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CHAPTER I.

INTRODUCTION

During recent years, public schools have become more socially and economically important in ways not fully utilized in previous decades.

They were not only to become the vehicles of social change, they were also involved in the processing of a product intimately related to the economic well-being of the nation and the Gross National Product (70, p. 2).

Leadership is of paramount importance in today's American decentralized educational system (24). In particular, the elementary school principal must possess highly specialized knowledge and leadership ability to insure as high a degree of achievement in the school as possible. Generally the elementary school is a neighborhood school from which individuals interact with people of many different ages. As a result, the elementary principal must skillfully utilize leadership abilities in establishing and maintaining a viable, imaginative, and progressive program of education (24).

By function, effective leadership is the result of successful blending of many different components consisting of such elements as discretion in the use of authority, the ability to communicate with understanding, skills for task accomplishment, humaneness, understanding, and the ability to recognize and work with change (24).
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Administrative leadership has been the subject of continuous study by many institutions in our society. Original studies centered around the unique qualities of the leader, but more recently, the focus has shifted to the investigation of leadership behavior. In all these studies, it has been observed that leadership is a vibrant and dynamic force. It is the major force which enables institutions to both establish and achieve goals.

As we review the years of the 1960's and early 1970's, an ancient truism reappears—"that despite decades upon decades of oppression and stereotyping, society still has not recognized that equality of opportunity, like liberty, is indivisible (70, p. 2).

In 1973, the Leadership Training Institute realized that in its preoccupation with more representation in school administration by minorities such as blacks, American Indians, and Spanish speaking people, they had omitted women, the group that comprises the largest portion of the educational profession as teachers (70). As one realizes that when discrimination is practiced against any single individual or group, no one can be assured of equal treatment (70).

It has not been unusual in the past few years for discussion and speculation to be held, and concern expressed, over the declining percentage of women in principalship roles. This has been particularly obvious in the elementary school where, at one time, women principals were common. The problem
becomes even more striking when one realizes, as Seltz points out, that even though eighty-four percent of all elementary teachers are women, only twenty percent (or one of every five) elementary principals are female (120).

Much has been written and discussed concerning the academic competence and/or emotional ability of women to handle the complexities of today's educational institutions. Many studies such as done by Durkin seem to refute those arguments. He states:

...equal numbers of men and women possess objective personality and high vocabulary. More women have abstract visualization than men.... Theoretically, at least, there should be more women in management than men...this is definitely not the case.... In most occupations, if positions were based solely on aptitudes, men and women would be found in approximately equal numbers (26, p. 3).

In addition to the above reasons for the decline of females in administrative roles, Helen Morsink adds other frequently cited reasons such as:

1) women lack the appropriate graduate hours in education,
2) women lack the necessary desire to become principals
3) women are unwilling to compete with men for the principalship,
4) women lack the necessary career tenure to qualify for the position,
5) women lack the financial incentive to seek the principalship (105).
Although her study dealt with secondary administration, it has been assumed that they may apply in elementary school situations also.

In summary then, one may detect from the available research that several reasons for the decline in numbers of female principals are being contemplated. The opinion of most informed persons is that, even though in fact this decline does exist, and many opinions are given for its existence, further study is needed in order to document and substantiate the attitudes and/or perceptions of females as administrators in order to overcome stereotyping and prejudice in educational administration.

The reality of declining enrollments and budget tightening procedures makes it essential to obtain qualified and appropriately dynamic leadership in key roles in education. The elementary principalship seems to be one of those roles.

Statement of the Problem

Basically, then, the overall problem is how to get the best qualified individual into this role, regardless of sex.

This research is designed to investigate a phase of this problem. This segment is to study if significant differences do exist in reported self-perceptions of leadership behavior between female and male elementary principals in selected school districts in the midwest United States.
Need for the Study

The need for the study may be explained in the possible uses of the results of the investigation.

If the study shows a significant difference does exist, there may then be implications for further study to determine why the differences exist. Recruitment and in-service training are areas in the profession which may be affected in that the approach to their implementation could be altered depending upon the results. If no significant differences exist, and males and females are found to have no self-perception differences, then research could be expanded to determine why females have not entered the ranks of the elementary principalship. Implications for this research could address hiring practices, attitudes of members of boards of education as well as recruitment and in-service training.

The Purposes

The purpose of this study is to offer a comparative study of a survey of self-perception of leadership behavior of elementary principals in selected school districts in the midwest United States using the variables of sex, years of administrative experience, and rural or urban geographic orientation.

While some recent studies included both sexes in their statistical information as one of several variables, the primary objectives were not comparisons of role perception by sex. These studies were also limited in geographic area to either
one state or one metropolitan area. Also some of the statistical information in these studies was not a part of the original design but was added by popular demand, much like ethnic differences when racial concerns were most prominent.

It is not the purpose of this study to determine the effectiveness of the respondents as to their role or function as a leader, nor is it the purpose to identify good or poor administrators, but rather to investigate for purposes of insight the relationship between female and male elementary principals as they see their role and review this relationship in the following categories 1) the self-perception of leader behavior of female and male elementary principals in selected school districts in the midwest United States, 2) the self-perception of leader behavior of elementary school principals in selected school districts in the midwest United States related to rural or urban geographic orientation, and 3) the self-perception of leader behavior of elementary school principals in selected school districts in the midwest United States related to their years of administrative experience.

The instrument selected to measure how these principals perceive their leader behavior is the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire Form XII (130).

The Objectives

The objectives of this study are to determine if there exists a difference in role self-perception between:
1) female and male elementary principals in selected school districts in the midwest United States,
2) elementary school principals in selected school districts in the midwest United States related to rural or urban geographic orientation,
3) elementary school principals in selected school districts in the midwest United States related to years of administrative experience.

These three basic objectives may also be compared in the following combinations to determine if a difference exists when they are paired or totally combined:

4) female and male elementary principals in selected school districts in the midwest United States related to rural or urban geographic orientation,
5) female and male elementary school principals in selected school districts in the midwest United States related to years of administrative experience,
6) elementary school principals in selected school districts in the midwest United States related to rural or urban geographic orientation and years of administrative experience,
7) female and male elementary school principals in selected school districts in the midwest United States related to urban or rural geographic orientation and years of administrative experience.
Hypotheses to be Tested

A) It is hypothesized that there is no significant difference in male and female principals' perception of their role of elementary principal.

Statistical hypothesis

\[ \text{Ho: } U_{1..} = U_{2..} \quad \text{or } \alpha_1 = 0 \]
\[ \text{Ha: } U_1 \neq U_2 \quad \text{or } \alpha_1 \neq 0 \]

B) It is hypothesized that there is no significant difference in role perception of the selected elementary school principals related to rural-urban geographic orientation.

Statistical hypothesis

\[ \text{Ho: } U_{1.} = U_{2.} \quad \text{or } B_j = 0 \]
\[ \text{Ha: } U_1 = U_2 \quad \text{or } B_j \neq 0 \]

C) It is hypothesized that there is no significant difference in role perception related to years of administrative experience of the selected elementary school principals.

Statistical hypothesis

\[ \text{Ho: } U_{.1} = U_{.2} \quad \text{or } \gamma_k = 0 \]
\[ \text{Ha: } U_1 \neq U_2 \quad \text{or } \gamma_k \neq 0 \]

A X B) It is hypothesized that there is no interaction in role perception between male and female elementary school principals and geographic orientation of the selected elementary school districts.

Statistical hypothesis

\[ \text{Ho: } (\alpha B)_{ij} = 0 \]
\[ \text{Ha: } (\alpha B)_{ij} \neq 0 \]

A X C) It is hypothesized that there is no interaction in role perception between male and female elementary principals
and years of administrative experience in the selected elementary school districts.

Statistical hypothesis

$H_0: (\alpha \Gamma)_{ik} = 0$

$H_a: (\alpha \Gamma)_{ik} \neq 0$ for at least one combination

B X C) It is hypothesized that there is no interaction in role perception related to geographic orientation and years of administrative experience in the selected elementary school districts.

Statistical hypothesis

$H_0: (B \Gamma)_{jk} = 0$

$H_a: (B \Gamma)_{jk} \neq 0$

A X B X C) It is hypothesized that there is no interaction in role perception between male and female elementary principals related to geographic orientation or years of administrative experience in the selected school districts.

Statistical hypothesis

$H_0: (\alpha B \Gamma)_{ijk} = 0$

$H_a: (\alpha B \Gamma)_{ijk} \neq 0$

**Basic Assumptions**

Underlying this study are 4 basic assumptions. It is assumed that:

1) role perception may be accurately measured

2) the chosen instrument can reliably and validly measure role perception
3) the chosen variables are a function of the geographic orientation, sex, years of experience and other factors influencing role perception.

4) the influence of other factors not included are randomly distributed.

Where possible, a minimum number of 20 in each category has been determined. Therefore the researcher will attempt to survey 100 men and 100 women for a total N of 200.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>sex</th>
<th>geographic experience</th>
<th>M R</th>
<th>U 20</th>
<th>F R</th>
<th>U 20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 200

Delimitations

All of the delimitations which follow will be observed during the course of this investigation.

1) The elementary school principals selected for this study shall be located in selected states in the midwest United States.

2) The selected elementary school principals, both male and female, utilized in this study will be obtained from public school systems.

3) The principals participating in this study shall be full-time administrators assigned to those schools included in this sample.
Investigative Procedure

Following is an outline of procedure, the design to be followed in conducting the investigation, the research techniques, sources of data, method of securing data, and limitations of these techniques.

Design: Factorial Design employing the variables of a) sex, b) rural-urban geographic orientation, and c) years of administrative experience.

Data Source: The school districts participating in this study shall consist of those districts located in the midwest United States.

Method of Securing Data: Data will be secured by a random sample survey of elementary principals in selected states, using the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire-Form XII, and a personal data form designed for demographic information gathering. It shall be analyzed at the .05 significance level.

The Leader Behavior Descriptive Questionnaire-Form XII was originally designed at The Ohio State University. The segment chosen for this study measures how a leader perceives her/his behavior, not how well she/he behaves in particular situations.

Definition of Terms

Various methods of determination of population classification have been explored. The system which seems most expedient for this study is the one developed in 1970-71 by
the Michigan Department of Education for the Michigan Educational Assessment Program (100). Type I and a combination of Type III and Type V are the appropriate classifications for the stated objectives of this study.

*Urban--Type I Metropolitan Core: One or more adjacent cities with a population of 50,000 or more which serve as the economic focal point for environs.

Type II City: Community of 10,000 to 50,000 that serves as the economic focal point for its environs.

*Type III Town: Community of 2,500 to 10,000 that serves as the economic focal point for its environs.

Type IV Urban Fringe: A community of any population size that has as its economic focal point a metropolitan core or a city.

*Rural--Type V Rural Community: A community of less than 2,500.

Elementary School Principal - a person who is by designation of the Board of Education, the administrative head of a school containing grades kindergarten through six and meets the certification requirements of the state in which she/ he is employed.

Organization of the Study

The remainder of this study will be divided into five areas:

Chapter I Statement of the problem
Chapter II Review of related literature
Chapter III  Research design, method of data collection, statistical treatment of the data, and a detailed description of the instrument used

Chapter IV  Analysis of the data

Chapter V  Summary of the study, conclusions, discussion and recommendations
CHAPTER II.

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The Study of Leadership

Definitions of leadership

Since the dawning of recorded history, it has been evident that certain individuals or groups of individuals emerge as leaders of other organized humans. These humans may be either formally or informally organized. However, when attempts are made to define the term leader or the function of a leadership position conflict seems to arise. In 1971, J.V. Spotts found that there were more than 130 definitions of leadership (124). It seems clear that leaders exist, they function in certain ways and are usually recognized in some manner. Even though a definition of leadership has not been clearly and concisely delineated, a discussion of leadership definitions may merit some space in order to understand the need for additional and continued research into the topic of leader behavior and leadership.

The following samples of the meaning of leadership differ in some respects, while they all seem to possess the common trait of activity orientation, action, or performance. Little feels,

"Leadership may be considered as one of the two primary functions of administration; the other function is management.... The leadership function requires the capacity to 'live ahead' of his institution; to
interpret his institution's needs to the public and the public's needs to his institution; and to conceive and implement strategies for effecting changes required for his institution to fulfill its purpose (87).

This definition seems to emphasize that leader as a change agent for the organization. Lipham agrees when he refers to leadership as,

"the initiation of new structure or procedure for accomplishing an organizations goals and objectives or for changing an organizations goals and objectives (86, p. 122).

He feels it is an administrative task, not a leadership function when use of existing structures and procedures are employed to accomplish the goals and objectives of the organization.

Some definitions like the one by Saunders seems to make no differentiation between administration and leadership. He says,

"Educational leadership is any act which facilitates the achievement of educational objectives (119, p. 5).

Other people who have addressed the task of defining leadership have viewed it from the human characteristics attitude. For example, Quinn states that leader behavior is, "the manifest actions which a leader influences or affects organizational activities" (114, p. 10). Knezevich feels that, "Leadership is, in essence, concerned with human energy in organized groups. It is a people phenomenon" (82, p. 81).

Even wider breadth is added to the endeavor of explaining the leadership concept when the idea that any member of a
group could emerge as a leader under a particular set of circumstances. Wiles states,

"Leadership is a function which makes possible the formulation and attainment of group goals.... Leadership is a product of interaction within a group.... The extent to which group members can use an individual's contribution determines the leadership he exerts. This in turn depends upon the group members' perception of him, his motives, and his competency" (140, p. 11).

Stogdill and Coons felt "leadership was the behavior of an individual when directing the activities of a group or organization toward a shared goal" (131, p. 7). Finally, Halpin seems to sum up the dilemma of defining leadership with the premise that the term - leadership - can refer to a role or an individual's behavior in that role, or on the evaluation of that leader's performance (58). He feels that an effective administrator may have to adopt different behavior patterns in different situations in order to maintain a leadership role.

One may see that, although experts may not agree on a definition for leadership, the role is definitely viewed as active in nature, either by the activity of the leader or by the causing of activity by the leader.

Theories of Leadership:
Classical Theories

Great man theory and time theory

Again looking back in history, one may find that relatively early in recorded time philosophers, theologians, historians, and educators have studied and debated the concept
of leadership. Many ideas were formulated and refined through the years. Two basic or classical theories of leadership emerged as a result. These are the "great man" theory and the "times" theory.

Knezevich quotes Feigl's definition of theory. Feigl says theory is,

"a set of assumptions from which can be derived, by purely logico-mathematical procedures, a large set of empirical laws" (35, p. 182).

With this in mind, a consideration of these basic theories will be made.

In the more prominent civilizations of Europe and the Americas the "great man" theory has been most popular. Davenport feels that,

"the 'great man' theory emphasizes that certain individuals are hereditarily endowed with unique characteristics and abilities.... The doctrine of the divine right of kings gave birth to this idea and helped to sustain its perpetuity" (24, p. 27).

Burns shows this thinking when he quotes Machiavelli;

"A prince will never lack for legitimate excuses to explain away his breaches of faith. Modern history will furnish innumerable examples of this behavior.... Men are so simple of mind, and so much dominated by their immediate needs, that a deceitful man will always find plenty who are ready to be deceived" (12, Prologue).

Even earlier the "great man" theory, was hinted at in the idealistic work of Plato called the Republic, a recognized classic. He hypothesized that most men attain any knowledge they have by opinion and/or guess work and that a few proceed
to a higher level of intelligence which is characterized by empirical truths and concepts beyond them. Plato felt that even fewer gained the highest level which is the perception of an interrelationship between all things. Here Plato says "reality takes the form of permanence and is found in universals, laws, and first principles" (110, p. 173). Davenport feels that Plato's philosophy as discussed in the Republic is representative of the "great man" theory in its extreme form.

The "time" theory has the social situation as its central focus. This is attributed to the belief that leadership is a function of a variety of factors in a relatively small social setting. In other words, as in some of the above mentioned definitions, a leader may emerge from a group at a particular time because that individual has the characteristics to assist the group in meeting their needs. It should be emphasized that the personal characteristics or traits of the leader are secondary to the needs of the group in the "times" theory of leadership. Chance plays an important part in determining the leadership in a situation and the same "leader" in one instance may not have the uniqueness needed for a leadership role in another group.

Dictators such as Hitler, and the rise of a powerful leader during a time of crisis may be cited as examples of the "times" theory of leadership. Davenport points out that analysis of the "times" theory embraces a portion of the
"great man" theory (24). He says that the concept of individual differences is blended into the "times" theory. "The unique qualities of the emergent leader meet the special needs of a given group in a time of unrest or indecision (24, p. 29).

Approaches to Leadership

Another path to identification of leadership theories is by the approach method. Three approaches have been identified by researchers. They are: 1) the trait approach, 2) the situation approach, and 3) the behavioral approach.

Trait approach

The trait approach of leadership has been the subject of much research. Some investigators feel that the "great man" theory was the genesis of the trait approach. Although it is not usually included in the category of classical theories and is fading from view, it does have characteristics which make it a concept related to and yet set apart from the other theories discussed. "Trait theorists feel that some combination of individual qualities, inherent or acquired, was what made effective leaders..." (114, p. 12). They also felt that, "If one stresses the values of the individual and concentrates on leadership, a list of traits is bound to emerge" (114, p. 13). Faber and Shearron have listed the following among a catalog of traits from various investigations of leader behavior and leadership; "age, height,
weight, physique, energy, health, appearance, fluency of speech, intelligence, scholarship, knowledge, judgements and decision, insight, originality, adaptability, introversion-extroversion, dominance, initiative,...integrity and conviction, self-confidence, mood control,...emotional control, social and economic status, social activity, and mobility,...and cooperation" (33, p. 310).

The study of leadership by the "trait" approach hinges on identification of the behavior variables and the relationship of those variables to leader behavior. Three assumptions basic to the trait approach of leadership were identified by Pierce and Merrill. They are:

1) one has to assume that specific elements of behavior can be isolated and examined as entities in themselves;
2) that such factors act independently of one another so they can be measured and analyzed;
3) that the influence of a particular trait on leadership behavior is relatively constant and therefore somewhat predictable (113, p. 321).

The two also felt that personality traits were the ones most significantly related to leader behavior. However, they pointed out that an individual having possession of these traits has no guarantee of becoming a successful leader and that the same combination of traits are not found in all leaders (115, p. 321).
Chester Barnard, who has been termed the father of modern organizational theory, identified five fundamental characteristics of leaders. He lists them in what he feels is the order of importance. Those five are:

1) Vigilance and dynamic qualities.
2) Decisiveness which is a most difficult term to define.
3) Persuasiveness which is defined in terms of ability to persuade and propensity to persuade.
4) Responsibility which alludes to the emotional reactions that instill a sense of acute dissatisfaction in the individual due to his failure to meet obligations or his violation of inhibitions in specific concrete situations.
5) Intellectual capacity which is an inexplicable concept (3, p. 93).

Franseth categorized characteristics of leaders into these traits, 1) democratic, 2) people-oriented, 3) able to perceive situations as others do, 4) proponents of group-centered leadership, 5) well-informed, 6) possession of a scientific attitude, and 7) committed to helping others use energy creatively (39, p. 58).

Capacity, achievement, responsibility, participation, and status are the five traits Stogdill concluded were consistently present in leader behavior.
In 1948, after Stogdill reviewed the results of 124 leadership studies he was of the opinion that, "a person does not become a leader by virtue of some combination of traits, but the pattern of personal characteristics of the leader must bear some relationship to the characteristics, activities, and goals of the followers" (127, p. 35).

Organizational researchers, such as Stogdill, Cooper, and McGaugh have come to the conclusion that trait identification alone is not sufficient for identification of leader behavior. Therefore, other approaches to leader identification were deemed necessary.

**Situational approach**

The situational approach, which has been called an outgrowth of the "times" theory, is another approach. It may be more difficult to define situational leadership because the variables are difficult to observe, confine, and qualify.

Fiedler maintains that different situations require different leadership. In other words, the same leadership style or behavior will not be effective in all situations. He identifies three major situational factors which may decide if a leader will have difficulty or ease in influencing the group. They are:

1) the degree to which the group accepts and trusts its leader;
2) the leader's position power—that is the power which the organization rests in the leadership position;
3) the degree to which the task of the group is structured or unstructured (38).

Thus proponents of situational leadership feel that a leader is not a person with skills inherent to leading and which may be successfully transferred from one setting to another, but they attempt to define leadership on the basis of relative abilities. An individual may emerge as the leader in a particular situation yet may not in another situation in which the social considerations are changed and other circumstances differ.

Critics of the situational approach have used this syllogism to explore its limits:

"Leadership depends upon the situation; no two situations are ever alike; therefore, leadership is never the same thus no meaningful generalizations about leadership are possible" (33, p. 311).

A more positive view is predicated on the view certain common characteristics may be identified in situations (33). Research, such as the study by Gross and Herriott, called the Executive Professional Leadership are based on the situational approach (49).

Wolman emphasized the importance of the situational approach. He maintained that leadership characteristics may be found in three basic types of social organizations. They are:
1) instrumental groups--one to which an individual adheres because it is perceived as being the instrument by which to achieve one's own goals;

2) mutual acceptance groups--a group to which an individual belongs because of a desire to be friendly with other persons;

3) vectorial group--an organization which espouses lofty goals and noble ideals; individuals join it due to a desire to render service to others (143).

Wolman determined leadership as a type of status based on power and acceptance, and upon this he based his studies. He then concluded that an individual's status is within an organization, is a function of power as the group members perceive it, and the degree to which that individual is accepted (143).

Lucio and McNeil supported the situational approach when they stated,

"Underlying the "trait" theory of leadership is the assumption that leadership resides in an individual, that is a possession which he is capable of producing in different groups and in different situations. A more supportable contention is that a person does not become a leader because of his pattern of personality traits, but because these traits bear some relevance to the characteristics, activities, and goals of the group of which he is a leader" (91, p. 67).

In summary then, one must be aware that the situational approach does not ignore or attempt to belittle the importance
of traits or individual qualities. It embraces them while insisting that they are significant only in terms of a particular social or group situation (24).

Behavioral approach

The third approach to leadership has been named the behavioral approach because it attempts to identify leader performance or behavior. Wenrich and Wenrich have stated that, "What appears to be one of the more useful approaches to research on leadership is a series of studies focusing upon leadership behavior in organizational environments" (138, p. 91). They continue by citing Cartwright and Zander's 1960 study, (16) at the Research Center for Group Dynamics at the University of Michigan. That research showed,

"that most group objectives may be accomplished through behaviors which can be classified as either 'goal achievement behaviors' or 'group maintenance behaviors.' The kinds of leadership behavior directed toward goal achievement are those in which the leader initiates action...keeps members attention on the goal...clarifies the issue...develops a procedural plan...evaluates the quality of work done and makes expert information available. The types of leadership behavior which serve the function of group maintenance are those through which the leader 'keeps interpersonal relations pleasant...arbitrates disputes...provides encouragement...gives the minority a chance to be heard...stimulates self-direction and increases the interdependence among members" (16, p. 496).

Commencing in the late 1950's and continuing at present, studies such as Cartwright's and Zander's have tended to focus more on the behavioral approach to leadership. The emphasis on the behavioral tendencies of leaders may be seen
in this statement by Ramseyer in defining education leadership as "...that action or behavior among individuals or groups which causes both the individual and the group to move toward educational goals that are increasingly mutually acceptable to them" (115, p. 27).

It is felt that the main thrust of the behavioral approach is the interpersonal contribution a person may make in a particular situation which draws a reaction from that individual. The traits of the individual are of lesser significance than the behavior that is exhibited.

A major study of the behavioral approach to leadership was done by the Personnel Research Board at The Ohio State University. Members of this board (which include Ralph Stogdill, Andrew Halpin, and John Hempshill) believed that leader behavior was more easily recognized than leader traits or leadership eliciting situations. Halpin explained the feeling of the board in this statement,

"We will greatly increase our understanding of leadership phenomena if we abandon the notion of 'leadership' as a trait and concentrate instead on an analysis of the behavior of leaders" (52, p. 172).

He went on to say that there are two major methodological advantages to emphasizing behavior of leaders instead of leadership per se. They are:

1) it permits the researcher to deal with directly observable phenomena; and
2) it emphasizes the need to distinguish between the
description of leader behavior and the qualitative
effects of that behavior (52).

The focus on leader behavior instead of leadership as
such by the Ohio Leadership Studies has been a major con­tri­bu­tion to the study of leadership. "The description of
leadership from the evaluation of the leader's behavior are
prominent aspects of the behavioral approach" (24, p. 51).

Through a factor analysis of the Leader Behavior
Description Questionnaire two major dimensions of leader behav­ior have been identified. They are consideration and
initiation of structure (see pages 77-78 for detailed expla­nation). Halpin first identified these characteristics in a
study of aircraft commanders. Leaders were determined to be
effective if they scored high on both the initiation and
consideration scales. Task oriented leaders were found to
score high on initiation but low on consideration while
democratic leaders scored high on consideration and low on
initiation (131). When comparing aircraft commanders with
educational administrators, he found more consideration and
less initiation on the part of administrators. The differ­ences were presumed to be because of the difference in the
settings of the institution within which the respondents
operate (53).

Although the heavy thrust of leadership study began in
the 1950's, it continues today and many view it as the primary
interest in educational administration. "Two types of studies have been used in recent investigations of leadership: (1) those that include a search for additional dimensions to explain the nature of leader behavior, and (2) those that include a search for meaningful variables having a high correlation with leader behavior. The Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ) has been used as the primary instrument to gather the data for many of these studies" (24, p. 53).

Styles of Leadership

Sources of authority

In his discussion about authoritarianism Knezevich quotes Simon's definition: "the power to make decisions which guide the actions of another" (122, p. 125). He states that there are different kinds of authority and discusses and defines technical authority as the type that "adheres to the individual because of his recognized expertness in a given field...it goes with him as he moves from one position to another" (82, p. 45). Knezevich distinguishes between authority and power in this way, "Power accrues from holding access to or actual possession of resources...that someone else desires" (82, p. 45). He concludes that authority is the reputation one has earned and is voluntarily obeyed by individuals because they feel they should obey rather than because they must obey.

This may lead one to puzzle over the source of authority and question the concept. Does authority emanate from more
than one source? What classifications are used to determine an authority base? There are several methods for describing and defining styles of authority that may answer the preceding questions.

Perhaps the most common method of authority description may be explained by a discussion of the three sources of authority; the traditional, the charismatic, and the rational. Burns discusses Max Weber's historical view of the three in the following:

"Max Weber concluded that societies passed through a sequence of three 'pure' types of authority: the charismatic, the rational-legal, and the traditional. The miraculous, transcending leadership of a religious savior such as Christ or Muhammad was followed by a period in which charisma was routinized and bureaucratized and authority was exercised through legal and 'rational' institutions and practices. In time this system evolved into a traditionalist society in which authority was legitimated by usage, precedent, and custom. As this society became more tradition-bound and static, the seeds were sown for the birth of a new charismatic leadership and authority. And so the cycle proceeded. Russia seemed to fit Weber's model. The archetypes of traditionalist rule there were the czars" (12, p. 243).

Weber explained what he felt was the cyclic rotation of the authority sources. A separate discussion of each follows:

**Charismatic**

The term charismatic leadership is sometimes called symbolic leadership. This type of authority is usually accorded an individual who has achieved leadership because of the qualities of personality such as enthusiasm or friendliness which many feel are vague. Proponents of this
type of leadership may feel that the axiom, "leaders are born, not made," is an accurate perception. Knezevich goes a little farther by adding "some have it, some don't" (82, p. 81). He views this as closely akin to the trait approach to leadership. A charismatic leader spends a great deal of energy keeping the attention of the followers or group focused on the leader in an effort to enlarge the enthusiasm of the followers and the leaders own commitment. It has been said that a charismatic leader can use direct orders effectively, but that frequently goals may be achieved by suggestions to devotees (24).

Burns states,

"The concept of charisma has fertilized the study of leadership. Its very ambiguity has enabled it to be captured by scholars in different disciplines and applied to a variety of situations" (12, p. 243. He goes on to give the examples: "Moses was one of the first of the towering charismatic leaders" (12, p. 241) and "In the United States the 'jumpers' of 1960 hopped up and down, screaming in frenzy, as John F. Kennedy and his entourage approached during the presidential campaign of that year. One can doubt that these teenagers and subteenagers were whooping it up for Kennedy because of his stand on old-age pensions or on Latin American policy.... He was handsome, with a boyish grin, but in 1960 Kennedy had little connection with the basic needs, expectations, and values of the young people. Kennedy's appearance and performance titillated them; that was enough" (12, p. 248).

He summarizes by saying, "Idolized heroes (Burns' terms for charismatic leaders) are not, then, authentic leaders because no true relationship exists between them and the spectators--no relationship characterized by deeply held
motives, shared goals, rational conflict and lasting influence in the form of change" (12, p. 248).

Rational

The terms rational, formal, status leadership, or rational-legal seem to be used almost interchangeably in the literature to describe the leadership style that is associated with a position that is somehow official. It may occur at a particular point on an organizational chart, and the individual who holds that position is considered leader by that virtue alone. Certain expectations are demanded of position holders and acceptance of authority and responsibility are part of the rational leadership position (2).

Knezevich discusses formal leadership and says,

"The individual occupying a given status in the organization or holding a specific title of office or place in a certain position in the hierarchy or granted special authority in the formal chart of organization is automatically considered a leader. This recognition may disappear when he vacated status, title, position, or office. ...mere occupancy of a position is no guarantee that its incumbent will actually be what subsequently will be defined as a 'functional' leader" (82, p. 83).

Characteristics which seem to fit the style of a rational leader are the adherence to regulations of the organization, and the requiring of others within the organization to also conform to those policies. The rational leader also regards authority, standard procedures, and responsibility as important in the efforts of the organization (33).
Traditional

The traditional, or functional, style of leadership is based on the premise that leadership roles may be learned. The needs of the organization, not the traits of an individual, determine the leader role (82). In reference to Weber's explanation of traditional leadership being legitimized by precedent and custom, one may see that the leadership role is accorded to some positions in a community such as ministers or bankers, because people expect the individuals in those roles to assume leadership status.

Anderson states that in the functional style, "Leadership must be consonant with the nature of the problem, the abilities of the group members, and their willingness to accept an individual as leader" (2, p. 30). While at first these statements may not seem to be congruent, it should be pointed out that the last phrase of Anderson's quote may provide the key. The willingness of the group to accept certain individuals as leaders may hinge partially upon the recognition of the individuals in those roles that leader behavior is expected of them.

Again we may refer to Weber's analysis where he cited the Russian Czars as the prime example of the traditional style of leadership or authority. It has been said that traditionalists are apt to have a paternalistic attitude toward their group (24). Perhaps the czars or some of the other monarchs in the history of Western Europe could serve as examples.
Classification of Leader Behavior

So far an attempt has been made to discuss the definitions of leadership, theories of leadership, approaches to leadership, and styles of leadership. In a continuing effort to further research and perhaps refine the concept of leadership, one may look at the classification of leadership behavior. Three classifications are most common in literature. They are authoritarian, democratic, and laissez-faire. The democratic classification has some subclassifications which merit explanation.

Authoritarian

An authoritarian leader determines policy, according to Knezevich, and also determines the roles of other group members without their consent (82). The authoritarian leader is characterized by aloofness from the group and praising and criticizing from the personal plane. Authoritarianism is thought to be based on fear and suspicion and to thrive on distorting information. Decisions are not arrived at from group determination and almost always methods of high control are employed (33). It has been speculated that a leader may use authoritarian methods to defend or attempt to hide the leader's own fear (24).

Knezevich quotes Adolf Hitler's rationale for authoritarianism. Hitler said:
"Nothing is possible unless one will commands, a will which has to be obeyed by others, beginning at the top and ending only at the very bottom. . . . we must train our people so that whenever someone has been appointed to command, the others will recognize it as their duty to obey him, for it can happen that an hour later they will be called upon to command, and they can do it then only if others in turn obey. This is the expression of an authoritarian state--not of a weak, babbling democracy--of an authoritarian state where everyone is proud to obey because he knows; 'I will likewise be obeyed when I must take command!'" (13, p. 29).

Democratic

The democratic classification of leadership behavior highlights the human relations concept of group functioning. In this classification, the leader along with organization members determine policy and make decisions (82). The thrust of democratic leadership is upon group consensus.

Knezevich refines the democratic leader behavior into two categories. They are:

1) the anarchic--"grants complete freedom to group or individual decision without leader participation or direction. The primary role of the leader is merely to supply materials, remaining a part from the group and participating only when asked."

2) the manipulative or pseudodemocratic--"...the leader makes his desires known and then appoints a committee, ostensibly to deliberate, but primarily to approve his
proposals. ..." Under the manipulative leadership style the group members not only follow orders, but take full responsibility for creating the orders as well" (82, p. 89).

Knezevich concludes that the anarchic system is really a "leaderless social situation" (82, p. 88).

The democratic leadership is denoted by four types of behavior. They are:

1) participation with the group,
2) urging group members to take part in decisionmaking,
3) giving suggestions whenever they are necessary, and
4) sharing authority and responsibility with the group members (33).

Another classification of leadership which has been given a separate billing by some, may be viewed as the extreme form of the democratic classification. This is the altruistic leader. Present in this type of leader is an extreme concern for democratic processes, extreme concern for the feelings of other people and fairness. Characteristically, decisions are reached by the total group, the leader is indecisive and fearful of hurting feelings of the group or community (24).

Characteristics usually associated with the democratic classification are that the leader is a self-adequate person who assumes colleagues are loyal, adequate to perform their tasks, and responsible (24).
Laissez-faire

The laissez-faire classification of leader behavior may best be described as one with the least emotional involvement or commitment to group activities and a near absence of participation in those activities. The laissez-faire type does supply information even though there is little participation with the group. It is characteristic for this type of leader to be neutral on as many issues as possible thereby allowing the group members to do nearly what they want to do. Members of the group may respect this type of leader as an individual but could find the necessary leadership values lacking in a group situation (2).

Models of Leader Behavior

Since the 1950's increase in the study of leadership and leader behavior, some researchers have developed models or paradigms in an effort to clarify and explain leader behavior. A discussion of the more prominent models may aid in the matter of understanding leadership behavior and techniques.

Getzels and Guba

Getzels and Guba developed one of the best known models of organizational behavior. They see administration of organizations as a social process which in order to be successful, must blend the interdependent elements of the nomothetic dimension and the idiographic dimension. They see
the process as a function of both the institution (nomothetic) and the individual (idiographic). In this model there is a structure with a hierarchy of superordinates and subordinates who each have roles to achieve goals within the organization (42). The term institution is used to designate agencies established to carry out institutionalized functions for the social systems as a whole. Roles are the dynamic aspects of the positions, offices, and statuses within an institution (138). A clearer view might be seen from Figure 1.
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Figure 1. Model showing the nomothetic and the idiographic dimensions of social behavior from J.W. Getzels and E.G. Guba (42, p. 429).

"In the nomothetic dimension,...,institution is defined as a set of roles, and role as a set of expectations which influence behavior. Similarly, on the idiographic dimension the individual is seen as having certain personality characteristics or needs which influence behavior (138, p. 93).

The Getzels and Guba paradigm emphasized that there are three models of leader behavior:

1) behavior that stresses the nomothetic (task-achievement) considerations:
2) behavior that emphasizes the idiographic (needs-satisfaction) considerations:

3) behavior that utilizes a judicious combination of the two (138, p. 93).

Wenrich and Wenrich state that, "The proportions of individual (personality) and institutional (role) factors determining leader behavior will carry according to the situation. For example, in a military organization the behavior of a leader would be influenced more by role than by personality, while in an organization of artists, personality would dominate over role" (138, p. 94).

In relationship to leadership classification, a leader who might follow the nomothetic dimension would be oriented strongly toward institution goals and the autocratic classification may be closest to describing the system. This type of leader would insist on conformity, regulation, and very seldom employ group decision making processes. Effectiveness would be the most sought after goal (82).

The idiographic leader, on the other hand, would put prime emphasis on individualism. This type of leader would put few rules or restrictions on individuals associated within the organization (2). The laissez-faire classification has been called the extreme from of the idiographic dimension (24).

A third dimension, the transactional, has been described as a compromise between the nomothetic and idiographic dimensions. They are viewed as interdependent as opposed to
being in a state of conflict. Anderson says that there is the implication that it is "desirable to bring into congruence the nomothetic and idiographic dimensions..." (2, p. 36). He believes that this shows that leadership in its most effective form includes both consideration and initiating structure (2).

The transactional type leader can recognize the need to achieve the goals of the institution while not violating the goals and freedoms of the individual. A transactional leader has been described as one who may in certain circumstances stress the needs of the institution (nomothetic) and under another set of circumstances emphasize the individuals goals (idiographic) (82).

McGregor

In 1960, Douglas McGregor examined the attempt to apply behavioral science to management efforts to improve productivity in his book, *The Human Side of Enterprise*. He viewed management activity and thinking as being predicated on two quite opposite sets of assumptions of managerial style. These two sets of assumptions he labeled X and Y (97).

Theory X has been defined as the traditional view of direction and control, while theory Y has been identified as the basis for integration of individual and organizational goals. These may best be seen by a listing of the assumptions for each division of McGregor's model.
THEORY X

1. "The average human being has an inherent dislike of work and will avoid it if he can

2. "...most people must be coerced, controlled, directed, threatened with punishment to get them to put forth adequate effort toward achievement of organizational objectives.

3. "The average human being prefers to be directed, wishes to avoid responsibility,...wants security above all."

THEORY Y

1. "The expenditure of physical and mental effort in work is as natural as play or rest.

2. "...Man will exercise self-direction and self control in the service of objectives to which he is committed.

3. "Commitment to objectives is a function of the regards associated with their achievement.

4. "The average human learns, under proper conditions, not only to accept but to seek responsibility.

5. "The capacity to exercise a relatively high degree of imagination, ingenuity, and creativity in the solution of organizational problems is widely distributed in the population.

6. "Under the conditions of modern life, the intellectual potentialities of the average human being are only partially utilized" (97, p. 34 and p. 47).

Wenrich and Wenrich (138) quote McGregor as stating:

"Man is a wanting animal--as soon as one of his needs is satisfied, another appears in its place. This process is unending. It continues from birth to death. Man
continuously puts forth--works, if you please--to satisfy his needs" (97, p. 36). This statement is in reference to the theory Y segment of his model and may be related to Maslow's hierarchy of human needs and continuing on the hierarchy to social needs as motivators.

In discussion of the theory X concept of the model, McGregor addresses the top end of Maslow's hierarchy, the egoistic needs. He says, "The philosophy of management by direction and control is inadequate to motivate because the human needs on which this approach relies are relatively unimportant motivations...direction and control are of limited value in motivating people whose important needs are social and egoistic" (97, p. 42).

In relationship to leader behavior, a theory X individual would see people as needing highly structured, formal organization. This leader would also feel the need to direct, motivate, and plan the activities of subordinates. They would be viewed as lacking imagination, having some varying degrees of hostility, and probably naturally irresponsible (114).

Conversely, the theory Y leader would use a participatory approach by involving subordinates and superordinates in decision making. This leader views individuals as self-directive, naturally creative, and flexible (82). Jimerson concludes his discussion of McGregor's model with this statement:
"Perhaps, instead of defending either theory the student of management would be well advised to look for the most effective blend of the two. There may be a mixture of 'X' and 'Y' elements that will prove as practical as the American compromise between private enterprise and socialism in the politico-economic sphere" (78, p. 87).

Likert

The Institute for Social Research at the University of Michigan, in 1947, began a project to discover which methods of leadership and organizational structure produced the best performance in the business and industrial setting. Some researchers in educational leadership feel the findings of Likert's study may apply to school administrators as well (2).

Four systems of management were described in the studies, which were designed to measure the types of leadership used in the best and poorest producing units within an organization. Those classifications are:

System 1) exploitative-authoritative;
System 2) benevolant-authoritative;
System 3) consultative;
System 4) participative (85)

The four systems have been described as being on a continuum from almost no participation, by the employees, in administrative decisions to a great deal of participation by employees in decision making (85).

System 4 (Participative) has been further subdivided into three basic components. They are:
1) the use by management of the principle of supportive relations

2) management use of group decision making and group methods of supervision, and

3) management high performance goals for the organization (85).

Likert developed the concept of supportive relationships (component) which he felt provided, "a formula for obtaining the full potential of every major motive which can be harnessed in a working situation" (85, p. 47). He clarified the concept in this way:

"The leadership and other processes of the organization must be such as to ensure a maximum probability that in all interactions and all relationships with the organization each member will, in the light of his background, values, and expectations, view the experience as supportive and one which builds and maintains his sense of personal worth and importance" (85, p. 47).

It should be emphasized that it is the perception of the subordinate that determines if an experience was ego-building.

The second component explores the concept of group decision making. Likert describes the role of some individuals, who he calls "linking pins". These people belong to more than one group within the organization. This group method of decision making, using members who overlap groups, should not be thought of as a committee process. The supervisor is still held accountable for the decisions and the result of those decisions (138).
The third component is based on the assumption that employees have the desire to be proud of the organization for which they work and that this coupled with group decision making strategies and the overlapping or "linking pins" yield higher productivity (2).

Likert's research provided support for group decision making processes or as it is often times called, Likert's System 4. The traditional method of organization provides for interaction on a one to one level between superordinate and subordinate; as seen in the following diagram. The system 4 approach stresses participation with decision making as a group process. This is also shown in Figure 2.
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Using the four classifications mentioned earlier, Likert devised a method for analysis in management systems in organizations using eight performance variables such as motivation, goal setting, and communication. It became visible from this research "that alternative organizational patterns exist and that managers use various management styles" (114, p. 26).
General Studies of Educational Leader Behavior

Some of the studies cited in the following sections will involve secondary school principals. These have been included because it is felt that these findings have implications for the inclusion of more females into administrative roles in general, and the findings may apply to elementary positions.

The preceding pages were filled with a discussion of the attempt to define leadership and leader behavior in general, as well as some theories, approaches, and models addressing those definitions. The recognition of the need for some type of leadership in both informal and formal organizations within our society is an undisputed need.

The same holds true for the educational system within society. One aspect particularly important in this area is the leader behavior of public school administrators whose actions touch nearly every aspect of the educational system. If the school administrator must accept responsibility for decisions about such things as curriculum and staff accountability, then that administrator has also the responsibility to engage in leader behavior. The administrator, or educational leader, must exhibit an understanding of educational goals and objectives on a local and more global level. These same individuals should also realize that the educational
leaders attitudes and behaviors are inseparably bound to the process of education.

Erickson maintains, "the area of inquiry that comes closest to being unique to the field of educational organization and administration is the study of the educational administrator: (28, p. 455).

One of the earliest of this kind of studies was done by Andrew Halpin in 1955. He compared aircraft commanders and school superintendents using the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire--Ideal and the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire--Real (114). He hypothesized that leader behavior is a product of both situational and individual variables. Halpin found that aircraft commanders and the superintendents did differ in their behavior patterns according to their workers (in the LBDQ-Real) and in their perception of how they should perform (in the LBDQ-Ideal).

Halpin's concern in this study addressed the two dimensions that have consistently emerged in factor analysis of the LBDQ-initiating structure and consideration. A greater percentage of aircraft commanders stressed the initiating structure while more school administrators emphasized consideration. Halpin concluded that the differences could be accounted for by the difference between institutional settings (28).

Erickson reported that:

"In a later LBDQ study of school superintendents, Halpin (1959) discussed a tendency for superiors
(school board members) and subordinates (staff members reporting to the superintendent) to differ in their descriptions of how school leaders do and should conduct themselves. Superiors (as compared with subordinates) desired more initiating structure, while subordinates (as compared with superiors) desired more consideration. The superiors generally described the superintendents as higher on both initiating structure and consideration than the subordinates reported them as being. Halpin's conclusion was that the superintendents in the study probably utilized two different patterns of behavior, depending on whether they were dealing with school boards or with members of their own staffs"

(28, p. 457).

Before the 1959 study, Halpin did a study using fifty Ohio school superintendents (1956). He determined that successful leadership includes high initiating structure and high consideration. He felt these two dimensions to be fundamental and critical aspects of leader behavior. He also felt that the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire provided a reliable and objective method of describing these concepts. He also explained that he felt it could be erroneous to assume those concepts make up the sole criteria of leader behavior (114).

Studies in the late 1950's attempted to identify characteristics and behavior of school administrators. Examples of these are: a 1956 study by Marquit-researched supervisory behavior of principals (94); in 1957 Gentry looked at school administrators characteristics (41); and in 1958, Grobman studied the community interaction and operational behavior of education administrators (47). In 1959, Hunter found that
board members and teachers in larger school systems almost invariably rated the superintendent lower on the initiating structure and consideration scale of the LBDQ than did their counterparts in small school districts. At the same time the superintendents in large districts rated themselves higher than did their small district colleagues (74).

The 1960's saw still more pursuit of the nature of leadership and leader behavior. In 1964, Charters contended that Getzel's and Guba's concept of institutionalized behavior was reported by respondents in a study to determine teachers' perceptions of superintendents' leader behavior. He also maintained that a number of operations performed by individual leaders in small group settings were carried out using an impersonal mechanism in a complex organizational setting (18). Later, in the 1970's, others such as Bridges (10) and Erickson (29), in agreement with Charters, began to address the extent of the lack of power of administrators to imprint personal images on their organization. Erickson concluded that "the 'Great Man Theory' dies hard" (28, p. 459) when he refers to a 1965 study by Carlson (14), which he felt ignored the explanation that school districts tend to hire administrators with what they consider the proper outlook, as opposed to Carlson's explanation that innovation was credited to the superintendent as an individual (28).

Also in 1964, Hemphill reported a study concerning the administrative styles of 232 elementary principals whose
personal qualities were studied when they worked for one week each as the principal of a simulated elementary school. Eight administrative styles were identified and the following conclusions drawn.

"The style of administration of a principal may be understood in part as an expression of measurable personality characteristics. The different patterns of administrative performance also appear to lead to differences in the way a principal is regarded by his superiors and his teachers" (64, p. 493).

Other studies in the 1960's included Hayden's 1965 research concerning the behavior of principals as it related to their amount of education, experience level, and other factors, (62) and Gott's 1966 study of perceptions and expectations of secondary principals' leader behavior (45).

The decade of the 1970's has produced, and is still producing, attempts and evidence of the search for identification of leader behavior. In 1970, Lucietto described a study analyzing speech patterns of school administrators. She used language samples from conversations by twenty male elementary principals with teachers held in a suburban area of a large midwest city. This study has been said to have provided the first evidence of concurrent validity of the LBDQ. In addition, her study raised questions concerning the dominant rejection of the trait approach to administrative study. Erickson felt her study seemed to show that speech patterns were fundamentally a part of personality rather than
a product of social context. Her findings supported the hypothesis that subgroups of principals who were scored in the high consideration category used a great deal of clarifying language (90).

That same year, Feitler researched the relationship between the leadership styles of a principal and elementary school characteristics (36). Fultineer's 1971 study dealt with principal and staff interpersonal relationships (40).

In 1974, Wolcott presented yet another alternative to the number of options of study of behavior of educational administrators. His methodology, an anthropological approach, he entitled, "an ethnographic-type account of the elementary principalship by means of extensive case study of one principal" (142, p. 464). He employed three field study methods; enumeration, to document; participant observation, to describe; and informant interviews, to uncover institutionalization. Wolcott's motivation for this style of study was his feeling that education administration literature was ignoring the actual behavior of administrators. He felt much of the research told principals "how they ought to act" (142, p. 514).

He identified that research up to that time had determined that the average elementary school principal in the United States was a married male, between 35 and 49 years old, who had a total of 10 to 19 years of experience in schools, and was a classroom elementary teacher just before becoming an
administrator. His case study personnel fit this description. In describing the conclusions of his study, he seemed to find more questions. He commented that although public schools seem to have a penchant for change, the successful principals seem to be ones who can contain and constrain the constantly changing groups they have to administer. He finished by saying,

"Could it be that those people who seek to become and are able to survive as principals,...,have their greatest impact on education not as agents of change, but rather as advocates of constraint? If so we may be better able to account for the remarkable stability and uniformity that has characterized American elementary schools in spite of the forces for change swirling about them" (142, p. 539).

Even though it may seem that a variety of research has been conducted about leadership and leader behavior, Erickson still feels that research in the area of leader behavior in school administration is an immature field. Although he does credit some of the preceding authors, he feels empirical research in educational administration has not been comprehensively done (28).

Comparative Studies in Educational Leader Behavior

A number of variables have been researched in relation to leader behavior in educational administration. One variable, however, that has not often been dealt with is the
relationship, if there is any, between sex and leader behavior. A summary of the studies which have addressed this field follows.

Along with the interest in identification of leadership characteristics in the 1950's, some research did review sex in the list of variables. In a 1955 study, Kimball and Grobman used the three classifications of leader behavior discussed earlier, democratic, authoritarian, and laissez-faire. They found that female principals were considered democratic more often than men. Their research maintained that men did not score as highly as women in such concepts as student morale (80).

Another study by Grobman and Hines in 1956, using larger and more varied groups of respondents (including parents and other community members) determined again that female principals tended to be more democratic (48). They also reported that program development in schools with female principals was rated higher than with male principals (48).

A study done in 1957 by Barter showed that most teachers rated male and female principals equal on variables of ability and personal characteristics (5). They found that female teachers usually approved of women principals more than men, but male teachers who had worked with female principals tended to be more favorable to female principals than to male principals. For the most part, males who did not approve of female principals were males who had worked only with male principals (4).
Melton did a study in 1958 in Wayne County, Michigan, which revealed that the sex of the principal did not significantly affect the perception of the role of a principal. In fact, when he did a repeat of this study in California, sex, as a variable was eliminated (99).

Along with the 1960's pursuit of leader behavior identification generally it seemed that some research recognized sex as a researchable variable that had not been vigorously investigated.

A 1961 study by Weir concluded that female administrators had leadership behavior comparable to males when superintendents and principals were surveyed (137).

A major study in 1962, investigated elementary principals. The researchers provided a simulated elementary school situation to test administrative performance. The participants were scored on knowledge, interests, abilities, and by observed behavior.

Background data was also collected on each individual. The researchers compared the simulation performance of 137 men and 95 women principals who were exposed to the same problems and asked to solve them. They found no reason to favor men to women in the principalship role. The study did show that on the average women elementary principals were about ten years older than the men. In addition, ninety percent of the male principals were married as compared to fifty percent of the women principals (64).
A 1963 study by Krause gave support to Barter's earlier research. Krause found that the attitude of female teachers toward female principals was supportive as Barter had concluded. However, the study determined that the attitude of male teachers toward female principals was neutral (83).

One hundred and seventy-five principals from forty large school districts were used in a nationwide study by Gross and Herriott in 1964. They determined that the sex of the principal had no apparent relationship to the professional leadership ability of those involved (49).

Gross and Trask in a 1964 study, entitled the Executive Professional Leadership Study, obtained results that appeared to contradict the earlier findings of Hemphill, Griffiths, and Fredrickerson. They determined that women principals did involve staff members in decision making to a greater extent than their male counterparts. From this study of 189 school districts, they also made the following comparisons:

1) "Teaching was the first career choice for most women, but for only one-half of the men;

2) Four times as many males as females became principals within ten years after they became teachers and more than two times as many males as females became first time principals at the age of thirty-five or younger;

3) Thirty-four percent of the males compared to three percent of the females had never taught in an
elementary school before they became principal. In addition, the mean teaching experience was three times greater for females than for males;

4) Women had a lower aspiration for career advancement than the males;

5) Female principals did indicate a greater concern for individual differences among the students;

6) Males derived a greater satisfaction from performance of managerial tasks than did the female principals;

7) Women exerted a greater control over the professional activities of their staff and also associated more frequently with them outside of the job setting than males did" (50, p. 13-2 - 13-5).

In a 1965 study of twenty Texas suburban elementary schools, Hoyle used the Randall Problem-Attack Inventory (RPAI) to study the description of teachers' response to questions about problem handling in school (72). He analyzed five aspects of that variable and concluded that female principals perceived potential problem situations more often than male principals and also reviewed results of actions more often. Hoyle and Randall gave as possible explanations for the results, the following:

1) the greater elementary teaching experience of women principals;
2) the likelihood that female principals are more sensitive to the problems of women teachers than male principals are; and

3) since most of the respondents were female there may have been a tendency to describe behavior from a female point of view (73, p. 28).

A study by Ernst, also in 1965, found that sex was not a significant variable in principal leader behavior as related to organization (30).

Morsink used fifteen male and fifteen female secondary principals as subjects for her 1966 examination of behavior. She used the RAD Scales, which indicate the level of responsibility, authority, and delegation, to determine self-perception along with the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire--Form XII to survey the staff of each respective principal. On the dimensions of Tolerance of Uncertainty and Consideration, no significant difference between the males and females was found. However, the dimension of Tolerance of Freedom found males receiving a significantly higher score than the female principals. The remaining nine dimensions measured by the LBDQ-Form XII found females consistently receiving higher scores than the males (104).

The late 1960's saw a continued interest in leader behavior and again some delving into comparative studies using sex as one of several variables.
Holsclaw's 1967 research concluded that a principal's sex did not affect ratings by superiors but found that ratings of those principals by subordinates, for the most part, favored males over females regardless of the effectiveness the principal was thought to achieve (68).

Warwick explored attitudes toward women in administration, in a 1968 study and found:

1) women did have unfavorable attitudes toward working for women administrators;
2) men, for the most part, had neutral or favorable attitudes toward female administrators;
3) promotional policies were not clear concerning administrative positions and may have caused women not to apply: clear cut policies often showed prejudice and discrimination hampered women in attempts to obtain administrative positions;
4) women had low aspirations concerning professional goals; and
5) women had to possess superior qualifications to obtain administrative appointment (136).

The dawning of the 1970's found conditions nearly the same as the previous decade and research thrusts continuing along the same veins as before--an increasing interest in research in leader behavior and some inclusion of concepts about male and female administrators.
In 1970, Wilson published a study about views and concerns of elementary principals. It was learned that both males and females shared the same ideas about which problems were most critical and that they all had experienced a comparable amount of difficulty with these problems (141).

Hansen (59) and Esparte (31), in 1970, did studies which supported those of Ernst (30) (1965) and Marquit (94) (1956) concluding that sex was not a significant factor in principal effectiveness and organizational climate.

A 1971 study by Van Meir, used the LBDQ-XII to compare leader behavior of male and female elementary principals. The respondents were ten female and fifteen male principals, and selected members of their staffs, from seven Chicago suburban school districts. The research determined, using the same instrument as Morsink, that teachers rated the female principals higher than the male principals on all twelve dimensions. The female principals were also viewed by the teachers as exhibiting more leader behavior in the dimensions of persuasiveness, role assumption, demand reconciliation, and predictive accuracy (134).

Longstreth used the LBDQ-XII for a 1973 study of secondary school principals in Florida. She compared responses from seventeen female and twenty male principals, their immediate superordinates, and a sampling of their own subordinates. The study supported Holsclaw's findings concerning the ratings of principals by superordinates; that
is, that sex is not a significant factor in ratings of principals by superordinates. The results of the principals' self-evaluation showed that male and female principals perceived their own behavior as being different significantly in just one dimension. That dimension was consideration the dimension which addresses behavior traits of trust, warmth, and friendliness. Female principals felt themselves concerned with these traits more often than did the males.

When the subordinates were grouped according to the sex of the principal, the study showed that both male and female subordinates perceived females to exercise a higher degree of representation. When respondents were grouped according to the sex of the subordinates, males saw principals as exercising a higher degree of production emphasis. Longstreth found no significant difference on the interaction of the sex of the principal and that of the subordinates (88).

The Longstreth study concurred with that of Halpin on the issue that superordinates and subordinates tend to view principals differently (54 and 55).

A 1976 study by Quinn, examining leader behavior, instructional leadership, and decision making orientation of male and female elementary principals in the Chicago school system, found some slight differences between males and females on three of the four leadership variables. Males scored higher on consideration, initiation, and instructional leadership, while females scored higher on the decision
making orientation analysis. Quinn pointed out that, in nearly every case, differences between males and females get more pronounced as the experience levels of both increase. In the instances of low experience levels, the differences are small or reversed. She felt that sex alone could not predict leader behavior because there was a lack of consistency when other variables were controlled. In other words, when the variables, other than sex, were controlled some of them sharpened the male-female attitude difference while some other variables eliminated the differences. She concluded that while sex was not a significant factor in predicting leader behavior, there is a need for more comparative research on leader behavior to erase the myth surrounding female administrative abilities. She also felt more study of self-perception of the female and male administrators may help in the search to discover why the continued decline in female administrators exists (114).

Davenport, in 1976, researched perceived leader behavior in elementary school principals in the state of Missouri (24). He randomly selected forty male and forty female elementary principals from which he received responses from twenty-nine males and twenty-eight females. Members of each principals' staff were also surveyed. Using the LBDQ-XII and the Professional Attitude and Background Survey (PABS) instruments, Davenport reported the following:
1) "Male elementary principals were perceived by superordinates to be superior to female principals in reconciling conflict demands and reducing disorder to the system;

2) "Subordinates perceived the male principals to permit their subordinates a higher degree of freedom and the female principals to have the greater thrust toward task completion and the maintenance of more wholesome relationships with their superiors.

3) "Female subordinates perceived their principals to speak and act more representative of the group than did male subordinates.

4) "Male respondents perceived male elementary school principals tend to operate in the middle ranges of the leadership continuum.

5) "Female respondents perceived male principals' administrative behavior to be slanted toward the leader-centered end of the continuum.

6) "Males respondents generally perceived the female elementary school principals to be fairly evenly distributed in their administrative methods along the leadership continuum.

7) "Female respondents perceived female elementary school principals as tending toward the subordinate-centered end of the continuum" (24, p. 166-168).
Davenport also explored the area of obtaining administrative positions and advancement within a system. He found that both males and females agreed that men received more consideration and opportunity than females. The one exception to this finding was in the male superordinate unit. These respondents felt men and women received equal consideration. There seemed to be a general agreement among the various units, according to Davenport, that the sex of the principal is not a major factor in the administrators' relationship with school staff, students, the community, or the principal's superordinates.

Every category of respondent thought past educational experiences and educational background were very important (24).

Davenport expressed the feeling that more research with a broader geographic base and larger samples may produce insights not yet shown (24).

**Status of Men and Women in Educational Administration**

In chapter one it was discussed that while the majority of elementary teaching positions are filled with women, there seems to be a continuing lack of women in administrative positions. It was also quoted that, "...society still has not recognized that equality of opportunity, like liberty, is indivisible (70, p. 1). From that statement one may conclude that if employment equality does not exist for
females, it does not for males either. Although this endeavor is concerned with educational administration and leader behavior in the United States generally and elementary educational leadership specifically, it may serve the profession to point out that other professions share the same concerns, prejudices, and challenges.

Sandler states that,

"The percentage of women professionals in the U.S. is pathetically small, women account from 3.5% of the lawyers, 2% of the dentists, 7% of the physicians, and 1% of the engineers" (118, p. 50).

She continues by pointing out that 24% of the lawyers in Sweden are female, 70% of Denmark's dentists are women, and 75% of the physicians in Russia are female. Sandler also explains that, "the percentage of women in professional and technical occupations has decreased over the last 30 years, contrary to the popular myth of expanding opportunities from women" (118, p. 50). She feels that sex discrimination is the last socially acceptable prejudice. She concludes her discussion by maintaining that, "Society can expect to see... more progress as women and employers join together to ensure that every individual--male or female--enjoys equal employment opportunity. No nation can afford to waste half of its human resources" (118, p. 52).

Some of the reasons by Morsink, cited in Chapter one, appear to be undergoing a change according to the findings
in a more recent study by Taylor. In an attempt to answer a question about the reasons for the lack of women becoming leaders, she explained:

"Two explanations remain to be considered: preparation and preference. A large number of women do receive advance training. Therefore, lack of formal qualification does not seem to be an important factor. A recent study by the Women's Equity Action League (WEAL) indicates that more than 20% of the doctorates in education in the U.S. have been granted to women. Some 13% of these advanced degrees were awarded in educational administration and supervision. Since women earned only 12% of the doctorates given in all fields the percentage for education was higher than the average percent" (132, p. 125).

She continues,

"My study showed that all other things being equal superintendents (male) were not likely to hire women as administrators. Half of the school systems studies did not encourage women to train or apply for administrative positions. Moreover, even though there were no written policies precluding women from administrative appointments and very few school systems acknowledged unwritten policies, women were still not likely to be appointed the principals or superintendents. ...analysis of the data revealed that the only factor which appeared to have any significance on the hiring process was that of sex" (132, p. 125).

Statistics seem to show that the number of men elementary teachers has been increasing at an accelerating rate, 39 percent in the decade of the late 1960's to early 1970's (132). This has been offered as another reason for the drastic decline in female elementary administrators. It has been discussed that this combined with the larger amount of education and greater number of years in teaching
belonging to men has put women at a disadvantage (11). The actual percentage (21%) of female elementary principals is lower today than in past decades.

Taylor points out that historically male dominance of our educational system is a tradition. "The seventeenth century 'dame schools' actually excluded girls for fear that they would learn to write and forge their husbands' signatures" (132, p. 124). She cites Reitman in the opinion that part of the fault for the decline may lie with women themselves. Reitman urges women to become less docile and more assertive to remedy the situation (116). One example given as impetus for others is the success of the president of the Detroit, Michigan local unit of the American Federation of Teachers, Mary Ellen Riordan (132).

National Conference on Women in Educational Policy Making

In harmony with the above stated opinion is a portion of a position paper offered by the National Conference on Women in Educational Policy Making. The paper states:

"For large numbers of women,....qualifying oneself for educational leadership demands more seriousness of purpose, and more persistence, than many have been willing to give to the enterprise. ....women are sometimes their own worst enemies when it comes to jumping through the qualifying hoops set up by the educational establishment (70, p. 12).

This paper, as did Taylor, makes reference to historical influences on the educational system in general, and specifically to administration. The authors state,
"...there was and is a deliberate and continuing effort to move the schools administration and management from that of a cottage industry or small factory to that of a modern corporation. Parallel with the remaking of school administration and management practices have been two kinds of personnel trends that are not unrelated to the attempt to streamline managerial structures. One ...
is the flight of the female from positions of leadership" (70, p. 13).

They continue:

"Another phenomenon worth noting is that the corporate model of policy and decision making most usual in the modernized school and school system is a military one. ...most of the people with military experience in the school are men. ...the difficulty has been the wholesale lifting of a 'foreign' power system from the military and the large corporate bureaucracies without attention to the essential, therefore, that women who are unhappy about the status quo begin to learn something about power. ... Not only may they then be able to change their position in the world of education, but they may also find the tools for institutional change within the schools and join the movement crying for seasoned recruits" (70, p. 3-5).

The historical analysis continues in their discussion of student learning from preschool through graduate school, of sexually stereotyped and humanly restrictive roles. The authors contend that female students are taught, "to make coffee not policy" (70, p. 7).

The paper addresses the decline or lack of rise in numbers of female administrators to a tightening at the top of the power structure that has created enough backlash to frighten a group of women and silence others. The authors feel that women are at the bottom in the educational realm,
but they have an advantage in their numbers if they choose to "make waves". They also point out, "it is a single woman or a small group who provide the current, and it is clear enough that they take a great risk in so doing" (70, p. 10).

**Practices at universities and colleges**

Another hinderance to women's advancement has been found at the college and university. Cronin found that until quite recently admission and recruitment policies favored male to females (22). Among the practices, cited by Cohen that have contributed to women not completing undergraduate or graduate degrees, was the inclination of counselors and admission officers to perpetuate sex stereotyping various professions (19). Olson supported the findings of Cronin and Cohen by reporting that women encounter obstacles more often than men in prestigious graduate institutions. She supported her stand by stating that while only thirty-seven percent of all graduate students are female, forty percent of the Master's degrees are granted to women, but only thirteen percent of the doctorates are earned by women (109).

Lyon and Saario examined programs of educational administration and financial aid programs at colleges and universities and found that women were not even moderately represented. They concluded that women have been denied equal access to the two routes of advancement in educational administration.
Those are the difficulty of remaining in the system and to advance through the ranks and the limitation for returning to a system to an advanced position (93).

**Employment practices**

The previously discussed findings by Sandler and Taylor concerning employment practices to women have been supported by Milanovich. His research in the state of New York showed that school superintendents advised boards of education to employ young men, even with limited qualifications, in preference to well-qualified females. He questioned graduate students and found them to have developed prejudicial attitudes toward female principals. They described female principals as being, "too autocratic, too demanding, too critical, too particular, too moody, too emotional, and too nosey" (102, p. 19).

Research by Shreiber in 1971, found that:

1) When candidates for an elementary school principalship are equally well-qualified, male candidates will be selected more often than female candidates.

2) When the female candidates are very much more well-qualified than the male candidates, the female candidates more often will be selected than the male.

3) Men tend to select male candidates more often for the elementary school principalship than do women. This
occurs both when female candidates are as well qualified as the male, and when they are more well-qualified than the male.

4) Those who have worked with women administrators show a greater acceptance of them than do those who have never worked with women administrators (121).

Until quite recently the lack of female administrators could have been tied to strict regulations concerning the length of time women could work during a pregnancy. This added to the difficulty of finding adequate child care often made it necessary for a woman to stay out of active pursuit of professional goals for a period of time (120).

**Special training**

The idea has been advanced that women need special training to assume leadership roles. Cohen believes they do not. She believes that two errors of assumption are made when the ways men and women assume leadership roles is looked at. The first one is that women don't assume leadership roles as early as men. In her address to the Women's Educational Equity Colloquium, Cohen said, "Many people believe that we have to 'fix' women and teach them to be leaders, but all you have to do is look at the large family and watch the way a mother organizes it to know that women do have natural leadership ability" (20, p. 8). The other popular idea is that there are particular leadership skills possessed only by
men. To that assumption Cohen says, "While this is true in very specific sets of circumstances, it is not true as a general rule" (20, p. 8). She explained that there is with this assumption the feeling that males are task-oriented while females are more passive in groups. "This does happen in mixed-sex groups, but it is more a function of status difference based on the assumption that men are more competent than women" (20, p. 8). Megargee reported findings that tend to support this. The research showed that high dominance women were reluctant to assume overt leadership over low dominance men (98).

Cohen goes on to state that she does not favor assertiveness training for women. She believes that in order for a person to function as a leader, one must have an "aura of legitimacy" and the best method for women to obtain legitimacy is for every woman placed in a responsible position to be well-qualified for that particular position. She cautions that putting a token woman in a job that she is not qualified for creates backlash (20).

Cohen feels that another way for women to achieve leadership status is to ensure that women are not put in positions where they are accountable for outcomes over which they have no control. She says that many jobs of this type are found in school systems. The school principalship is one she uses as an example. "That's a job in which males and
females exhibit the same pattern of behavior because it is a job in which the holder has little control over the ends he or she is expected to achieve" (20, p. 8).

Mention has been made of the myths regarding the suitability of women in administrative positions. Unfortunately, some women appear to believe them also. A study by Vallery showed that the myths may be boiled down to three general ones. They are: 1) anatomy is dictating, 2) women are not serious about work, and 3) a concept named "the individualistic fallacy" (133, p. 71). This last myth is the belief that excellence, like cream, will rise to the top. This causes individuals to be blind to prejudices and focus the majority of attention on the low number of women having leadership status. The lack of opportunity for experienced women is often overlooked.

Summary

Leadership has been and continues to be a topic of interest in many segments of our society. The task of trying to define what leadership was and has continued to be a controversial topic from at least the times of the Greek philosophers. The earlier theories of leadership attempted to identify a leader or leadership by the traits a recognized leader displayed or by the situations which caused certain individuals to emerge as leaders. Various approaches, styles, classifications, and models of leadership have been identified.
Basically leadership has been researched from three approaches. The "great man" theory led to refinement of the trait approach. It attempted to isolate and label the unique qualities that certain individuals who emerged as leaders seem to possess.

The situational approach is thought to be derived from the "times" theory. This approach enveloped the concept of traits and merged it with the concept of opportunity. The behavioral approach is a relatively new concept which attempts to define the behavior of individuals in leadership positions.

Styles of leadership have also been the subject of research and controversy. Three sources of authority have been identified under the style concept. Traditional authority, charismatic authority, and rational authority Weber felt all were part of a cyclic societal process. Under the terminology of styles of leadership, three classifications of leader behavior have been included. Those are authoritarian, in which the leader makes all or most decisions; democratic, in which the leader make determinations along with group members; and laissez-faire where there is little emotional involvement on the part of the leader.

Three basic models of leader behavior were also identified. The Getzel Guba model includes nomothetic, ideographic, and transactional behavior. McGregor identified
individual leader behavior according to theory X or theory Y. Likert used a four system approach to leader behavior identification.

Although the research has shown that the vast majority of elementary teachers are still women, there has been a decline in the number of women in the elementary principalship role. There has been much speculation as to why the ratio of female elementary administrators has never been in line with the number of female teachers and in fact, has in recent years declined. Some authors cite historical precedent, while others have attempted to deal with the factors surrounding the premise that women are somehow unable to function successfully as public school administrators.

There is much literature showing the ability of females to be successful elementary principals. Research shows that females perform administratively on a par with males. Yet there clearly seems to be a need for more study of role perception of leader behavior.

Some discussion was directed toward the status of men and women in educational administration. There appear to be some long standing barriers and prejudices which may hamper the manifestation of consistent quality leadership at the elementary level. Policies in colleges and universities, in recruitment, employment, and advancement policies, along with a variety of myths, and the lack of child care facilities are examples of these barriers and prejudices. Research into the
leader behavior of both male and female elementary principals on a wide geographic base may help tear down the barriers and explode the myths which tend to slow down the progress of elementary administration and ultimately the well-being of our society.

Wood put it well when this statement was made--"Today's society can flourish only if both women and men are encouraged to make full use of their individual skills and talents" (144, p. 876).
CHAPTER III.

DESIGN AND PROCEDURES
OF THE STUDY

This study examined the self-perception of leader behavior of elementary school principals in selected school districts in the midwest United States. The major thrust of the examination is to offer a comparative study of self perception of leader behavior of the elementary principals using the variables of sex, years of administrative experience, and geographic orientation. It should be noted that the two questionnaires used in this study were in no way intended or designed as a measure of the ability of the principal. The concern was targeted toward determining how a principal--as a leader--perceived himself/herself to behave, not on how well the principal behaves.

The Survey Instruments

**Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (Ideal Self)**

Development The (Ideal Self) was the survey research instrument used to collect the description of leaders data.

The Ohio State University Personnel Research Board staff developed the first **Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire** in 1957, under the direction of Hemphill and Coons. The original research for the questionnaire was done
with approximately thirty different groups and group situations. The instrument, in the beginning had 150 items and used a forced choice answer selection process ranging from "never" to "always" as foils. Those early experiments provided data analysis that led to refining the number of items to 40. Fifteen cover the initiating structure construct, fifteen items address the consideration construct, and in addition there are ten items "retained in the questionnaire in order to keep the conditions of administration comparable to those used in standardizing the questionnaire" (57, p. 1).

The Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire--Form XII was then developed in 1962, by Ralph M. Stogdill (130).

Halpin and Winer reported that when they developed an adaptation of the instrument for an Air Force study, they identified two fundamental dimensions of leader behavior. They were termed initiating structure and consideration. These were identified on the basis of a factor analysis of the responses from 300 B-29 crew members who were asked to describe the leader behavior of their aircraft commanders. Initiating structure accounted for about thirty-four percent of the common variance, while consideration accounted for fifty percent. A later study which used 249 commanders as a sample found the correlation between the scores on the two dimensions to be .38 (57).
Initiating structure refers to the leader's behavior in delineating the relationship between the leader and members of the work group and in an effort to establish well-defined patterns of organization, channels of communication, and methods of getting the job done. The fifteen items scored to measure initiating structure are:

What the ideal leader should do:

1) (2) Make his/her attitudes clear to the group.
2) (4) Try out his/her new ideas with the group.
3) (7) Rule with an iron hand.
4) (9) Critize poor work.
5) (11) Speak in a manner not to be questioned.
6) (14) Assign group members to particular tasks.
7) (16) Schedule the work to be done.
9) (22) Emphasize the meeting of deadlines.
10) (24) Encourage the use of uniform procedures.
11) (27) Make sure that his/her part in the organization is understood by group member.
12) (29) Ask that group members follow standard rules and regulations.
13) (32) Let group members know what is expected of them.
14) (35) See to it that group members are working up to capacity.
15) (39) See to it that the work of group members is coordinated (130).
The numbers in parentheses indicate the actual number of the item on the questionnaire.

Consideration relates to leader behavior denoting friendship, mutual trust, respect, and warmth in the relationship between the leader and group members (57). The fifteen items scored to measure consideration are:

What the ideal leader should do:

1) (1) Do personal favors for group members.
2) (2) Do little things to make it pleasant to be a member of the group.
3) (6) Be easy to understand.
4) (8) Find time to listen to group members.
5) (12) Keep to himself/herself.
6) (13) Look out for the personal welfare of individual group members.
7) (18) Refuse to explain his/her actions.
8) (20) Act without consulting the group.
9) (21) Back up the members in their actions.
10) (23) Treat all group members as his/her equal.
11) (26) Be willing to make changes.
12) (28) Be friendly and approachable.
13) (31) Make group members feel at ease when talking with them.
14) (34) Put suggestions made by the group into operation.
15) (38) Get group approval in important matters before going ahead (130).
Halpin and Winer also developed a quadrant scheme for describing the two dimensions of leader behavior treated in this study. Using the initiating structure and consideration constructs, the authors identified four distinct leader behavior styles for self-perception of principals. They are: 1) above the mean on both dimensions, 2) above the mean on the initiating structure dimensions, 3) above the mean on the consideration structure, 4) below the mean on both dimensions. Figure 3 gives a more graphic explanation:

Consideration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C-</th>
<th>C+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S+</td>
<td>S+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean of Consideration Scores

Figure 3. A quadrant scheme for describing leaders' behavior on the initiating structure and consideration dimension (56).

The Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (Ideal Self) has the respondent indicate the frequency which they believe leaders should exhibit the particular behavior in the statement. There are five adverbs as responses available to them, always, often, occasionally, seldom, or never. Each
of the keys for the two dimensions has fifteen items and each is scored from 0 to 4. Thus, the theoretical range of scores for each dimension is from 0 to 60.

Practitioners in leader positions usually realize that a leader must lead and in doing so must initiate movement and obtain results. Leadership style and how it differs between individuals is one effort being attempted by looking at the initiating structure and consideration dimensions. "The Leader Behavior Questionnaire offers a means of defining... leader behavior dimensions operationally" (58, p. 88). It must be pointed out that while initiating structure and consideration may not be considered traits, they describe leader behavior in specific situations.

Validity Since The Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (Ideal Self) is one segment of The Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire Form XII, the literature on the validity for the entire instrument seemed appropriate for discussion.

Before 1970, no validity claims for the LBDQ-XII were made. Stogdill made the following statement while reviewing validity research on the instrument.

"In order to test the validity of several subscales of the LBDQ-XII, Stogdill (1969) with the assistance of a playwright, wrote a scenario for each of six subscales (consideration structure, representation, tolerance of freedom, production emphasis, and superior orientation). The items in a subscale were used as a basis for writing the scenario for that pattern of behavior. Experienced actors played the role of supervisor and workers. Each role was played by two different actors. Motion
pictures were made of the role performances. Observers used LBDQ-XII to describe the behavior of the supervisor. No significant differences were found between two different actors playing the same role. However, the actors playing a given role were described significantly higher in that role than in other roles. Since each role was designed to portray the behaviors represented by the items in its respective subscale, and since the same items were used by observers to describe the playing of the role, it can be concluded that the scales measure what they are purported to measure" (129, p. 5).

Davenport feels that,

"It is not possible to determine whether a self-description of behavior is more accurate than a description of one's behavior and the description of that behavior by others" (24, p. 81).

Reliability Referring to the LBDQ-XII, Stogdill says, "The reliability of the subscales was determined by a modified Kuder-Richardson formula" (128, p. 8). In doing this, all items of a given subscale were correlated with the remainder of the statements in that subscale instead of the subscale score including that item. This procedure gives a conservative estimate of subscale reliability. The reliability coefficients rated from .38 to .91 for nine different groups of leaders (128, p. 11).

"The estimated reliability by the split-half method is .83 for the Initiating Structure scores, and .92 for the Consideration scores when corrected for attenuation" (57, p. 1).
Means and standard deviations No norms have been established for the LBDQ-XII. It was found that there is very little variation among mean scores of nine experimental groups listed in the manual. The mean scores for the Initiating Structure and Consideration are on the following tables and were determined by Halpin (57).

Table 1. Means and standard deviations for Initiating Structure index scores for three samples of leaders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Samples</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Means</td>
<td>41.6</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td>37.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard deviations</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Means and standard deviations for Consideration index scores for three samples of leaders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Samples</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Means</td>
<td>41.4</td>
<td>44.8</td>
<td>44.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard deviations</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Quinn and Davenport reported means on the Consideration scale and Initiating Structure scale for males and females as shown on Table 3 (24 and 114). It can be seen that there is little variation among these mean scores as well.
Table 3. Mean scores for male and female principals on Consideration and Initiating Structure scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Davenport (24, p. 100)</th>
<th></th>
<th>Quinn (114, p. 70)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Males</td>
<td>Females</td>
<td>Males</td>
<td>Females</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consideration</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>28.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiating structure</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>37.8</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td>31.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Because none of these groups can be considered as normal, and norms for the subscales are unavailable LBDQ-XII and its components are recommended for research purposes only.

Demographic questionnaire The research instrument used to collect data for this study was a student designed and committee approved demographic questionnaire. The purpose of this instrument was to gather information of research pertinence from all respondents. The questionnaire requested participants to give responses for data on:

1) sex identification
2) geographic orientation
   rural/town (communities up to 10,000 that serve as the economic focal point of its environs)
   urban/metropolitan (one or more adjacent cities with a population of 50,000 or more which serve as the economic focal point for its environs)
   Other
3) Years of educational experience as administrator
   all elementary school, kdg-8
   a combination
   other
   as a teacher
   all elementary kdg-8
   secondary 9-12
   other
   other

4) Professional preparation
   license, no graduate degree
   a master's degree
   an educational specialist degree
   a doctorate degree
   other

5) Method of becoming an elementary principal
   recruited
   recommended
   made independent application
   other (Appendix A)

The Population

The population for this study was elementary principals
in selected public schools in the midwest United States. The
states included in the research were Iowa, Kansas, Missouri,
and Nebraska. The sample included 170 male and 170 female
elementary school public school principals in the above named states. The principals whose cooperation was asked were randomly selected from the 1977-78 educational directories of the four states. They were stratified according to geographic orientation and sex. Quinn (114) cites Borg on stratification. "Stratified samples are particularly appropriate in studies where part of the research analysis is likely to be concerned with comparisons between various subgroups" (8, p. 170). If particular variables are important, as sex and geographic orientations, it is thought appropriate to keep them under rigid control and not depend on randomization to give the proportions of respondents necessary.

The Procedures

**Administration and data collection**

The Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (Ideal Self) (Appendix B) is intended for use as a measurement instrument, not of how well a leader behaves, but addressing how the respondent feels an ideal leader would behave. The instructions direct the respondent to: "THINK about how frequently the leader SHOULD engage in the behavior described by the item" (130, p. 2). Since the purpose of the study is to look at self-perception of leader behavior, it was determined that there was no need to survey subordinates or superordinates of the principals in the sample.
The members of the sample were each mailed the two instruments plus a cover letter (Appendix C) with directions, and a stamped self-addressed envelope on January 3, 1979. They had been selected from the state directories during the latter part of November, 1978, and The Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire-(Ideal Self) copies ordered from the Ohio State University at approximately the same time.

The next week (January 15, 1979) a postcard reminder was mailed to all nonrespondents requesting them to complete and return the instruments. (Appendix D). During the week of January 20, 1979, a second mailing of the two instruments and a revised cover letter (Appendix E) were mailed to the remaining nonrespondents.

The final response rate was 273 principals. The male respondents numbered 154 and the female response numbered 118 principals. Rural/Town principals returning the questionnaire totaled 134, while Urban/Metropolitan respondents came to 127.

Methods of statistical analysis

The technique employed for analysis of the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (Ideal Self) and the Demographic questionnaire was a multivariate analysis of variance testing for three main effects. Those main effects were sex of the respondent, geographic orientation of the respondent, and the years of administrative experience of the respondent.
Seven hypotheses were examined for each scale—the Initiating Structure and the Consideration scale. These tests were performed through the facilities of the Computer Center on the campus of Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa. Before the two dimensions were analyzed, each respondent's questionnaires were scored and placed on IBM cards.

Hypotheses to be tested

The following seven hypotheses were tested for both the Initiating Structure and the Consideration dimension on the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire—(Ideal Self).

A) It is hypothesized that there is no significant difference in male and female principal's perception of their role of elementary principal.
Statistical hypothesis: $H_0: \mu_1 = \mu_2 \text{ or } \alpha_i = 0$
$H_a: \mu_1 \neq \mu_2 \text{ or } \alpha_i \neq 0$

B) It is hypothesized that there is no significant difference in role perception of the selected elementary school principals related to rural-urban geographic orientation.
Statistical hypothesis: $H_0: \mu_1 = \mu_2 \text{ or } \beta_j = 0$
$H_a: \mu_1 \neq \mu_2 \text{ or } \beta_j \neq 0$

C) It is hypothesized that there is no significant difference in role perception related to years of administrative experience of the selected elementary school principals.
Statistical hypothesis: Ho: \( \bar{U}_{1} = \bar{U}_{2} \) or \( \Gamma k = 0 \)

Ha: \( U_{1} \neq U_{2} \) or \( \Gamma k \neq 0 \)

A x B) It is hypothesized that there is no interaction in role perception between male and female elementary school principals and geographic orientation of the selected elementary school districts.

Statistical hypothesis: Ho: \((\alpha B)ij = 0\)

Ha: \((\alpha B)ij \neq 0\)

A x C) It is hypothesized that there is no interaction in role perception between male and female elementary principals and years of administrative experience in the selected elementary school districts.

Statistical hypothesis: Ho: \((\alpha \Gamma')ik = 0\)

Ha: \((\alpha \Gamma')ik \neq 0\) for at least one combination

B x C) It is hypothesized that there is no interaction in role perception related to geographic orientation and years of administrative experience in the selected elementary school districts.

Statistical hypothesis: Ho: \((B \Gamma')jk = 0\)

Ha: \((B \Gamma')jk \neq 0\)
A X B X C) It is hypothesized that there is no interaction in role perception between male and female elementary principals related to geographic orientation or years of administrative experience in the selected school districts.

Statistical hypothesis: Ho: (\(\alpha B\)) ijk = 0  
Ha: (\(\alpha B\)) ijk \(\neq\) 0

Summary

This study includes a random selection of 340 elementary principals from the midwest United States. They were stratified according to sex and geographic orientation. The participants were selected from the 1977-78 educational directories of Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska. Responses were obtained from 273 principals.

Two instruments were used. The self-perception of leader behavior was assessed by the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (Ideal Self) developed through the College of Administrative Sciences of the Ohio State University. The reliability and validity of this questionnaire was established by the Ohio Leadership Study staff. The second instrument was a student authored and committee approved demographic questionnaire developed for the purpose of obtaining background data.
A multivariate analysis of variance test with three main effects was used to determine if any significantly different findings on either of the two dimensions existed. The dimensions under consideration are the consideration dimension and the initiating structure dimension.
CHAPTER IV.

FINDINGS OF THE STUDY

The contents of this chapter include the analyses of data according to the procedures discussed in Chapter III. Administration of the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire Form XII (Ideal Self) and the demographic information questionnaire provided the data which were analyzed. All respondents were asked to complete both instruments.

A multivariate analysis of variance test with three main effects tested at the .05 significance level was performed on the data for each of the two dimensions. The dimensions are consideration and initiating structure.

The hypotheses are cited here for clarity.

A) It is hypothesized that there is no significant difference in male and female principal's perception of their role of elementary principal.

Statistical hypothesis: $H_0: U_1 = U_2 \quad \text{or} \quad \alpha_i = 0$

$H_a: U_1 \neq U_2 \quad \text{or} \quad \alpha_i \neq 0$

B) It is hypothesized that there is no significant difference in role perception of the selected elementary school principals related to rural-urban geographic orientation.

Statistical hypothesis: $H_0: U_1 = U_2 \quad \text{or} \quad \beta_j = 0$

$H_a: U_1 \neq U_2 \quad \text{or} \quad \beta_j \neq 0$
C) It is hypothesized that there is no significant difference in role perception related to years of administrative experience of the selected elementary school principals.

Statistical hypothesis: \( H_0: \mu_1 = \mu_2 \) or \( \Gamma_k = 0 \)

\( H_a: \mu_1 \neq \mu_2 \) or \( \Gamma_k \neq 0 \)

A X B) It is hypothesized that there is no interaction in role perception between male and female elementary school principals and geographic orientation of the selected elementary school districts.

Statistical hypothesis: \( H_0: (\alpha B)_{ij} = 0 \)

\( H_a: (\alpha B)_{ij} \neq 0 \)

A X C) It is hypothesized that there is no interaction in role perception between male and female elementary principals and years of administrative experience in the selected elementary school districts.

Statistical hypothesis: \( H_0: (\alpha \Gamma)_{ik} = 0 \)

\( H_a: (\alpha \Gamma)_{ik} \neq 0 \) for at least one combination

B X C) It is hypothesized that there is no interaction in role perception related to geographic orientation and years of
administrative experience in the selected elementary school districts.

Statistical hypothesis: Ho: \((B \gamma)_{jk} = 0\)
Ha: \((B \gamma)_{jk} \neq 0\)

A X B X C) It is hypothesized that there is no interaction in role perception between male and female elementary principals related to geographic orientation or years of administrative experience in the selected school districts.

Statistical hypothesis: Ho: \((\alpha B \gamma)_{ijk} = 0\)
Ha: \((\alpha B \gamma)_{ijk} \neq 0\)

Description of the Demographic Questionnaire

Questionnaires were mailed to 340 elementary principals in Iowa, Missouri, Nebraska, and Kansas. One half (170) of these were mailed to females and one half to males. A total of 273 or 80.2 percent of the principals responded.

Table 4. Rate of return of female and male elementary principals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Relative %</th>
<th>Total sample %</th>
<th>Category %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female (170)</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>43.2</td>
<td>34.7</td>
<td>69.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male (170)</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>56.4</td>
<td>45.3</td>
<td>90.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

273 100.0  80.2
Table 4 indicates that more male elementary principals returned the questionnaires than did female elementary principals.

One half of the questionnaires (170) were mailed to principals in rural/town locations and one half were mailed to principals in urban/metropolitan areas.

Table 5. Rate of return of rural/town and urban/metropolitan elementary principals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Relative %</th>
<th>Total %</th>
<th>Category %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rural/town (170)</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>49.1</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>78.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban/metropolitan (170)</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>46.6</td>
<td>37.3</td>
<td>74.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>273</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>80.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5 shows that more principals from rural/town locations responded to the inquiry than those located in urban/metropolitan areas.
Table 6. Rate of return of low, medium, and high administrative experienced elementary principals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Relative %</th>
<th>Total sample %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low (1-5 years)</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>22.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium (6-15 years)</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>42.2</td>
<td>32.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High (16-36 years)</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>22.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>273</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>80.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6 shows the rate of response for the three categories of experience. It also reveals the response rate for low and high years of experience are quite similar. The mean number of years of administrative experience for respondents is 11.4 years. The median number of years is 10.0 and the standard deviation is 7.7 years.

A detailed listing of respondents by years of administrative experience may be found in Appendix F.

Following is a listing of characteristics and an identification number for each cell group.
The rate of response for each cell in the procedure design is shown in Table 7.

Table 7. The rate of response and identification number for each cell group in the procedure design

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex Experience</th>
<th>Geographical orientation</th>
<th>Cell group number</th>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R U</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td>18 17 26 25 11 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R U</td>
<td>7 8 9 10 11 12</td>
<td>27 8 28 29 19 28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis of the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire Form XII (Ideal Self)

The analysis of the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire Form XII (Ideal Self) will be discussed in terms of the seven hypotheses stated in Chapter One and repeated again in this chapter.
Significance was found on the consideration dimension, but not on the initiating structure dimension at the .05 significance level. The analysis of variance tables (Tables 8 and 9) are shown first and discussion of each hypothesis follow.

Table 8. Three way analysis of variance for female and male elementary principals related to geographic orientation or years of administrative experience on the consideration dimension

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of variation</th>
<th>Sum of squares</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Mean square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main effects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>111.154</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>111.154</td>
<td>5.931</td>
<td>0.016*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geog.</td>
<td>19.405</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19.405</td>
<td>1.035</td>
<td>0.310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin.</td>
<td>50.095</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25.047</td>
<td>1.337</td>
<td>0.265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-way interactions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex Geog.</td>
<td>48.447</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>48.447</td>
<td>2.585</td>
<td>0.109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex Admin.</td>
<td>74.646</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>37.323</td>
<td>1.992</td>
<td>0.139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geog. Admin.</td>
<td>165.660</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>82.830</td>
<td>4.420</td>
<td>0.013*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-way interactions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex Geog. Admin.</td>
<td>21.192</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.596</td>
<td>0.565</td>
<td>0.569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explained</td>
<td>479.691</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>43.608</td>
<td>2.327</td>
<td>0.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>4385.324</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>18.741</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4865.016</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>19.857</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* = significant

Sex = sex

Geog. = geographic orientation

Admin. = years of administrative experience
Table 9. Three way analysis of variance for female and male elementary principals related to geographic orientation and years of administrative experience on the initiating structure dimension

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of variation</th>
<th>Sum of squares</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Mean square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main effects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>49.100</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>49.100</td>
<td>1.609</td>
<td>0.206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geog.</td>
<td>12.174</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.174</td>
<td>0.399</td>
<td>0.528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin.</td>
<td>108.508</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>54.254</td>
<td>1.778</td>
<td>0.171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2-way interactions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex Geog.</td>
<td>0.090</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.090</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex Admin.</td>
<td>111.611</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>55.805</td>
<td>1.829</td>
<td>0.163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geog. Admin.</td>
<td>130.498</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>65.249</td>
<td>2.138</td>
<td>0.120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3-way interactions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex Geog. Admin.</td>
<td>51.581</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25.791</td>
<td>0.845</td>
<td>0.431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explained</td>
<td>461.918</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>41.993</td>
<td>1.376</td>
<td>0.185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>7201.473</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>30.515</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>7663.391</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>31.026</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 248
Sex = sex
Geog. = geographic orientation
Admin. = years of administrative experience

It should be noted that while each respondent was asked to complete all questions some did not. Respondents were divided into cell groups on the basis of their responses to the variable selections on the demographic questionnaire. If a selection was not made for each variable, the respondent's
data were dropped by the computer because it did not meet the criteria for any cell group. The analysis of data was completed on those questionnaires that were completely filled out. Thus the N on the following tables will not equal 273, which was the total number of respondents. Incomplete data were received from 24 individuals. Thus total subjects assigned to the twelve groups is 249. In addition, one subject was excluded from the initiating structure dimension analysis, and three subjects from the consideration dimension analysis.

**Analysis for hypothesis A**

Hypothesis A addresses the main effect variable of sex. Tables 10 and 11 show the differences between female and male respondents on both the consideration and initiating structure dimensions. The null hypothesis states that there is no significant difference in the perception male and female principals have of their respective roles. The analysis of variance tables (Tables 8 and 9) show that the alternative hypothesis was rejected, thus the analysis failed to reject the null hypothesis on the initiating structure dimension. However, on the consideration dimension, analysis rejected the null hypothesis and failed to reject the alternative hypothesis.
Table 10. Female and male differences in role perception on the consideration dimension

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean score</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>49.2</td>
<td>4.182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>47.9</td>
<td>4.595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>246</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11. Female and male differences in role perception on the initiating structure dimension

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean score</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>46.30</td>
<td>5.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>45.55</td>
<td>5.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>248</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis for hypothesis B

Hypothesis B considers the main effect variable of geographic orientation. Tables 12 and 13 show the differences between rural/town and urban/metropolitan respondents on both the consideration and initiating structure dimensions. The null hypothesis states that there is no significant difference in the perception of rural/town and urban/metropolitan principals have of their role. The analysis of variance tables (Tables 14 and 15) demonstrate that the alternative
hypothesis was rejected, thus the analysis failed to reject the null hypothesis on both dimensions.

Table 12. Rural/town and urban/metropolitan differences in role perception on the consideration dimension

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean score</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rural/town</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>48.09</td>
<td>4.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban/metropolitan</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>48.86</td>
<td>4.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>246</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13. Rural/town and urban/metropolitan differences in role perception on the initiating structure dimension

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean score</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rural/town</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>45.98</td>
<td>5.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban/metropolitan</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>45.78</td>
<td>5.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>248</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis for hypothesis C

Hypothesis C examines the data for the main effect variable of years of administrative experience. Tables 14 and 15 show the differences between low, medium, and high experience levels and the principals perception of their roles. The null hypothesis states that there is no significant difference in the perception low experience, medium
experience, and high experience principals have of their role. The analysis of variance tables (Tables 8 and 9) reveal that the alternative hypothesis was rejected, thus the analysis failed to reject the null hypothesis on both dimensions.

Table 14. Years of experience differences in role perception on the consideration dimension

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean score</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low experience</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>47.74</td>
<td>4.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium experience</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>48.75</td>
<td>4.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High experience</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>48.67</td>
<td>4.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>246</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 15. Years of experience differences in role perception on the initiating structure dimension

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean score</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low experience</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>44.97</td>
<td>5.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium experience</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>46.09</td>
<td>5.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High experience</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>46.47</td>
<td>5.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>248</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Analysis for hypothesis AxB

Hypothesis AxB addresses the interaction of the variables of sex and geographic orientation. Tables 16 and 17 show the differences between female rural/town, male rural/town, female urban/metropolitan, and male urban/metropolitan respondents on both the consideration and initiating structure dimensions. The null hypothesis states that there is no significant difference in the perception these principals have of their role. The analysis of variance tables (Tables 8 and 9) demonstrate that the alternative hypothesis was rejected, thus the analysis failed to reject the null hypothesis on both dimensions.

Table 16. Female, male, and geographic orientation differences in role perception on the consideration dimension

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female rural/town</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>35.26</td>
<td>19.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male rural/town</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>46.18</td>
<td>8.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female urban/metropolitan</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>45.58</td>
<td>12.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male urban/metropolitan</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>41.94</td>
<td>16.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>246</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 17. Female, male, and geographic orientation differences in role perception on the initiating structure dimension

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean score</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female rural/town</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>45.85</td>
<td>7.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male rural/town</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>45.66</td>
<td>5.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female urban/metropolitan</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>46.20</td>
<td>5.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male urban/metropolitan</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>44.80</td>
<td>7.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>248</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis for hypothesis AxC

Hypothesis AxC considers the interaction of the variables of sex and years of administrative experience. Tables 18 and 19 show the differences between female low experience, male low experience, female medium experience, male medium experience, female high experience, and male high experience respondents on both the consideration and initiating structure dimensions. The null hypothesis states that there is no significant difference in the perception these principals have of their role. The analysis of variance tables (Tables 8 and 9) exhibit that the alternative hypothesis was rejected, thus the analysis failed to reject the null hypothesis on both dimensions.
Table 18. Female, male, and years of experience differences in role perception on the consideration dimension

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean score</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female low experience</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>45.40</td>
<td>11.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male low experience</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>44.09</td>
<td>13.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female medium experience</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>49.72</td>
<td>4.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male medium experience</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>46.30</td>
<td>9.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female high experience</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>46.13</td>
<td>14.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male high experience</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>34.13</td>
<td>19.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>246</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 19. Female, male, and years of experience differences in role perception on the initiating structure dimension

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean score</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female low experience</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>42.51</td>
<td>10.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male low experience</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>45.14</td>
<td>5.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female medium experience</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>46.20</td>
<td>5.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male medium experience</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>41.96</td>
<td>14.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female high experience</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>48.71</td>
<td>5.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male high experience</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>38.35</td>
<td>16.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>248</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Analysis for hypothesis BxC

Hypothesis BxC treats the data for the interaction of the variables of geographic orientation and years of administrative experience. Tables 20 and 21 show the differences between rural/town low experience, urban/metropolitan low experience, rural/town medium experience, urban/metropolitan medium experience, rural/town high experience, and urban/metropolitan high experience respondents on both the consideration and initiating structure dimensions. The null hypothesis states that there is no significant difference in the perception these principals have of their role. The analysis of variance tables 8 and 9 show that the alternative hypothesis was rejected, thus the analysis failed to reject the null hypothesis on the initiating structure dimension. However, the analysis of the consideration dimension rejected the null hypothesis and failed to reject the alternative hypothesis.
Table 20. Geographic orientation and years of experience differences in role perception on the consideration dimension

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geographic Orientation</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rural/town low experience</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>47.71</td>
<td>4.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban/metropolitan low experience</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>47.80</td>
<td>4.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural/town medium experience</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>47.57</td>
<td>4.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban/metropolitan medium experience</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>49.94</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural/town high experience</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>49.57</td>
<td>4.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban/metropolitan high experience</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>48.10</td>
<td>3.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>246</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 21. Geographic orientation and years of experience differences in role perception on the initiating structure dimension

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geographic Orientation</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rural/town low experience</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>42.11</td>
<td>12.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban/metropolitan low experience</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>43.72</td>
<td>5.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural/town medium experience</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>45.46</td>
<td>5.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban/metropolitan medium experience</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>46.72</td>
<td>5.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural/town high experience</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>39.37</td>
<td>19.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban/metropolitan high experience</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>44.80</td>
<td>8.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>248</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Analysis for hypothesis AxBxC

Hypothesis AxBxC addresses the interaction of the variables of sex, years of administrative experience, and geographic orientation. Tables 22 and 23 show the differences between female rural/town low experience, female urban/metropolitan low experience, male rural/town low experience, male urban/metropolitan low experience, female rural/town medium experience, female urban/metropolitan medium experience, male rural/town medium experience, male urban/metropolitan medium experience, female rural/town high experience, female urban/metropolitan high experience, male rural/town high experience, and male urban/metropolitan high experience respondents on both the consideration and initiating structure dimensions. These tables also indicate the combined differences on both dimensions. The null hypothesis states that there is no significant difference in the perception these principals have of their role. The analysis of variance tables (Tables 8 and 9) show that the alternative hypothesis was rejected, thus the analysis failed to reject the null hypothesis on both dimensions.
Table 22. Sex, geographic orientation, and years of experience differences in role perception on the consideration dimension

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean score</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female rural/town low experience</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>48.28</td>
<td>3.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female urban/metropolitan low experience</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>47.06</td>
<td>4.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male rural/town low experience</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>47.33</td>
<td>4.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male urban/metropolitan low experience</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>49.38</td>
<td>4.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female rural/town medium experience</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>49.15</td>
<td>4.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female urban/metropolitan medium experience</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>50.76</td>
<td>4.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male rural/town medium experience</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>46.57</td>
<td>4.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male urban/metropolitan medium experience</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>49.62</td>
<td>5.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female rural/town high experience</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>52.00</td>
<td>3.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female urban/metropolitan high experience</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>48.85</td>
<td>3.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male rural/town high experience</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>48.16</td>
<td>4.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male urban/metropolitan high experience</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>49.57</td>
<td>10.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>246</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 23. Sex, geographic orientation, and years of experience differences in role perception on the initiating structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean score</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female rural/town low experience</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>46.05</td>
<td>4.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female urban/metropolitan low experience</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>43.47</td>
<td>4.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male rural/town low experience</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>45.40</td>
<td>4.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male urban/metropolitan low experience</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>44.25</td>
<td>7.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female rural/town medium experience</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>45.81</td>
<td>5.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female urban/metropolitan medium experience</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>46.60</td>
<td>5.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male rural/town medium experience</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>45.14</td>
<td>6.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male urban/metropolitan medium experience</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>46.83</td>
<td>5.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female rural/town high experience</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>48.36</td>
<td>5.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female urban/metropolitan high experience</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>49.00</td>
<td>6.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male rural/town high experience</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>46.79</td>
<td>5.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male urban/metropolitan high experience</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>46.21</td>
<td>11.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>248</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary

The contents of this chapter included the analyses of data found in the response to the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire Form XII (Ideal Self) and the demographic questionnaire. A multivariate analysis of variance test with three main effects tested at the .05 significance level was performed on the data for the dimensions of consideration and initiating structure.

A response of 80.2 percent of the 340 elementary principals in Iowa, Missouri, Nebraska, and Kansas was received. The analyses of data showed no significant differences in any of the three main effects or in the interactions of these variables on the initiating structure dimension of leader behavior. Significance was found for the main effect of sex, with females having a higher score, and for the interaction between geographic orientation and years of administrative experience on the consideration dimension.
CHAPTER V.

INTERPRETATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

During recent years the role of public school education in our society has undergone what may be termed a dramatic change. As previously stated, public education has not only become a vehicle of social change, but a producer of a vital product. The quality of leadership has continued to be a topic of controversy and study during this era of intense change.

The role of the elementary school in the production of citizens able to enhance the quality of life in a rapidly changing society is basic. Fundamental concepts of academic, emotional, and social attitudes are usually first dealt with at this level. Thus the leadership of this phase of public education must possess the knowledge and ability to insure a high degree of achievement in school for students and staff.

Studies and discussions have shown that leadership is a vibrant and dynamic force which enables institutions to establish goals and achieve them. The elementary principalship has been identified as one of the positions where quality leadership is vital. While the importance of the elementary principalship is not disputed, there seems to be concern because of a decline in numbers of females in the position and therefore the possibility of potential quality leaders being missed.
The literature in the past few years has explored this decline and found no empirical evidence for the decline. Historically, women have always been active in education. Quinn feels that, "Females have dominated the education field from the beginning of our country." (114, p. 87) Seltz determined that even though eighty-four percent of all elementary teachers are female, just twenty percent of the elementary principals are female (120). Research determined, in a nationwide study, that in the fall of 1977, 8.8 percent of all school administrators in Iowa were female, 18.6 percent in Missouri were female, and Nebraska female administrators comprised 19.8 percent. Kansas was among the nine states that did not submit data delineated by sex (23, p. 584). Cronin and Pancrazio also found the decline of female administrators in downstate Illinois has continued in the decade of the 1970's. They determined that the number of female elementary principals declined from 21 percent in the 1968-69 school year to 15 percent for the 1977-78 school year (23).

The attention to women's abilities and the dissolution of some stereotypes concerning women has been achieved by the movement surrounding the Equal Rights Amendment. Although some women have gotten what may be termed high level or top flight positions, Cronin and Pancrazio warn that there is danger in becoming too optimistic. They feel that, "Although
chief executive positions may change, middle management may not change at all" (23, p. 583). They cited lack of experience and lack of prior opportunity as reasons females may not qualify for specialized administrative roles (23). The two authors also feel that, "Most men still perceive this issue as a women's problem rather than a problem of equal opportunity or human resource allocation" (23, p. 584).

The opinion that education itself must accept some of the responsibility for limiting human resources has been voiced. This limitation has been manifested in the tendency to stereotype certain occupations from kindergarten through high school counseling, and even the children's literature available, some believe, support this condition. Also cited as reasons education has not provided opportunity for women's development equally are the lack of child care facilities, non-equitable practices in awarding scholarships, grants, and assistantships (24). This may be supported by comparing the number of females and males who obtain doctorates, occupy administrative positions in school districts, and are on staffs of colleges and universities.

Women, also, must accept some responsibility in halting the decline in their numbers among educational administrators. Cronin and Pancrazio state that, "they must get the graduate training and academic credentials associated with leadership" (23, p. 585). Kimmel, Halow, and Topping support this in
their discussion of programs at some universities aimed at providing women with opportunities for experience as well as the training needed to qualify for administrative positions (79).

Cronin and Pancrazio also feel that women must be prepared to become mobile in order to move where job opportunities exist and that women must overcome some socialization hurdles and learn to work with other women (23).

Research literature has not yielded much evidence, if any, that an individual's sex is a significant factor in the possession of expertise as an elementary administrator. The literature also failed to reveal substantial evidence for the decline of female administrators.

An awareness of the decline in women elementary administrators, revelation from the literature review that there is at least equal competence, and speculation concerning administrators views of their own role as a factor, and continued or perhaps renewed thrust toward identifying quality leadership in education gave rise to this study.

Summary

The Problem

Basically, the problem was how to get the best qualified individual into the elementary administrator or leadership role, regardless of sex.
This research was designed to investigate a phase of this problem. This segment was to study if significant differences existed in reported self-perceptions of leadership behavior between female and male elementary principals in selected school districts in the midwest United States. In addition to sex, the elementary principals were compared by geographic orientation, years of administrative experience, and these variables in combination.

**Population**

The population for this study was elementary principals in selected public schools in the midwest United States. The sample included 170 male and 170 female elementary school public school principals randomly selected from 1977-78 educational directories. They were stratified according to geographic orientation and sex.

The study sample finally consisted of an 80.2 percent response from the principals contacted.

**Data collection instruments**

Two individual instruments were used in the collection of data for this study. A demographic questionnaire was used to obtain personal and demographic information.

Using the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire Form XII (Ideal Self), consideration and initiating structure dimensions were treated as dependent variables in an
effort to compare female and male elementary principals self-perceptions of leader behavior.

Method of treatment

The responses on the questionnaires were recorded and then key-punched on IBM cards. The data was then analyzed, using a multivariate analysis of variance with three main effects, at the Computer Center on the campus of Iowa State University in Ames, Iowa. The .05 significance was designated as the rejection level for each hypothesis.

Findings of the study

Seven hypotheses were formulated and tested at the .05 significance level. Two of the seven were found to be significant on the consideration dimension while none were found significant on the initiating structure dimension.

Hypothesis A: It is hypothesized that there is no significant difference in male and female principals' perception of their role of elementary principal.

Statistical analysis failed to reject hypothesis A on the initiating structure dimension, but did reject it on the consideration dimension.

Hypothesis B: It is hypothesized that there is no significant differences in role perception of the selected elementary school principals related to rural-urban geographic orientation.
Statistical analysis failed to reject hypothesis B on both the consideration and initiating structure dimensions.

Hypothesis C: It is hypothesized that there is no significant difference in role perception related to years of administrative experience of the selected elementary school principals.

Statistical analysis failed to reject hypothesis C on both the consideration and initiating structure dimensions.

Hypothesis AxB: It is hypothesized that there is no interaction in role perception between male and female elementary school principals and geographic orientation of the selected elementary school districts.

Statistical analysis failed to reject hypothesis AxB on both the consideration and initiating structure dimensions.

Hypothesis AxC: It is hypothesized that there is no interaction in role perception between male and female elementary principals and years of administrative experience in the selected elementary school districts.

Statistical analysis failed to reject hypothesis AxC on both the consideration and initiating structure dimensions.
Hypothesis BxC: It is hypothesized that there is no interaction in role perception related to geographic orientation and years of administrative experience in the selected elementary school districts. Statistical analysis rejected hypothesis BxC on consideration dimension, but failed to reject on the initiating structure dimension.

Hypothesis AxBxC: It is hypothesized that there is no interaction in role perception between male and female elementary principals related to geographic orientation or years of administrative experience in the selected school districts. Statistical analysis failed to reject hypothesis AxBxC on both the consideration and initiating structure dimensions.

Limitations of the Study

This study was concerned with public elementary school principals in a four state area of the midwestern United States. Thus, it is not recommended that inferences or generalizations from these findings be made toward elementary principals in public school systems in other regions of the country or private or parochial schools.

The study was also limited to the two dimensions, consideration and initiating structure, measured by the
Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire Form XII (Ideal Self) and the demographic questionnaire.

The research design of the study and the data are intended to be supportive of the research problem and the hypotheses and could be used or modified for replicative study in other regions or at other levels.

Conclusion and Discussion

Evidence was available through the literature review on the interest in the topic continuing controversy, and varying philosophies of leadership or leader behavior. Proponents were found who supported a variety of methods for determining leadership. These range from support of those born to lead, to acquisition by training of leadership techniques. Current research appears to be centering around investigation of leader behavior.

Also present in the literature was evidence that in the past few decades there has been a steady decline in the number of female elementary school principals despite employed women remaining a majority in the field of education.

It has in addition, been recognized that the role of public education is in a state of flux and quality leadership is essential for the continued success of education in our society.

Discussion has been held concerning the existence of barriers that may be preventing some women, who could provide the standard of leadership needed, from becoming part of the
administrative segment of public education. The premise has been offered that females are not able to perform leadership responsibilities on a par with males because they behave differently than men and possess attitudes unlike their male counterparts. The attention to women's abilities caused by the Equal Rights Amendment move has dispelled some of these ideas; however, the number of women principals continued to decline into the middle of the decade of the 1970's.

This study agrees with the Longstretch (88) study, of secondary principals in Florida, in that female principals tended to view themselves significantly higher on the consideration dimension of leader behavior than did male principals. It does not agree with those done by Davenport (24) and Quinn (114) who found no significant difference between male and female self-perception on the consideration dimension. The addition of the variables of geographic orientation and the years of administrative experience of each respondent did show a significant difference in the role of self-perception on the consideration dimension. Since this study was done in a four state area, not in a single state or metropolitan area, the self-perceptions of the principals are shown in a new light.

Table 24 exhibits the rate of return of the elementary principals in the sample using all three variables.
Table 23. Rate of return of elementary principals by sex, years of administrative experience and geographic orientation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>Total male</th>
<th>Sample female</th>
<th>Rural male</th>
<th>Sample female</th>
<th>Urban male</th>
<th>Sample female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low (1-5 years)</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium (6-15 years)</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High (16-36 years)</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the principals responding to the survey, there appears to be a change in the ratio of male to females from the high experience level to the low experience level. The medium level could be viewed as a transition period. There may be implications for further study with respect to the possibility of a rise in the number of female elementary principals in the late 1970's and why this may be occurring. Questions such as the following could be researched.

1) Are more women becoming elementary principals? If so, why is the trend reversing?

2) Are more women becoming principals because male principals are moving up the administrative ladder and women are filling lower level or mid-level positions?

3) Will women also move up this ladder or will they top out at middle level positions?
In conclusion then, this study showed that in the sample of the elementary public school principals in the midwestern United States, sex was a significant factor in self-perception of leader behavior on the consideration dimension, but not on the initiating structure dimension. The years of administrative experience of these principals alone was not a significant factor among the principals responding, nor was the geographic orientation of the principals in the sample a significant factor. However these factors in combination did show significance on the consideration dimension.

A study which considers only the self-perceptions of leader behavior of the principals is not all conclusive. It appears from this endeavor that there may be some justification for the feeling that male and female principals would behave differently as leaders. However, the combined factors of geographic orientation and years of administrative experience also provide criteria for thought in the selection of administrators. This study may serve to further emphasize the need to consider individuals for selection as elementary principals, not solely on the basis of traditional criteria, but instead on the type of the leadership qualities they possess.

Recommendations for Further Research
1) A larger geographic area or comparison by geographic regions might produce additional information.
2) Research including views of community members and members of boards of education might yield additional insights.

3) Investigations could be initiated to determine why women do or do not enter educational administration.

4) Research could be done to compare perceptions of male and female educational leaders with their counterparts in noneducational administrative positions.
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APPENDIX A: DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONNAIRE
Demographic Questionnaire

1. What is your sex?
   ____ female
   ____ male

2. Which of the following population categories best describes the location of the school system in which you work?
   ____ Rural/town  a community up to 10,000 that serves as the economic focal point of its environs
   ____ Urban/Metropolitan one or more adjacent cities with a population of 50,000 or more which serve as the economic focal point for environs
   ____ Other

3. How many years of experience as an educator have you had (count this year as one year of experience) as
   ____ an administrator
     ____ all elementary (Kdg-8)
     ____ combination
     ____ other (explain)
   ____ a teacher
     ____ elementary (Kdg-8)
     ____ secondary (9-12)
     ____ other (explain)
   ____ Other (explain)
   _______ Total

4. Which of the following best describes your professional preparation?
   ____ license, no graduate degree
   ____ Masters degree
   ____ Educational Specialist degree
   ____ Doctorate degree
   ____ Other (explain)

5. Which method best describes how you became a principal?
   ____ recruited
   ____ recommended (by whom)
   ____ made independent application
   ____ Other (explain)
APPENDIX B: THE LEADER BEHAVIOR DESCRIPTION QUESTIONNAIRE (IDEAL SELF)
IDEAL LEADER BEHAVIOR
(What You Expect of Your Leader)
Developed by staff members of
The Ohio State Leadership Studies

On the following pages is a list of items that may be used to
describe the behavior of your supervisor, as you think he/she
should act. This is not a test of ability. It simply asks
you to describe what an ideal leader ought to do in supervising
his/her group.

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

Published by
College of Administrative Science
The Ohio State University
Columbus, Ohio 43210

Copyright 1957, The Ohio State University
DIRECTIONS:

a. READ each item carefully.

b. THINK about how frequently the leader SHOULD engage in the behavior described by the item.

c. DECIDE whether he/she SHOULD always, often, occasionally, seldom or never act as described by the item.

d. DRAW A CIRCLE around one of the five letters following the item to show the answer you have selected.

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

What the IDEAL leader SHOULD do:

1. Do personal favors for group members ........ A B C D E

2. Make his/her attitudes clear to the group ............................................ A B C D E

3. Do little things to make it pleasant to be a member of the group ............... A B C D E

4. Try out his/her new ideas with the group ............................................ A B C D E

5. Act as the real leader of the group ........ A B C D E

6. Be easy to understand ......................... A B C D E

7. Rule with an iron hand ......................... A B C D E

8. Find time to listen to group members ................................................. A B C D E

9. Criticize poor work ............................... A B C D E
10. Give advance notice of changes .......... A B C D E
11. Speak in a manner not to be questioned ......................... A B C D E
12. Keep to himself/herself ......................... A B C D E
13. Look out for the personal welfare of individual group members ................. A B C D E
14. Assign group members to particular tasks .......................... A B C D E
15. Be the spokesperson of the group .......... A B C D E
16. Schedule the work to be done .................. A B C D E
17. Maintain definite standards of performance ........................ A B C D E
18. Refuse to explain his/her actions .......... A B C D E
19. Keep the group informed ......................... A B C D E
20. Act without consulting the group ............. A B C D E
21. Back up the members in their actions .............................. A B C D E
22. Emphasize the meeting of deadlines ........... A B C D E
23. Treat all group members as his/her equals .......................... A B C D E
24. Encourage the use of uniform procedures ......................... A B C D E
25. Get what he/she asks for from superiors ................................ A B C D E
26. Be willing to make changes ...................... A B C D E
27. Make sure that his/her part in the organization is understood by group members .......................... A B C D E
28. Be friendly and approachable ......................... A B C D E
29. Ask that group members follow standard rules and regulations ................. A B C D E
30. Fail to take necessary action ............ A B C D E
31. Make group members feel at ease when talking with them ................ A B C D E
32. Let group members know what is expected of them ......................... A B C D E
33. Speak as the representative of the group .................................. A B C D E
34. Put suggestions made by the group into operation .......................... A B C D E
35. See to it that group members are working up to capacity .................. A B C D E
36. Let other people take away his/her leadership in the group ............... A B C D E
37. Get his/her superiors to act for the welfare of the group members ........ A B C D E
38. Get group approval in important matters before going ahead ............ A B C D E
39. See to it that the work of group members is coordinated ................... A B C D E
40. Keep the group working together as a team ................................... A B C D E
APPENDIX C: LETTER TO PRINCIPALS
January 3, 1979

Dear Principal:

Your position as an elementary principal is vital. Public schools have been more socially and economically important to American society in recent years, and leadership has become of paramount importance in today's school systems. You, as an elementary principal must skillfully utilize leadership abilities in establishing and maintaining a viable, imaginative, and progressive program of education. The key to maintaining that leadership seems to be getting the best qualified individual into the role of principal, regardless of sex.

In an effort to address this challenge, I am making a survey of elementary principals in selected school districts in the midwestern United States. The purpose of this study is to offer a comparative study of self perception of leader behavior of elementary principals using the variables of sex, years of administrative experience, and geographic orientation. The success of this project depends upon the voluntary response from each of you who has been selected for this study.

The enclosed instruments for the survey are the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire--Form XII and a demographic information sheet. These instruments are not tests and in no way are they a measure of the ability of a principal. The emphasis is on how a leader behaves, not how well the leader behaves.

Anonymity of results is assured. Under no circumstances will you be identified as an individual. The numbers on the questionnaires are solely for internal administrative purposes or for follow up.

I realize time is at a premium for you. The survey, as field tested, takes less than a half hour.

I will be most grateful for your time and assistance in this study.

Please return the completed questionnaire in the enclosed, stamped, self-addressed envelope by January 12, 1979.

Sincerely,

Judith B. Arcy
Doctoral Candidate

Enclosures (2)
January 15, 1979

Last week a questionnaire concerning perceived leader behavior of male and female elementary principals was mailed to you. If you already have completed and returned the survey, my sincere thanks. If not, I would ask that you complete it at your earliest convenience.

Your responses are vital to the achievement of maximum validation of this study.

Your assistance is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Judith B. Arcy
Doctoral Candidate
APPENDIX E: FOLLOW UP LETTER TO PRINCIPALS
January 20, 1979

Dear Principal:

A few weeks ago, I sent you a questionnaire as part of a survey of school districts in the midwestern United States. The response thus far has been gratifying, but to achieve maximum validation of the findings I need to hear from as many principals as possible.

As yet, I have not heard from you. I recognize that the questionnaire may have arrived when your schedule was particularly busy. I do hope, however, that now you might be able to complete and return the survey form. In case you may have misplaced the earlier copy, I am taking the opportunity of enclosing another, together with a return envelope for your use.

The survey form has been field tested and required less than half an hour to complete.

Please be assured that the questionnaires will be coded to protect the anonymity of individual respondents.

Thank you for your help and consideration.

Sincerely,

Judith B. Arcy

Judith B. Arcy
Doctoral Candidate
Iowa State University
APPENDIX F: FREQUENCY OF RESPONDENTS BY YEARS OF ADMINISTRATIVE EXPERIENCE
Table Fl. Frequency of respondents by years of administrative experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of administrative experience</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Relative %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncodable or missing</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean = 11.4 years
Standard deviation = 7.7 years
Median = 10.0 years
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of elementary administrative experience</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Relative %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncodable or missing</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>66.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean = 10.6 years  
Standard deviation = 6.9 years  
Median = 9.8 years
Table G2. Frequency of respondents by years of combination administrative experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of combination administrative experience</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Relative %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncodable or missing</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>95.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean = 10.0 years  
Standard deviation = 8.9 years  
Median = 6.8 years
Table G3. Frequency of respondents by years of administrative experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of other administrative experience</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Relative %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncodable or missing</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>93.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean = 7.8 years
Standard deviation = 6.6 years
Median = 5.0 years
Table G4. Frequency of respondents by years as a teacher

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years as a teacher</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Relative %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncodable or missing</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean = 11.4 years
Standard deviation = 7.6 years
Median = 9.3 years
Table G5. Frequency of respondents by years as an elementary teacher

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years as an elementary teacher</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Relative %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncodable or missing</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>58.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean = 9.6 years
Standard deviation = 7.2 years
Median = 7.8 years
Table G6. Frequency of respondents by years as a secondary teacher

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years as a secondary teacher</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Relative %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncodable or missing</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>81.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean = 5.2 years
Standard deviation = 3.8 years
Median = 4.3 years
Table G7. Frequency of respondent by other teaching experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of other teaching experience</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Relative %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncodable or missing</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>96.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean = 6.6 years  
Standard deviation = 5.8 years  
Median = 6.0 years
Table G8. Frequency of respondents by other experience as an educator

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of other experience</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Relative %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncodable or missing</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>93.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean = 3.5 years  
Standard deviation = 2.8 years  
Median = 2.5 years
Table G9. Frequency of respondents by total years of experience as an educator

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total years of experience</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Relative %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table G9. (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total years of experience</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Relative %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Uncodable or missing</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean = 22.1 years  
Standard deviation = 9.6 years  
Median = 22.0 years
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional preparation</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Relative %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>License</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>75.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational specialist</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Method of job entry</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Relative %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruited</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>23.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>36.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>35.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncodable or missing</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>