect on teachers' morale, findings indicated that the edge in interactions consisted of social/personal interactions and instructional leadership interactions and that the principals need to be visible, interact frequently with the staff, be around when they are, care about them, and interact with them as a person and as a professional.

### **The Effect of Principal Leadership**

Misker (1978) contends that the process of administration becomes an important leader effectiveness criterion. Subjective judgments of the leader by subordinates, peers and supervisors yield a second effectiveness type. Leadership effectiveness, therefore, has an objective dimension-accomplishment goals-and a subjective-dimension. Studies by Bossert, Dwyer, Rowan and Lee (1982) conclude after reviewing the literature that administrative behavior of principals is important to school effectiveness.

Researchers have been investigating the topic of organizational effectiveness for over 100 years (Lewin and Minton, 1986). To date, the research on school effectiveness has identified the number of factors that appear important in identifying effective schools. One factor that appears consistently in all of the studies is principal leadership. Wright and Renihan (1985) note that principal leadership is critical in influencing how effective a school will be. There is a well-documented body of literature in educational administration (Fullan, 1982; Geering, 1980; Leithwood and Montgomery, 1981; Lipham, 1977) indicating the importance of the principal on many varied aspects of school operations.

Further support for investigating the situational context of the principal comes from the work of Rowan, Bossart, and Dwyer (1983). They suggest the feasibility of using contingency



theory (most appropriate leadership in terms of follower outcomes) to analyze the varying effects of the organization.

The more recent literature on school effectiveness concludes that there are structural differences among schools that affect students' academic achievement. Studies on the determinants of achievement have been concerned with variables relating how school districts are structured and make decisions, the process of change in schools and school districts.

The effective schools literature has consistently identified principals as central figures in fostering schools that successfully educate students (Andrew & Soder, 1987; Leithwood, Jantzi, Silins & Dart, 1992; Showmaker & Fraser, 1981; Southworth, 1990; Weber, 1971). In order to be effective, principals are expected to be proactive and resourceful and to have personal visions that guide them in setting priorities, so they are not consumed by organizational maintenance requirements (Blumberg & Greenfield, 1980; Dwyer, Lee, Rowan & Bossart, 1983). Principals must plan their time to enable them to spend most of it in instructional leadership activities, student teacher relationships, professional development, and parent-principal contact, whereas management should be de-emphasized (Manasse, 1985; Mortimore, Sammons, Stoll, Lewis & Ecob, 1988).

Boyd and Crowan (1981) argued that school administrators behave the way they do because their organizations are "domesticated".

Martin and Willower (1981) offered an alternative explanation for principals' behavior. They proposed a model of "sectional control", where everybody in the organization is expected to conform to the role expected of him or her. According to the above researchers,

because the various positional incumbents are aware of the norms and expectations that govern behavior in school organizations, they limit their autonomous actions accordingly” (p. 88).

A further outgrowth of this viewpoint was Gaziel (1995) whose study was designed to determine through field observation, whether principals at high-performing schools differed in their use of time, observations, and desired work behavior from principals at average schools. Principals were asked to complete a questionnaire about their preferences for allocating work time. Findings indicated that, although principals in high performing schools resembled principals in average schools in some aspect of their work activity (very busy, a heavy work load, fragmented tasks to perform, high level of verbal communication, large portion of their time scheduled, relatively little interruption), they differed in some work activities for their counterparts. Principals in high-performing schools invested much more time in instructional management, school improvement, parent-community relationships, and personnel management.

Weber (1971) was one of the first researchers to test the hypothesis that schools can make a difference. He studied four effective schools from a nomination list of 96 throughout the United States. From his case study reports on each school he found a number of factors common to each school, for example, high expectations, orderly climate, and stress on reading. Subsequent studies (Austin, 1978; Brookover and Lezolt, 1979; Shoemaker and Fraser, 1981) were designed to identify specific factors that differentiated between high achieving schools and low achieving schools. Factors associated with high achieving schools were as follows: positive pupil-teacher interaction, frequent informal classroom observations by the principal, attention to atmosphere that is conducive for learning in a school setting.

A similar longitudinal study by Mortimore, Sammons, Stoll, Lewis, and Ecob (1986) not only concluded that schools do make a difference, as stated by Weber, but also identified a number of factors that promote effectiveness. These factors included purposeful leadership of the staff by the principal, involvement of teachers in the school's operation, consistency among teachers structured sessions, maximum communication between teachers and students and positive climate.

A review of the literature conducted by Oakley (1989) delineated seven factors as having importance for school effectiveness: (a) strong leadership on the part of the principal, (b) high expectations by the principal and staff for student achievement, (c) a positive, orderly climate, (d) emphasis on basic skills development, (e) clearly stated, well-defined goals, and (f) good home-school conducive to learning, and open communication with teachers, parents and community.

A survey developed by a group of teacher tested the effect of principal leadership style on staff motivation. The results show that teachers who work under democratic and transactional administrators do not have a significantly higher motivational level than those who work under dictatorial administrators. Further research is needed in this area using different instruments. However, research from a variety of fields (psychology, sociology, military and industry) suggests that professionals associate the conditions under which they work with job satisfaction.

The terms job satisfaction, job attitudes, and morale are used interchangeably as reflecting affective orientation of individuals toward their job. According to DuBrin (1974), "motivation refers to expenditure of effort toward goal, while satisfaction, in general refers to the feelings of contentment related to work" (p. 38). Bently and Rempel (1976) defined job

satisfaction as “the professional interest and enthusiasm that a person displays toward the achievement of individual and group goals in a given job situation” (p. 2).

Lawler (1973) defined job satisfaction as a measure of the quality of life organizations. He defined job satisfaction as “people’s affective reactions to a particular aspect of their job” and overall job satisfaction as “a person’s affective reactions to his total work role” (p. 64).

Liontus (1993) in her study of the relationship of principal leadership style to perceptions of student achievement and educational improvement in schools, found that elements of transformational leadership style were associated with perceptions on the part of students and teachers of increased levels of student achievement.

Araki (1982) reports two interesting findings from a leadership study done in Hawaii’s schools. “Student achievement, as measured by the Scholastic Aptitude Test, increased with teacher job satisfaction and teacher are more satisfied and less frustrated if they perceive the principal’s leadership to be participative” (on the Lickert scale). School effectiveness researchers increasingly forge a link between satisfied teachers and increased student performance (Goodlad, 1984; Sapone, 1983).

Research has shown that administrative leadership style is an important and often key factor in a schools’ education effectiveness and that a leader’s attitude has a strong effect in a school setting in which the principal’s beliefs about the human nature of others could have positively or negatively affected faculty morale.

In a study of 500 senior high school teachers in Massachusetts, Cook (1983) determined that principal styles high on consideration were inversely related to teachers’ emotional exhaustion and depersonalization, while styles reflecting high initiating structure were not

significantly correlated with those variables. Roberts (1985) investigated the relationship of principal management style with teacher stress, job performance, satisfaction and absenteeism among 135 teachers in Washington state. He determined the following:

1. Teachers under high consideration - high structure principals experienced lower rates of stress, higher job satisfaction, higher job performance and lower absenteeism than teachers under principals with high consideration - low structure and low consideration - high structure.
2. Teachers under high consideration - low structure principals experienced lower stress, higher job satisfaction, higher performance and lower absenteeism than teachers under low consideration - low structure principals but higher absenteeism and lower job performance than teachers under low consideration - high structure principals.
3. Teachers under low consideration - high structure principals experienced higher job satisfaction, higher job performance and lower absenteeism and lower stress than teachers under low consideration - low structure principals.
4. Consideration was the most important variable related to job satisfaction.

Four other studies confirmed the importance of both initiating structure and consideration for positive teacher morale and lower stress levels. Ecker (1979) found that while teacher satisfaction was positively correlated to principal style high in consideration, it was also highly correlated with high initiating structure though not as strongly. Ryshavy (1978) concluded that both consideration and initiating structure variables of principal management style was strongly correlated with teacher morale factors. Singer (1985) determined a significant relationship

between teacher burnout and perceived management style of principals who exhibited high initiating structures or high consideration.

Anderson (1982) conducted a study in 20 Iowa secondary schools to determine the relationship between teacher morale and student achievement. Findings indicated that teachers in secondary schools whose pupils achieved relatively high scholastically have higher morale than do teachers in schools with relatively low pupil achievement. These results are supported by another study in which Koura (1963) studied 12 secondary public schools in Dearborn, Michigan, to compare the achievement of students with the morale of their teachers. In conducting the study, the researcher found that student achievement increased under teachers with high morale and decreased under teachers with low morale.

It seems plausible to assume, therefore, that teacher morale does make a difference in the scholastic achievement of their students.

After comprehensively reviewing the research carried out over a period of 25 years in teacher morale or job satisfaction, the investigators Blocker and Richardson (19 ) concluded that the administrator was still the key figure. Whether teachers were satisfied or dissatisfied depended greatly on the quality of the administrative relationships in which they were involved and on the quality of the leadership they were given within the structure.

The importance of this research indicates that there is a clear relationship between teacher morale and pupil achievement. Also, if it can be established that leadership style of the principal correlates with teacher morale, then principals as administrators might feel the necessity to analyze their leadership behavior in order to fulfill educational objectives. Research indicates that there is a clear relationship between teacher morale and pupil achievement. It was shown

that some of the related variables defined this stage of the change process: knowledge, preparation and training, and organizational commitment. Also, this study will support the hypothesis that there is a relationship between school principals as perceived by their staff in terms of teacher morale and leadership effectiveness.

Zbikowski (1992) analyzed the relationship between elementary principal leadership behavior characteristics, which were frequently associated with better staff morale. In this study, 25 percent of the teachers in seventeen Kent County, Michigan elementary schools were asked to complete the Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire and the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire. Major findings included significant relationships between elementary principal leadership behavior and each of the ten dimensions of teacher morale. These dimensions are listed below:

- 1) Satisfaction with Teaching
- 2) Teacher Work Load
- 3) Community Support
- 4) School Climate
- 5) Principal Support
- 6) School Facilities and Services
- 7) Teacher Rapport with Principal
- 8) Rapport among other teachers
- 9) Production
- 10) Principal Behavior

Informed by current research on leadership and climate, the School Climate Profile was condensed to 56 items. Analysis of teacher responses on a pre-test showed the modified

instrument to be highly reliable (0.99). Factor analysis allowed construction of a two factor model to represent the data: supportive principal leadership and considerate school climate. These factors accounted for 46% of the total variance.

Zbikowski (1992) showed that of the ten dimension mentioned above, all but production were significant on teacher morale. It was further found that in each of the leadership behavior dimensions, the principals rated themselves significantly higher than did their respective teachers. This study was important to this writer because of the hypothesis centered on the premise that there would be no significant differences between elementary principal leadership scores and staff morale scores. The importance of this current writer's hypothesis centers on the premise that there is no significant difference between administrative style and teacher morale.

In fact, the Phi Delta Kappa Commission on Teacher/faculty Morale (1985) reported that "... there was insufficient research to establish a direct cause-and-effect relationship between what a leader does and its effects on subordinate morale." (p.54). The commission goes on to state that there were however "...a large number of leader behaviors, attitudes, and skills that appeared to have some relationship to morale on the basis of correlational research, practice, and conventional wisdom" (p.54).

Bunting (1982) performed a similar correlation analysis on ratings provided for principals on the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire and scores earned by teachers of each principal on the Educational Attitudes Inventory. The results suggest a relationship between the style of leadership exhibited by a principal on the Educational Attitudes Inventory and teacher morale. The above results show a similar relationship to the one that this researcher is seeking.



A principal evaluation survey was administered to teachers on the basis of several leadership styles: democratic, dictatorial, and transactional. Findings indicate that teachers' experiences or principals' administrative level have no significant effects on evaluation. Overall, the organization of schools had the most positive influence on the evaluation of principals' job performance. The results suggest that principals, particularly those who employ the laissez-faire and dictatorial styles, re-examine their approaches to school management. Bass (1990) discusses a study that determines transactional leadership which influences some teachers favorably and some teachers unfavorably. The implied findings in terms of leaders and teacher power and their contradictory effects on school outcomes are discussed. It suggests that the important effects of leadership on schools may be undirected and mediated by in-school processes such as school goals, school culture, and teachers. The author recommends "refinement of constructs and further research that includes the mediated effects of leadership on school outcomes" (Bass, 1990, p. 3).

School effectiveness research, conducted in the late 1970's and in the early 1980's became the basis for a number of school improvement initiatives (Crowder, 1987). Researchers examined effective schools and attempted to enumerate those characteristics that helped to shape the outcomes of student success. Larsen (1989), in citing a California study, identified ten practices of principals from high achieving schools. These practices included involving the staff in crucial decisions that affected instruction and the development of a collaborative school climate.

Current research indicated that leadership style which had the greatest impact on teacher morale was cooperative, collaborative, and empowered teachers.

Effective schools and teachers had become an axiom of the “effective schools” literature (Edmonds, 1979). Bossert (1985), for example, observes that studies of effective elementary schools consistently show that such schools have in common “a school principal who was a strong programmatic leader” (p. 39).

The results of primary data analysis indicate a statistically significant correlation between implementation and supportive principal leadership and considerate school climate both individually and in combination. However, the researcher states that these relationships were not of sufficient magnitude to be practically significant. Findings suggested that other possible influences on teacher implementation of teacher morale were susceptible to manipulation by administrators (i.e. lack of communication, teacher workload, and decision-making). These findings established that the assessment of the leadership style of principals was necessary to analyze their leadership behavior in order to fulfill the objectives of the most cherished public institutions.

Findings show a relationship between styles of leadership administration and the effectiveness they exhibit. White (1988) identified statistical relationships between teacher morale and student achievement test scores in reading. The study suggested teachers’ attitudes toward classroom evaluation systems, as well as their perceptions of the functional behaviors of the principal, have shown to be the strongest predictors of student achievement in reading. This outcome shows a strong effective behavior of leadership that resulted in high morale which transcend to students’ achievements.

Many of the studies cited are based on correlational data--the researchers selected schools that have higher and lower achievement rates than expected and then looked to see what is

different about them. On the other hand, there are more studies needed which directly examine the impact of school principals on outcomes, such as student achievement, staff morale, and school climate and how it affects specific populations. The data still indicates a relationship between administration style and teacher morale.

### **Summary**

A review of the literature supports the notion that principal leadership styles and its effectiveness are related to teachers morale and performance. Also it was shown that leadership styles and its effectiveness of the principal affect core teachers' job dimensions which mediate low morale status of teachers. Teachers who have needs, which include maturation and mastery are uplifted by principals who effectively define the school mission, manage the instructional program and promote a positive school learning climate.

My research indicated that leadership style which had the greatest impact on teacher morale was collaborative. This new leadership role of the principal has also resulted in a need for teachers to accept increased responsibility for leadership within the schools. Involving the staff in decisions affected the development of a collaborative school climate which according to findings show a statistical relationship between teacher morale and students' achievements.

The results of this research was to show whether a traditional leadership style or reform leadership style of behavior has shown strong responses from the sample. Also, this study was to investigate which of these leadership styles most significantly related to teacher morale as well as which specific style most significantly relates to administrator effectiveness.

## References

- Anderson, C. (1982). The search for school climate: A review of the research. Review of Educational Research, 52, 368-420.
- Andrew, Parks L., Nelson, L.A. & the Phi Delta Commission on Teacher/Faculty Morale. (1985). Administrator's Handbook for Improving Faculty Morale.
- Araki, C.T. Leadership study in Hawaii -- how characteristics of principals affect the schools. NASSP Bulletin, 66, 88-96.
- Austin, G.R. (1979). Exemplary schools and the search for effectiveness. Educational Leadership, 37, 10, 12.
- Barnard, C.I. (1938). The functions of the executive. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University.
- Barth, R. (1984). Between teacher and principal. Principal, 63, 5.
- Bass, B., & Stogdill (1990). Bass and Stogdill's Handbook Leadership. Theory, Research, and Management Applications. New York: Fress Press.
- Bass, B.M. (1985), Leadership and performance beyond expectations. New York: Fress Press.
- Bass, B.M., & Avolio, B. (1988). Manual for the multifactor leadership questionnaire. Bringham, NY: Center for leadership studies. State University: New York.
- Bass, B.M., Waldman, D.A., Avolio, B.J. & Bebb, M. (1987). Transformational leadership and the falling dominoes effect. Group and organizational studies, 73-87.
- Bass, M.B. (1981). Stogdill's handbook of leadership. New York: Free Press.
- Bass, R.S. (1990). Bass & Stogdill's Handbook of leadership. New York: Free Press.
- Bennis, W.G., & Slater, P.T. (1968). The temporary society. New York: Penguin.
- Bentley, R.R. & Rempel, A.M. (1970). The managerial grind. Houston: Gulf Publishing.
- Bhella, S.K. (1982). Principal's leadership style: Does it affect teacher morale. Education, 102, 4, 369-72.

- Blake, R.R., & Mouton, J.S. (1964). The managerial grid. Houston: Gulf Publishing.
- Blase, J. and Blase, J.R. (1994). Empowering teachers: What successful principal's do. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Blocker, C.E., & Richardson, R.C. Twenty-five years of morale research: A critical review. Journal of Educational Sociology, 63,36, 200-210.
- Blumberg, B. and Greenfield, W. (1980). The effective principal: Perspectives on school leadership. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Bossert, Steven T. (1985). Effective elementary schools. Washington, D.C.: United States Government Printing Office, 1985.
- Bossert, S.T., Dwyer, D.C., Rowan, B., & Lee, G.V. (1982). The instructional management role of the principal. Educational Administration Quarterly, 18, 34-64.
- Boyd, W. & Crowson, L. (1981). The changing conception and practice of public school administration. Review of Research in Education, 9, 311-373.
- Brookover, W.B. and Lezotte, L.W. (1979). Changes in school characteristics coincident with changes in student achievement. East Lansing: Institute for Research on Teaching Michigan State University. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 181 005).
- Brown, J. (1993). Leadership for school improvement. Emergency Librarian, 20, 8-20.
- Bunting, C. (1982). Leadership style and the instructional role of the principal. Psychology in the Schools, 19, 570-572.
- Burns, J.M. (1978). Leadership, New York: Harper and Row.
- Calabrese, R.L. (1994). Back to the future. NASSP, 78, 558, 1.
- Carpenter, H.H. (1971). Formal organization, structural factors and perceived job satisfaction of classroom teachers. Administrative Science Quarterly, 16, 460-465.
- Clark, D.L., Lotto, L.S., & McCarthy, M.M. (1980). Factors associated with success in urban elementary schools. Phi Delta Kappan, 61, 460-470.
- Cook, E. (1983). The relationship between teacher perceptions of supervisory behavioral style and perceived teacher burnout. (Doctoral Dissertation, University of Connecticut). Dissertation Abstracts International, 44, (4-A), 925.

- Cosgrove, D. (1986). The effects of principal succession on elementary schools. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Utah, Utah.
- Crassie, M.C. and Caress, B.W. (1972). School structure, leadership quality and teacher satisfaction. Educational Administration Quarterly, 9, 15-28.
- Crowder, B.H. (1987). New York state school improvement program guidebook. Albany, NY: Effective Schools Consortia Network.
- Cummings, L.L. (1971). The manager as a leader. Educational Administration Selected Readings. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Deal, T.E. (1990). Reframing reform. Educational Leadership, 5, 6-12.
- Dubrin, Andrew J. (1984). Foundations of organizational behavior. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Dwyer, D., Lee, G., Rowan, B. and Bossert, S. (1983). Five principals in action: Perspectives on instructional management. San Francisco: Far West Laboratory.
- Ecker, M. (1979). The relationship between leadership style and teacher job satisfaction. Doctoral dissertation, U.S. International University.
- Etzioni, A. (1969). Dual leadership in complex organizations. American Sociological Review, 30 (5), 690-691.
- Fiedler, F. (1967). A Theory of Leadership Effectiveness. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Fullan, M. (1982, February 25-27). Implementing educational change: Progress at last. Paper prepared for a National Invitational Conference: Research on Teaching: Implications for Practice, The National Institute of Education, Washington, D.C.
- Fullan, M.G. (1991). The New Meaning of Educational Change (2nd Ed.). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Fullan, M.G. (1992). Visions that blind. Educational Leadership, 21, (2) 19-20.
- Gallmeier, K. (1992). The effectiveness of principal leader style on teacher motivation. ERIC ED 354-591.
- Gaziel, H. (1995). The Elementary School Journal 96, 2. Chicago, IL University of Chicago Press. 179-193.

- Geering, A. (1980). The role of the school principal in comparative perspectives. ERIC Document Reproduction Services No. ED 199-930.
- Getzels, J.W., Lipham, J.M. and Campbell, R.F., (1968). Educational administration as a social process. New York: Harper and Row.
- Goodlad, J.I. (1976). Principals are the key to change. Education Digest, 42, 32-35.
- Goodlad, J.I. (1984). A place called school. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Greenfield, W.D. (1991<sup>b</sup>). The micropolitics of leadership in an urban elementary school. American Educational Research Association: Chicago.
- Gallmeier, K. (1992). The effectiveness of principal leader style on teacher motivation. ERIC ED 354-591.
- Gnassie, M.C. and Caress, B.W. (1972). School structure, leadership quality and teacher satisfaction. Educational Administration Quarterly, 9, 15-28.
- Gross, N. and Herriott, R.E. (1965). Staff leadership in public schools: A sociological inquiry. New York: Wiley.
- Guthrie, J.W., & Reed, R.J. (1986). Education administration and policy: Effective leadership for american education. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Hadley, O.B. and Andrews, J. (1978). A study of leadership styles of administration at Los Angeles Southwest College.
- Hall, G., & Vandenberghe, R. (1987). The change facilitator style questionnaire. Greeley, Colorado: Concerns Based Systems International.
- Hallinger, P. and Murphy, J. (1985). Assessing the instructional management behavior of principals. Elementary School Journal, 86 (2), 217-247.
- Hallinger, P., Murphy, J., Wail, M., Mesa, R., and Mitman, A. (1983). School effectiveness: Identifying the specific practices behavior for principals. NASSP Bulletin, 67, 463.
- Hanson, M. (1979). Educational administration and organizational behavior. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Heck, R.H., L.T.J. & Marcoulides, G.A. (1990). Instructional leadership and school achievement: Validation of a causal model. Education Administration Quarterly, 26, (2). 94-125.

- Heck, R.H. and Marcoulides, G.A. (1993). Principal leadership behaviors and school achievement. NASSP Bulletin, 77 (553), 35-48.
- Hemphill, J.K. (1950). Leader behavior description. Columbus: Ohio State University.
- Hershey, P. and Blanchard, K.H. (1977). Management of organization behavior (3rd ed). New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Jacobs, J.W. (1965). Leader behavior of the secondary school principal. NASSP Bulletin, 49, 13-17.
- Johnston, G. and et al. (1985). The relationship between elementary school climate and teachers attitudes toward education. So Educational and Psychological Measurement, 5, 89-112.
- Johnston, G.S. & Venable, B.P. (1986). A study of teacher loyalty to principal. Educational Administration, 26, 1, 22-38.
- Kaiser, J.S. (1985). The Principalship. Illinois: Burgess.
- Kirby, P.C. (1991, April). Shared decision making: Moving from concerns about restrooms to concerns about classrooms. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago.
- Koura, H.S. (1963). An experimental study achievement in relation to the high morale of selected secondary school teachers. (unpublished doctoral dissertation. The University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan, 1963).
- Larsen, T. (1989). Effective schools? effective principals!. Thrust for Educational Leadership, 35-36.
- Leithwood, K., Jantzi, D., Silins, H. and Dart, B. (1992). Transformational leadership and school restructuring. Paper presented at the international congress for School Effectiveness and Improvement, Victoria, B.C.
- Leithwood, K.A. (1990). The principal's role in teacher development. In ASCD's 1990 Yearbook, Changing school culture through staff development. Edited by Bruce Joyce.
- Leithwood, K.A. (1992). The move toward transformational leadership. Educational Leadership, 49 (5), 8-12.



- Leithwood, K.A. and Jantzi, D. (1990). Transformation leadership: How principals can help reform school cultures. School Effectiveness and School Improvement, 1, 249-280.
- Leithwood, K.A., Begley, P.T. and Cousins, J.B. (1991). The nature causes and consequences of principal's practices: An agenda for future research. Journal of Educational Administration, 28, 4, 5-31.
- Lewellen, J.R. (1990). Effective Leadership Development: Key Components. NASSP Bulletin, 3, 7-12.
- Lewin, K. and Lippit, R. (1938). An experimental approach to the study of autocracy and democracy: A preliminary role. Sociometry, 1, 292-300.
- Lipham, J. (1977). The administrator's role in educational linkage. Columbus OH: UCLA (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No ED 141900).
- Lipham, J.M. (1976). The leadership role of the IGE principals. Journal of Teacher Education, 27, 226-228.
- Lortie, D. (1975). A sociological analysis. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Manasse, A.L. (1985). Improving conditions for principals effectiveness: Policy implications of research. Elementary School Journal 85, 439-463.
- Martin, W.J., & Willower, D.J. (1981). The managerial behavior of high school principals. Educational Administration Quarterly 17, 1, 69- 90.
- Maxcey, Spencer J. (1994). Democracy, design and the new reflective practice. NASSP 78, 558, 46.
- Mazzarcella, J. (1981). Leadership styles. In J. Mazarella, S. Smith, and D. Piele (Eds) School Leadership: Handbook for survival. Eugene: ERIC Publishing.
- McGregor, D. (1960). The Human Side of Enterprise. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Mitchell, D.E. and Tucker, S. (1992). Leadership as a way of thinking. Educational administration: Theory research and practice. New York: Random House.
- Mintzberg, H. (1973). The nature of managerial work. New York: Harper & Row.
- Mintzberg, H. (1989). Mintzberg management. New York: Free Press.
- Miskel, C.G. (1978). Educational administration: Theory research and practice. New York: Random House.

- Misker, C.G. (1978). Education administration: Theory research and practice. New York: Prentice Hall.
- Mortimore, P. Sammons, P., Stoll, H., Lewis, D., & Ecob, R. (1986). The junior school project. ILEA Research and Statistics Branch, London: County Hall.
- Mortimore, P., Sammons, P., Stoll, L., Lewis, D. & Ecob, R. (1988). School matters: The junior years. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Moser, R.F. (1957). The leadership patterns of school superintendents and school principals. New: Administrators Notebook.
- Oakley, W.F. (1989). A study of the relationship between the leadership style of the principal and school effectiveness under differing conditions of situational favorability. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Ottawa.
- Persell, C.H, Cookson, P.W., & Lyons, H. (1982). Effective principals: What do we know from various educational literatures. ERIC ED 224177.
- Phi Delta Kappa commission on discipline. (1985). Handbook for developing schools with good discipline. Bloomington, Ind: Phi Delta Kappa.
- Purkey, S.C. & Smith, M.S. (1982). Too soon to cheer? Synthesis of research on effective schools. Education Leaders 40, 30, 64-69.
- Reitzug, U.C. (1989). Principal-teacher interactions in instructionally effective and ordinary elementary schools. Urban Education, 24,1, 35-38.
- Roberts, K. (1985). An analysis of the relationships of principal leadership style to teacher stress and job related outcome. (Doctoral dissertation, Washington State University). Dissertation Abstracts International, 45, 07, 2002.
- Rogers, J.L. (1992). Leadership development for the 90's: Incorporating paradigm perspectives. N.A.S.P.A Journal, 29, 243-252.
- Rowan, B., Bossert, S.T. & Dwyer, D.C. (1983). Research on effective schools: A cautionary note. Educational Research, 12, 4, 24-31.
- Sagor, R.D., (1992). Three principals who make a difference. Education Leadership, 49, 13-18.
- Sanford, A.C. (1974). Human Relations. Columbus: Ohio. Charles Merrill.

- Sapone, C.V. (1983). A research review-perceptions on characteristics of effective schools. NASSP Bulletin, 69, 465.
- Saskin, M. (1988). The visionary principal. School leadership for the next century. Education and Urban Society, 20, 239-249.
- Sergiovanni, T.J. (1991). The principalship. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Sergiovanni, T., & Elliot, D. (1975). Educational and organizational leadership in elementary schools. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall.
- Shoemaker, J. & Fraser, H.W. (1981). What principals can do: Some implications from studies of effective schooling. Phi Delta Kappan, 63 (11), 178-182.
- Silins, H.C. (1992). Effective leadership for school reform. Alberta Journal of Educational, 38, 317-334.
- Singer, L. (1985). A study of the relationship between teacher burnout and the leadership style of the principal as perceived by the teacher burnout in early childhood and day care setting (Doctoral dissertation, University of Pacific California) Dissertation Abstracts International, 44 (4-A), 948.
- Southworth, G. (1990). Leadership headship and effective primary schools. School Organization, 10, 3-16.
- Stogdill, R.M. (1974). Handbook of leadership. New York: Free Press.
- Stronge, J.H. & McVeain, D.A. (1986). The functional role of building-level administrator: Head teacher or middle manager? ERS Spectrum, 3, 38-40.
- Tannenbaum, R. & Massarik, R. (1968) Leadership: A frame of reference. In D.E. Porter and P.B. Applewhite (Eds.) Organizational Behavior and Management. Scranton, PA: International Textbook.
- Tye, K. (1994). The goal orientation of the principal: A key factor in the success or failure of school change. A report to the ASCD Conference ED 370244.
- Vroom, V.H. & Yetton, P.W. (1978). Leadership and decision making. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.
- Waldman, D.A., Waldman, B.M., & Einstein, W.O. (1987). Leadership outcomes of performance appraisal processes. Journal of Occupational Psychology, 60, 178-182.
- Waller, W. (1932). The sociology of teaching. New York: Wiley.

- Weber, G. (1971). Inner city children can be taught to read: Four successful schools. Washington, D.C.: Council for Basic Education.
- White, W. & Stevens, R. (1988). Teacher morale and student achievement. Reading Improvement, 25, 222-32.
- Wilcox, D.E. (1992). The relationship between the teachers' perception of the high school principals leadership style and the correlation job satisfaction and morale. Dissertation Abstracts Internation, 53, (9-A) 3079.
- Wood, C.L. (1979). The secondary school principal. Boston: Ally and Bacon.
- Wright, R., & Renihan, P. (1985). The Saskatchewan principalship study: A review of the literature. (Report No. 12, #400-2222), Regina, SK: Saskatchewan School Trustees Association Research Centre.
- Wynne, E.A. (1978, April). Schools as morally governed institutions. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Education Research Association. Washington, D.C.
- Yammarion, F.J., & Bass, B.M. (1990). Long-term forecasting of transformational leadership and its effects among naval officers. Measures of Leadership. West Orange, N.J.: Leadership Library of America.
- Zibikowski, L.G. (1942), (1993). A study of the relationship between elementary principal leadership behavior and teacher morale. Dissertation Abstracts International, 54 (7-8) 2201.



U.S. Department of Education  
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)  
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)



# REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

## I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: <i>What Research Says About Administrators' Management Style, Effectiveness, and Teacher Morale</i>	
Author(s): <i>Dr. Vernaline Thomas</i>	
Corporate Source:	Publication Date: <i>January 1997</i>

## II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic/optical media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS) or other ERIC vendors. Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following two options and sign at the bottom of the page.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2 documents



Check here  
**For Level 1 Release:**  
Permitting reproduction in microfiche (4" x 6" film) or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic or optical) and paper copy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

*Sample*

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

Level 1



Check here  
**For Level 2 Release:**  
Permitting reproduction in microfiche (4" x 6" film) or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic or optical), but *not* in paper copy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN OTHER THAN PAPER COPY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

*Sample*

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

Level 2

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits. If permission to reproduce is granted, but neither box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

"I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic/optical media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries."

Sign here → please

Signature: <i>Vernaline Thomas</i>	Printed Name/Position/Title: <i>Vernaline Thomas Coordinator fine Arts</i>
Organization/Address:	Telephone: <i>773-238-9876</i>
	FAX:
	E-Mail Address:
	Date: <i>9/22/97</i>

### III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, or, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:
Address:
Price:

### IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:
Address:

### V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:

ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management  
1787 Agate Street  
5207 University of Oregon  
Eugene, OR 97403-5207

However, if solicited by the ERIC Facility, or if making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, return this form (and the document being contributed) to:

**ERIC Processing and Reference Facility**  
1100 West Street, 2d Floor  
Laurel, Maryland 20707-3598

Telephone: 301-497-4080  
Toll Free: 800-799-3742  
FAX: 301-953-0263  
e-mail: [ericfac@inet.ed.gov](mailto:ericfac@inet.ed.gov)  
WWW: <http://ericfac.piccard.csc.com>