



This is to certify that the
thesis entitled
A Study of Perceived Leader Behaviors and Communication
Behaviors among Elementary School Principals and Teachers

presented by

Sharon Johnson Wheeler

has been accepted towards fulfillment
of the requirements for
Ph.D. Administration and
Higher Education
(Educational Administration)


Major professor

Date August 7, 1980



3 1293 10381 4087

1



RETURNING MATERIALS:
Place in book drop to
remove this checkout from
your record. FINES will
be charged if book is
returned after the date
stamped below.

APR 23 1991
1 8 0273

APR 28 1991
329

JUL 7 1991
279

1

0

7

A STUDY OF PERCEIVED LEADER BEHAVIORS AND
COMMUNICATION BEHAVIORS AMONG ELE-
MENTARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALS
AND TEACHERS

By

Sharon Johnson Wheeler

A DISSERTATION

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Administration and Higher Education

1980

G116096

ABSTRACT

A STUDY OF PERCEIVED LEADER BEHAVIORS AND COMMUNICATION BEHAVIORS AMONG ELE- MENTARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALS AND TEACHERS

By

Sharon Johnson Wheeler

The purpose of this study was to determine whether or not principals' leader behaviors are related to the communication behaviors in schools. Previous studies have revealed that distinct styles of leader behavior are discernible in school principals by the teachers they supervise and that these distinct types of leader behavior affect teacher attitudes and performance and the climate of the school organization. / To determine if principals' leader behavior are related to communication behaviors in schools, sixty-three teachers from ten schools were surveyed. The teachers completed a two-part questionnaire, the first part being the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire, which was used to assess the leader behavior of principals as perceived by teachers, and the second part, the Communication Behavior Questionnaire, which was used to measure the perceived frequency of instrumental and expressive communication. Correlation analysis was used to measure the

relationship between leader behavior and instrumental and expressive communication.

The data were analyzed in an effort to answer the following five exploratory questions:

1. Do principals, who are perceived by teachers as demonstrating high Initiating Structure leader behavior, use more Instrumental communication than principals perceived by teachers as demonstrating low Initiating Structure?
2. Do principals, who are perceived by teachers as demonstrating high Initiating Structure leader behavior, use more Expressive communication than principals perceived by teachers as demonstrating low Initiating Structure?
3. Do principals, who are perceived by teachers as demonstrating high Consideration leader behavior, use more Instrumental communication than principals perceived by teachers as demonstrating low Consideration?
4. Do principals, who are perceived by teachers as demonstrating high Consideration leader behavior, use more Expressive communication than principals perceived by teachers as demonstrating low Consideration?
5. Is there a relationship between the perceived instrumental and expressive communication patterns of principals and the perceived instrumental and expressive communication patterns of teachers?

The analysis revealed that principals who were perceived as demonstrating high initiating structure leader behavior used more instrumental and expressive communication than those principals perceived as demonstrating low initiating structure. Likewise, those principals who were perceived as demonstrating high consideration leader behavior used more instrumental and expressive communication than those principals perceived as demonstrating low consideration. The last analysis revealed that there was no

statistically significant relationship between instrumental and expressive communication patterns of teachers and principals and the instrumental and expressive communication patterns among teachers.

In summary, principals' initiating structure and consideration leader behaviors are indeed related to their instrumental and expressive communication behaviors. The frequency with which principals discussed curriculum objectives, district policies, school rules and regulations, rewards, praises and acceptance with teachers was not related to the frequency with which teachers discussed curriculum objectives, district policies, rules and regulations of the schools, rewards, praises and acceptance with each other. Overall, this study determined that leader behaviors and communication behaviors are indeed related. In fact, the study strengthened the assertions by Merrihue (1960) and Gerloff and Cummins (1977) that one literally cannot study either of these concepts apart from the other.

© Copyright by
Sharon Johnson Wheeler
1980

DEDICATION

For Douglas. My special friend, my dear husband,
my true love . . . always. Without your constant support,
encouragement and love this goal would not have been
attained.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank the members of my doctoral guidance committee. I am thankful to the chairperson of my guidance committee, Dr. Philip Cusick, for his guidance and support throughout my course of study. To Dr. Lawrence Lezotte I am most grateful for the educational experiences, as your graduate research assistant and as a committee member, your support, assistance and encouragement was invaluable. I am thankful to Dr. Louis Romano for his concern and assistance throughout this experience. I am appreciative of the guidance, assistance and concern provided by Dean Robert L. Green and for the opportunity to work for the College of Urban Development. I would especially like to thank Dr. Bruce Williams whose steadfast support and words of encouragement were continuous and always timely.

I would also like to thank the Harvard Study Research Team which stimulated my research.

To Len Bianchi and Stephanie Madison I owe thanks for their assistance and preparation of data for computer analysis and to Theresa West for many hours spent typing this study.

I would also like to thank my dear friends, Drs. Nelvia Brady, Lillian Hollomon, and Jim Johnson, for sharing their talents and providing sincere concern and support during this experience. To Ms. Dottie Rolfe and Ms. Judy Chism Davis I am grateful for the long distance phone calls and letters which always provided encouragement.

A very special thanks goes to my family. To my parents, Vivian and Benjamin Johnson, I am forever indebted because their guidance and love throughout my life taught me to perservere. To Roy, Michael, Beverly, Vicki, Bryant and Tyrone I am grateful for your expectations that provided the incentive to continue. To my grandmother, Ollie Sharpless and my nephew, Ky, whose lives somehow depict the past and the future that make this all seem worthwhile. To my Uncle T. H., my Aunt Maggie, and my cousins Crystal and Cathi thanks for the love and inspiration provided throughout my life.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	vii
 CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Background and Statement of the Problem	2
Purpose of the Study	7
Significance of the Study	8
Conceptual Framework	8
Exploratory Questions	17
Definition of Terms	18
Overview of the Study	20
II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE	22
Educational Leadership Research	22
Dimensions of Leadership	29
Communication in Schools: Principal-Teacher Interaction	34
Summary	50
III. DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY	53
Design of the Study	53
Development	54
Setting	55
Sample Population	56
Instrumentation	58
Interpretation of the <u>LBDQ</u>	63
Analysis of the Data	70
Summary	72
Limitations of the Methodology	73
IV. ANALYSIS	75
Perceived Leader Behavior of Principals	76
Initiating Structure Leader Behavior vs. Instrumental and Expressive Communication Used by Principals	81

CHAPTER	Page
Consideration Leader Behavior vs. Instrumental and Expressive Com- munication Used by Principals	87
Initiating Structure Leader Behavior vs. Instrumental and Expressive Communication Used by Teachers	97
Consideration Leader Behavior vs. Instrumental and Expressive Communication Used by Teachers	99
Summary	100
V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	101
Conclusions	102
Discussion	106
Implications for Future Research	112
BIBLIOGRAPHY	114
APPENDIX	118

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
3.1. Characteristics of the Schools	59
3.2. Characteristics of the Principals	60
4.1. The Correlations Between Leader Behavior and Communication	78
4.2. The Correlations Between the Perceived Patterns of Principals' and Teachers' Instrumental and Expressive Communi- cation	80
4.3. Initiating Structure Leader Behavior vs. Instrumental Communication as a Form of Individual vs. Group Meetings Used Between Principal and Teachers	83
4.4. Initiating Structure Leader Behavior vs. Instrumental Communication as a Form of Written vs. Verbal Messages Used Between Principal and Teacher	83
4.5. Initiating Structure Leader Behavior vs. Instrumental Communication as a Form of Scheduled vs. Unscheduled Meetings Used Between Principals and Teachers	84
4.6. Initiating Structure Leader Behavior vs. Instrumental Communication as a Form of One-Way and Two-Way Communication Used Between Principals and Teachers	84
4.7. Initiating Structure Leader Behavior vs. Expressive Communication as a Form of Individual vs. Group Meetings Used Between Principals and Teachers	86
4.8. Initiating Structure Leader Behavior vs. Expressive Communication as a Form of Written vs. Verbal Messages Used Between Principal and Teachers	86

Table	Page
4.9. Initiating Structure Leader Behavior vs. Expressive Communication as a Form of Scheduled vs. Unscheduled Meetings Used Between Principal and Teachers	88
4.10. Initiating Structure Leader Behavior vs. Expressive Communication as a Form of One-Way vs. Two-Way Communication Used Between Principals and Teachers	88
4.11. Consideration Leader Behavior vs. Instrumental Communication as a Form of Individual vs. Group Communication Between Principals and Teachers	90
4.12. Consideration Leader Behavior vs. Instrumental Communication as a Form of Written vs. Verbal Communication Between Principals and Teachers	90
4.13. Consideration Leader Behavior vs. Instrumental Communication as a Form of Scheduled vs. Unscheduled Meetings Between Principals and Teachers	91
4.14. Consideration Leader Behavior vs. Instrumental Communication as a Form of One-Way vs. Two-Way Communication Between Principals and Teachers	91
4.15. Consideration Leader Behavior vs. Expressive Communication as Forms of Individual vs. Group Between Teachers and Principals	93
4.16. Consideration Leader Behavior vs. Expressive Communication as Forms of Written vs. Verbal Messages Between Principals and Teachers	93
4.17. Consideration Leader Behavior vs. Expressive Communication as Forms of Scheduled vs. Unscheduled Meetings Between Principals and Teachers	95
4.18. Consideration Leader Behavior vs. Expressive Communication as Forms of One-Way vs. Two-Way Communica- tion Between Principals and Teachers	95

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Leadership and communication are essential elements in the effectiveness of an organization. As pointed out by Hersey and Blanchard (1977), "The successful organization has one major attribute that sets it apart from an unsuccessful organization: dynamic and effective leadership" (p. 83), and Simon (1976) maintains that ". . . without communication there can be no organization" (p. 15).

These perspectives suggest that leadership and communication play a significant role in the successful operation of an organization. An indication of their interdependence is reflected by some researchers who view communication and leadership as being essentially intertwined. For instance, Thayer (1961) says that "The administration (leadership) of any organization can be accomplished only through communication" (p. 3). This interrelatedness of communication and leadership is alluded to by Merrihue (1960) who reflects on the 1950s and proclaims it the:

. . . age in which businessmen discovered communication as their principal tool, first to build understanding and cooperation by the employees they were trying to lead within their enterprise, secondly, to project

their leadership among the employees and the publics they serve . . . (p. 5).

Not only are leadership and communication important to organizations, but the effectiveness of one is dependent on the other.

The organization of importance in this study is the American Public Elementary School. Concepts of leadership and communication and how they function in the school are the topic of this study and for its purposes, principals will be viewed as the leaders of the school. Therefore, leadership will be discussed in reference to principalship. Communication will be examined in reference to its role in facilitating the principal's leadership tasks.

Background and Statement of the Problem

As heads of schools, principals are expected to display certain leadership behaviors to facilitate the tasks necessary to meet the goals of the school's educational programs. Spain, Drummond and Goodlad (1956) view the leadership role of the principal as requisite to a "challenging educational enterprise" (p. 69). They explain that:

The elementary school principal holds a key position in the improvement of the professional staff. He is the acknowledged and appointed status leader . . . whether the school becomes a challenging educational enterprise or a dull dreary place for children depends . . . upon the quality of leadership he provides for the staff (pp. 69-70).

This point of view reflects the leadership a principal is expected to exhibit and reinforces the importance of the leadership role the principal plays.

Principals' positions allow them to guide the implementation of the goals and strategies to determine the success or failure of schools' educational programs (Becker, 1970). Gross and Herriott (1965) suggest that if a principal's meetings with teachers are meaningful they assist in "stimulating educational experiences." Meaningful communication is a part of a principal's leadership role.

Communication channel stability is imperative to coherent and effective organizational systems. For any organization to achieve its goals, sound communication policies and procedures must exist (Lindgren, 1954) to provide direction for coordinating the activities necessary to accomplish the goals of an organization.

Literature related to organizational communications suggests that the organization administrator or leader should be the catalyst for overall effective communication (Thayer, 1961; Barnard, 1935). Communication is the critical link between the persons responsible for leadership and the staffs they lead. Barnard (1938) also contends that communication should be the first and continuous task of any administrator since commonly held goals, necessary for cooperative effort become known through communication. Therefore, it is imperative that administrators implement and maintain policies and procedures for effective communication because without sound communication an organization can neither operate effectively nor accomplish the tasks necessary to achieve its goals.

The development of effective communication processes should be the responsibility of the leader in an organization; in this case it is the principal of the school. Therefore, the leadership behavior of principals should determine the nature of communication within the schools. The following discussion of communication in schools will substantiate this assumption.

Communication infiltrates every process of the school environment. Principals interact with teachers and students. Teachers interact with the principal and students, and students interact with teachers and the principal. Most of what goes on in schools involves communication. Announcements, bulletins, intercom messages, faculty or department meetings, teacher-parent conferences, and teacher-student information exchanges are all examples of daily communications in the school.

The principal relies on different forms of communication to operate the school. For instance, school bulletins, intercom messages and meetings are means a principal uses to provide his staff and students with information.

Principals should develop policies and procedures that will prompt effective communication in order to provide the necessary information that all staff need to achieve the goals of the educational program. It is also their job to provide for the implementation of these policies and procedures. The decisions that principals make concerning implementation of communication involve such

questions as: What is the best means to communicate with the staff individually and collectively? When is the appropriate time to communicate certain information and where? Which atmosphere is conducive to certain kinds of communication? All of these concerns will be addressed in relation to a principal's communication style which is influenced by leadership style (Tannenbaum et al., 1966).

Tannenbaum et al. (1966) contend that leadership is the "interpersonal influence exercised in a situation and directed through the communication process, toward the attainment of a specified goal or goals" (p. 317). This definition reinforces the earlier contentions that communication and leadership are interrelated. Woffard, Gerloff and Cummins (1977) maintain that Tannenbaum's definition of leadership, ". . . points out the close dependency of leadership upon communication and that leadership cannot occur without communication" (p. 317).

Based on a survey of eighty-five companies, Woffard (1970) identified five dimensions of leadership: group achievement and order; personal enhancement; personal interaction; dynamic achievement and security and maintenance. Tannenbaum et al. (1977) assigned a communication style to each leadership dimension. According to the association that Tannenbaum finds between these dimensions of leadership and communication styles, it is conceivable that one familiar with leadership styles of principals could determine their communication styles and vice-versa.

Therefore, one can conclude that not only are leadership and communication essential to an organization, but the nature of communication in a school is dependent on the communication style of the principal which is influenced by that person's leader behavior.

While the leadership and communication styles of principals do influence the educational programs, a very important factor in the educational program is directly impacted by principals' communication and leadership styles--the teachers. Teachers' tasks for meeting goals of educational programs are influenced by the principals' leader behavior. If principals' leadership styles inhibit teacher tasks, it is highly likely that this could cause deficiency in programs.

Washington and Watson (1976) contend that a part of a principals' leadership task is to assess the needs of teachers and help them develop means of meeting those needs since to do so can provide positive rewards for the teacher and make a positive contribution to schools.

Hearns (1974) maintains that if principals are serious about meeting the personal and professional needs of their staffs they must provide effective communication channels that give teachers an opportunity to express their needs. Hearns suggests that without opportunities to express their needs, teachers will become alienated. Again, this is a factor which could cause deficiencies in

educational programs. The development of effective communication channels can prevent alienation.

In order for principals to know whether or not their leader and communication behaviors are accommodating and facilitating teachers directly and educational programs indirectly, they need to know how their communication and leadership styles are perceived by teachers, the persons who can best judge these behaviors.

In view of this situation, the writer will conduct a research study to determine the nature of the relationship between leader behavior and communication behaviors among staffs in schools.

Purpose of the Study

Communication and leadership are central organization processes. In schools, the principal is the person around whom these two elements evolve.

The purpose of this study is to determine whether or not principals' leader behaviors are related to the communication behaviors in schools. The nature of principals' and teachers' communication behaviors must be assessed to determine whether they reflect the principals' leader behavior. Therefore, the researcher will identify principals' leader behavior and, subsequently, determine if there is a relationship between these identified leader behaviors and the frequency and form of communication behaviors among the staff.

Significance of the Study

It is evident from the literature that communication and leadership are essential elements in an organization. The literature further suggests that the head of an organization plays a vital role in developing and maintaining successful communication channels. In view of principals' leadership position in schools, they need to be aware of the perceptions and effectiveness of their communication processes. However, while there are numerous studies that address leadership in schools, very few studies have been conducted concerning communication behavior in schools. Yet, the literature seems to suggest that leadership is dependent on the communication process to attain goals (Tannenbaum et al., 1966). Therefore, assessing leader and communication behavior in schools to determine whether leader behaviors do relate to communication behaviors, will perhaps enlighten principals to the close association between their communication and leader behaviors. Further, this study can also enlighten principals to the relationship that some leader behavior, coupled with communication behaviors, can have on teacher communication behaviors. This awareness can perhaps serve as a model with which to improve relations between principals and teachers.

Conceptual Framework

Parsons (1951, 1953) maintains that every collectivity, organization or group, must address four functional

problems or functional imperatives. Of these, two are instrumental activities: goal attainment and adaption; two are expressive activities: pattern maintenance and integration.

The instrumental activities, goal attainment and adaption, serve two different functions. Goal attainment serves the function of coordinating activities so the system moves toward attainment. Adaption is acquiring resource facilities that have value for system goals and obtaining the means necessary to reach them.

Expressive activities--pattern maintenance and integration--also have distinctive functions. Pattern maintenance reconciles the norms and demands of participation in one social system with the demands of another social system, i.e., the person as a system fitting into the organizational system. It is maintaining a level of motivation sufficient for the performance of tasks necessary to achieve the stated goals. The fourth functional imperative, integration, addresses relationships between members of an organization. It establishes and maintains a level of solidarity and cohesion among the units.

According to Parsons, every organization must cope with all four functional imperatives in order to maintain an adequate operation. Attention to only one imperative could cause lack of equilibrium in the organization. A system moves toward maintaining dynamic equilibrium of the four functional imperatives over time.

Parsons contends that collectivities develop differentiated action systems to fulfill instrumental and expressive needs. Each system requires control position for its direction. Based on experimental studies, Bales (1953) has shown that control positions of each system become segregated because they require incompatible role orientations and psychological characteristics. However, as stated by Etzioni (1961), some "great men" are able to effectively combine both controls.

Some groups do find leaders who effectively combine both controls; they are referred to as "great men." Empirical studies demonstrating the segregation of control positions have focused primarily on task-oriented groups and families. It is possible that there are other types of groups for which the statements made above do not hold. Until such groups are found, however, and considering the universality of instrumental and expressive needs, it seems justified to assume that these propositions about group structure apply to all collectivities.

To investigate whether or not Parsons directly impacted other researcher's means of addressing leadership is not the purpose of this paper. Rather the purpose is to study the relations between Parsons' dimensions as evidenced in communication behavior and leadership.

Many researchers have addressed the concept leadership. They have identified such dimensions of leadership as effectiveness-efficiency (Barnard, 1938); Instrumental Activities-Expressive Activities (Etzioni, 1961); Goal Achievement; Group Maintenance (Cartwright and Zander, 1953); Nomothetic-Idiographic (Getzels and Guba, 1957); Production Orientation-Employee Orientation (Kahn, 1966);

Task Leader-Social Leader (Bales, 1969); Goal Emphasis-Support (Bowers and Seashore, 1966); System Orientation-Person Orientation (Brown, 1967); and Production Emphasis-Tolerance of Freedom (Stodgill, 1963). The two dimensions of leadership that will be used as the conceptual framework for this study are: Initiation of Structure and Consideration (Halpin, 1954).

These two dimensions are derived from Stodgill's (1963) attempt to compare the leader-behavior of individuals thought to be effective with those thought to be ineffective to determine significant differences between them. Based on their extensive studies of leadership, Hemphill and Coons (1950) developed the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ) to compare leader behavior. It was later refined by Halpin and Winer (1952).

Halpin (1952) used the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire to compare the behavior of flight crews in a military leadership study. In the analysis, two dimensions of leadership, consideration and initiating structure, differentiated leader behaviors. Initiating structure accounted for 34 percent of the variance and consideration accounted for 50 percent of the variance (Halpin, 1966), and they are defined as follows:

Consideration includes behavior indicating mutual trust, respect, and a certain warmth and rapport between the supervisor and his group. This does not mean that this dimension reflects a superficial "pat-on-the-back," "first name calling" kind of human relations behavior. This dimension appears to

emphasize a deeper concern for group members needs and includes such behavior as allowing subordinates more participation in decision making and encouraging more two-way communication (Lowin et al., p. 238).

Initiating structure includes behavior in which the supervisor organizes and defines group activities and his relations to the group. Thus, he defines the roll he expects each member to assume, assigns tasks, plans ahead, establishes ways of getting things done, and pushes for production. This dimension seems to emphasize overt attempts to achieve organization goals (Lowin et al., p. 238).

These two dimensions provide a typology for studying leader behavior. The Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire provides a means of identifying them. In this study, the LBDQ will be used to determine whether or not a principals' leader behavior is initiating structure or if it is consideration.

If principal's leader behaviors are perceived by teachers as initiating structure, it can be expected that the principals define the goals of the schools and their relationship with the teachers. Principals who initiate structure define the roles that they expect teachers to assume; they also assign tasks, establish ways of getting things done and push for production (Owen, 1970). On the other hand, leader behaviors perceived as consideration indicate mutual trust, respect, and a certain warmth and rapport. The principal so identified will also show concern for teachers' needs, participation in decision-making and encourage two-way communication (Owen, 1970).

As reflected by the above descriptions, "the dimensions are relatively independent of one another; the

consideration and initiating structure factors seem to be separate and distinct dimensions, not opposite ends of the same continuum" (Hoy and Miskel, 1978, p. 183).

Initiation of structure and consideration can be divided into high and low groups and then combined with one another to make the following four dichotomies:

1. High Initiation of Structure,
Low Consideration
2. High Initiation of Structure,
High Consideration
3. Low Initiation of Structure,
High Consideration
4. Low Initiation of Structure,
Low Consideration

The mean score of leader behaviors determines which set of dichotomies a person's leadership reflects. Those (persons) who score above the mean on both dimensions are in set two. Those below the mean on both dimensions are in set four. Those who score below the mean in consideration, but above the mean in initiating structure, are in group one. Those who are scored below the mean on initiation of structure but score above the mean on consideration are in group three (Halpin, 1953). Because these dimensions of leadership can be "cross-partitioned," by using mean scores, the nature of a principal's leader behaviors may be identified as being in one of the four dichotomies.

From Halpin's perspective on leadership it can be expected that if principals are going to be good leaders they must contribute to the major objectives of the

educational program (goal achievement) and provide an atmosphere conducive to accomplishing tasks (maintenance).

Halpin contends that:

practical men know that the leader must lead, must initiate action and get things done. But because he must accomplish his purpose through other people, and without jeopardizing the intactness or integrity of the group, the skilled executive knows that he also must maintain good "human relations" if he is to succeed in furthering the purposes of the group (p. 87).

Therefore, according to the constructs developed by Halpin and Winer (1952), principals should be "strong" in initiating structure and they should also show high consideration for teachers.

So far, we have discussed the four functional imperatives of an organization and some possible dimensions of the term leadership. The major premise of this study is that there exists a relationship between the functional imperatives of an organization as evidenced through communication and the behavior of the leader of that organization. Our study is designed to investigate the nature of that relationship. The collectivity in this study is the elementary school, the actors are the principals and teachers. Initiating structure is comparable to Parson's "Instrumental Activities." It represents also, one of the "action systems" necessary for the function of an organization. Parsons views instrumental activities as functions which coordinate activities; the means by which resources are manipulated. Persons who demonstrate initiating structure leader behavior carries out similar, if not the same tasks. For instance,

they establish well-defined channels of communication and methods to meet the goals of the organization. In other words, they manipulate resources to meet organization goals.

Consideration, Halpin's other dimension of leader behavior, is consistent with Parson's concept of expressive activities. Leaders who demonstrate consideration behavior are concerned about the relationship between themselves and members of their staffs since this relationship determines how well a person can be integrated into the organization.

Etzioni (1961) applies Parson's instrumental and expressive activities to communication. He contends that communication in complex organizations is two-fold. One form is instrumental and task related to disseminate information and knowledge such as administrative directives, policies and curriculum objectives.

Expressive, the other form, is communication to integrate individuals into an organization. Person oriented, it changes or reinforces attitudes, norms and values, and includes praise and expressions of acceptance. Communications flow vertically and horizontally (Etzioni, 1961). Flow direction is also useful in analyzing communications in schools. Vertically, communication moves up and down the levels of the school hierarchy through memos, directives, policies and programs of action. Communication between principals and teachers is vertical.

Horizontal communication stays on one hierarchical level, between teachers in this study, to coordinate

educational activities on that level. It may be job-related or personal.

In summary, both instrumental and expressive activities must take place for a group to function properly. This writer will refer to these activities as task oriented and maintenance activities. Task oriented or instrumental activities accomplish tasks that are imperative to meeting the goals of an organization. Maintenance activities support an optimal level of performance for each group member. Whether or not members of an organization function at an optimal level depends on how they are integrated into the group. Further, leader behaviors and the communication behaviors of leaders are closely related, therefore, influencing the functioning of each activity as well as the members of the group. It follows that a certain leader behavior prompts a certain communication behavior. Initiating structure, associated with task-oriented activities, is the type of leader behavior principals engage in when they define the tasks of teachers communication patterns or define methods and procedures. As a result, one could speculate they would use instrumental communication. On the other hand, principals concerned with expressive or maintenance activities demonstrate consideration leader behavior. Given Etzioni's definition of expressive communication, "communication that helps integrate a person into a group by expressions of praises and acceptance,"

it is probable that principals who demonstrate consideration leader behaviors would use expressive communication.

This researcher also speculates that teacher's communication behaviors reflect principals' communication behaviors because of the important role principals play in the school. According to the literature, because the principal is the leader, his/her leader behavior will influence a certain communication style. Therefore, it is conceivable that the principals communication style will influence teachers' communication style. Because of a lack of studies relating leader behavior and communication, the significance of the study will be to provide information in this neglected area, and perhaps enlighten principals to the close association of these behaviors and to the influence they exert on teacher communications. In order to determine if, in fact, certain leader behaviors--initiating structure and consideration prompt particular communication behaviors--instrumental and expressive, respectively, the exploratory questions in the following section will be addressed.

Exploratory Questions

In order to determine whether or not principals' leader behaviors are related to communication behaviors in schools, the following exploratory questions were addressed in a questionnaire to teachers. In order to address each exploratory question, it was necessary to assess the

frequency of instrumental and expressive communication behaviors demonstrated by teachers and principals, as well as the forms of these communication behaviors. Preceding the communication behavior questionnaire, the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire was completed in order to identify a principal's leader behavior as either high, low consideration; or high, low initiating structure.

- #1. Do principals, who are perceived by teachers as demonstrating high Initiating Structure leader behavior, use more Instrumental communication than principals perceived by teachers as demonstrating low Initiating Structure?
- #2. Do principals, who are perceived by teachers as demonstrating high Initiating Structure leader behavior, use more Expressive communication than principals perceived by teachers as demonstrating low Initiating Structure?
- #3. Do principals, who are perceived by teachers as demonstrating high Consideration leader behavior, use more Instrumental communication than principals perceived by teachers as demonstrating low Consideration?
- #4. Do principals, who are perceived by teachers as demonstrating high Consideration leader behavior, use more Expressive communication than principals perceived by teachers as demonstrating low Consideration?
- #5. Is there a relationship between the perceived instrumental and expressive communication patterns of principals and the perceived instrumental and expressive communication patterns of teachers?

Definition of Terms

The following terms are operationally defined for this research study:

Communication: Any initiated behavior on the part of the sender which conveys the desired meaning to the

receiver and causes desired response behavior (Thayer, 1961). "Communication (can be) conceived of as the dynamic process underlying the existence, growth, change, the behavior of all living systems--individual or organization. Communication can be understood as that indispensable function of people and organizations" (Thayer, 1968, p. 17).

Instrumental communication: Information necessary to complete a task. This type of communication is used to disseminate information and knowledge such as administrative directions, policies, and instructions.

Expressive communication: Information related to helping an individual integrate into the organization. This kind of communication expresses rewards, praise, and acceptance.

Horizontal communication: Information that stays at one level of the organization; that is only discussed on one hierarchical level (i.e., communication only between teachers or only between principals) may be one or two-way communication.

Vertical communication: Communication that moves up and down the levels of a hierarchy (i.e., Information provided to principals, then given to teachers about which teachers respond or give feedback to principals. The principal may then give feedback to his superiors). Vertical communication may also be one-way (i.e., Instructions given by a superintendent to principals to be passed on to and followed by teachers).

One-way communication (nonreciprocal communication):

The sender of a message does not allow the receiver of the message the opportunity to respond or give feedback.

Two-way communication (reciprocal communication):

The sender of a message allows the receiver of the message to respond or give feedback.

Communication behaviors: The act of providing information.

Perceived leader behavior: The actual leadership activities of elementary principals as described by themselves and the teachers (Stodgill, 1963) refers to this type of behavior as "real" behavior.

Leader: The individual in the group given the task of directing and coordinating task--relevant group activities (Fiedler, 1967, p. 8).

Leadership acts: Those in which a leader engages in the course of directing and coordinating the work of his group. This may involve such acts as structuring work relations, rewarding or criticizing group members, and showing consideration for their welfare and feelings (Fiedler, 1967, p. 36).

Overview of the Study

Chapter II will be a review of the related literature and research pertaining to educational leadership and communication behaviors in schools.

Chapter III will delineate the methods and procedures undertaken to conduct this study.

Chapter IV will be an analysis of the data and a report of its findings.

Chapter V will be a summary of the data as well as a discussion of the implications as a result of the findings. Finally, conclusions from the study will be reported in this chapter.

Given the order of this presentation, the next phase is an indepth discussion of the pertinent literature in the field that has implications for the topic at hand.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The review of literature presented in this chapter consists of four sections. The first section, Educational Leadership Research, is an examination of well-known leadership studies conducted in the field of education. Section two, Dimensions of Leadership, discusses literature supporting the concept that leadership is multidimensional. Section three is a discussion of the literature related to communication in schools. Because of a lack of studies concerned specifically with relationships between leadership and communication in schools, this section is somewhat limited to studies of communication interaction between principals and teachers and its importance. Lastly, the summary will be a discussion relating and synthesizing the information from each section.

Educational Leadership Research

Numerous organizations varying in size and purpose have been studied by researchers trying to determine the nature of the leadership and leader behavior of the persons "in charge." However, regardless of the size or the

purpose of the organizations, research has shown that there are similar patterns of leadership and leader behavior demonstrated by those persons who hold these positions in organizations. The following research studies are concerned with the leadership and leader behavior of school principals.

In the 1950s, the Personnel Research Board at Ohio State University made a significant contribution to the study of leadership when they participated in developing the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ), which measures leader behavior. Among those cooperating on development of the questionnaire, Hemphill and Coons are cited (1950). Many researchers have used this instrument to study leader behavior including Halpin (1966) who along with other researchers, used the instrument several times in air force and educational leader behavior studies. From his summary of these studies, Halpin concludes that there are five principal findings:

- (1) The evidence indicates that initiating structure and consideration are fundamental dimensions of leader behavior, and that the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire provides a practical and useful technique for measuring the behaviors of leaders on these two dimensions.
- (2) Effective leader behavior is associated with high performance on both dimensions.
- (3) There is, however, some tendency for superiors and subordinates to evaluate differently the contribution of leader behavior dimensions to the effectiveness of leadership.
- (4) Changes in the attitude of group members toward each other and group characteristics such as harmony, intimacy, and procedural clarity, are

significantly associated with the leadership style of the leader high initiating structure combined with high consideration is associated with favorable group attitudes and with favorable changes in group attitudes.

- (5) There is only a slight positive relationship between the way leaders believe they should behave and the way in which their group members describe them as behaving.
- (6) The institutional setting within which the leader operates influences his leadership style (pp. 23-24).

Halpin (1956) studied the leader behavior of fifty superintendents in Ohio using the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire. The findings of this study suggest that staffs, board members and superintendents characterize the ideal superintendent as one scoring high in consideration and initiating structure.

Since the development of the LBDQ by Hemphill and Coons, the instrument was reused once in 1952 by Halpin and Winer. Later, as a result of other's identification of two factors which account for variance in leader behavior, Stogdill (1963) developed another revision called the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire - Form XII.

The new edition of the LBDQ - Form XII was used by Brown (1967) to study the leader behavior of principals as perceived by their teachers. Brown's study consisted of 170 school staffs and was centered around his assumption that how a leader really behaves is less important than how his followers perceive that he behaves. In another study, Brown (1967) reported that it was the teaching staffs'

perception of the principal's behavior that influenced their actions and determined what they called leadership.

Brown also suggested that teachers' satisfaction and their confidence in their principals are influenced by the perceived leadership of the school. However, the teachers' estimate of the school's organizational performance is not. Brown concluded, after analyzing the results of the study, that two distinctive factors were present: "The first, a set of leader behaviors that responded to the needs of the school qua system; the second, a set of behaviors that responds to the needs of the staff members qua persons" (p. 46).

Brown refers to these two sets of behaviors as the system and person factors of leadership. This dichotomy reflects the idea of leadership dimensions, which will be discussed in the next section.

In 1965 Gross and Herriott did a national principalship study called: Staff Leadership in Public Schools: A Sociological Inquiry. They measured the behavior of principals and assigned to this behavior the term Executive Professional Leadership (EPL). The study was designed to explore problems of interest to educational practitioners as well as social scientists. The major assumption of the study was that EPL positively influences the behavior of students and/or the morale of teachers. Gross and Herriott formulated twelve hypotheses. They are as follows:

- (1) The more a principal permits his teachers to share his decisions, the greater his EPL.
- (2) The more egalitarian a principal's relationship with his teachers, the greater his EPL.
- (3) The more social support a principal offers to his teachers, the greater the EPL.
- (4) The greater the managerial support a principal offers his teachers, the greater the EPL.
- (5) The greater the principal's support of his teachers in cases of conflict between teachers and pupils, the greater his EPL.
- (6) The higher a principal's evaluation of his ability to provide educational leadership to his staff, the greater his EPL.
- (7) The more off-duty time a principal devotes to his job, the greater his EPL.
- (8) The more fully a principal internalizes the professional leadership definition of his role, the greater his EPL.
- (9) The greater importance a principal attaches to his routine administrative duties, the greater his EPL.
- (10) Principals with a service motive for seeking their positions will provide greater EPL than those without it.
- (11) The greater the intellectual ability of the principal, the greater his EPL.
- (12) The greater a principal's interpersonal skills, the greater his EPL (pp. 121-149).

All twelve of these hypotheses were substantiated.

Another principalship study conducted by Hemphill, Griffiths, Frederickson et al. (1961) focused on problem-solving and decision-making. Their study had the following three objectives:

- (1) To determine the dimensions of performance in the elementary school principalship and thus to develop

a better understanding of the nature of the job of the administrator.

- (2) To provide information helpful in the solution of the problem of selecting school administrators.
- (3) To provide materials and instruments for study and teaching of school administration (pp. 1-11).

In order to present a simulated school situation, a twelve-category schema was developed by the researchers. Based on a preliminary tryout of the materials, some minor revisions were made and 127 principals across the country were tested. Three of the findings were:

- (1) "Men are not overwhelmingly superior to women as principals";
- (2) "Little relationship between experience and administrative performance was noted"; and
- (3) "Personality tests might be employed as a screening device in the selection of administrators in conjunction with ability and knowledge tests if the district can determine what kind of personality is needed for the particular job situation" (p. 35).

This study did not provide any major findings in the area of leadership, however, it did clarify questions pertaining to the sex and experience of persons in administrative positions.

From a different perspective, Chester, Schmuck and Lippett (1963) investigated "The Principal's Role in Facilitating Innovation." They determined that principals with innovative staffs were found to be in agreement with their teacher's feelings about education and well informed concerning their informal relationships. The researchers also found that the teachers who perceived their principals and

other teachers as supportive reported the highest number of innovations as opposed to schools with the lowest number of innovations where teacher perceived their principals and other teachers as nonsupportive.

Taken together, the studies discussed above suggest that there are distinctive patterns of leadership and leader behavior demonstrated by persons who hold the position of principal, the ultimate "in charge" position of responsibility and authority, in schools. Further, these distinctive patterns of leader behavior principals demonstrated can be perceived by the teachers they supervise. They can also be identified and measured by means of the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ) which was developed by Hemphill and Coons of the Personnel Research Board at Ohio State University (1950) and then revised and used extensively by researchers such as Halpin (1952, 1956, 1966), Stogdill (1962) and Brown (1967). In conducting various studies using the LBDQ these researchers have not only identified and described leader behavior in schools and other organizations, they have studied the effects of different types of leader behavior on subordinates and organizations and determined that leader behavior is multidimensional, an aspect which will be discussed further in the following section.

Dimensions of Leadership

As mentioned before, the dimensions of leadership identified by several researchers are corollaries of Parsons' (1951) four functional imperatives which were discussed extensively in Chapter I. In brief, two of the functional imperatives, goal attainment and adaption, serve as instrumental activity which is concerned with planning and coordinating tasks necessary to achieve the goals of an organization. Pattern maintenance and integration, the other two functional imperatives, comprise the expressive activity of a group. Expressive activities are person-oriented and associated with helping individuals integrate into an organization.

This section of the literature review discusses the relationship between researchers' concepts of leadership dimensions and Parsons' contention that instrumental and expressive activities are imperatives in a collectivity.

Barnard (1938) has identified effectiveness-efficiency as two dimensions of leadership. He contends that:

The persistence of cooperation depends upon two conditions: (a) its effectiveness; and (b) its efficiency. Effectiveness relates to the accomplishment of the cooperative purpose which is social and nonpersonal in character. Efficiency relates to the satisfaction of individual motives, and is personal in character. The test of effectiveness is the accomplishment of common purpose or purposes; . . . the test of efficiency is the eliciting of sufficient individual will to cooperate" (p. 60).

The concept of effectiveness that Barnard addresses is consistent with what Parsons calls instrumental activity. Both terms are concerned with the goals and purposes of an organization. Efficiency, the other dimension of leadership identified by Barnard, is represented as Expressive activity by Parsons. The latter terms are concerned with the integration of members into the organization.

Goal Achievement and Group Maintenance are dimensions of leadership identified by Cartwright and Zander (1953). Again, these two dimensions of leadership coincide with Parsons' concept of functional imperatives. Goal achievement addresses the issue of tasks necessary to meet the goals of the organization. Group maintenance is concerned with the relations among members of the organizations necessary to keep members working at optimal levels of performance.

Getzels and Guba (1957) also dichotomize leadership. Nomothetic and Idiographic are the two terms they use. Getzels and Guba contend that there are two dimensions of organizational behavior--personal and organizational. Idiographic, the personal dimension, encompasses individual personality--the dynamic organization within individuals which governs their actions in the environment--and needs-disposition; an individual's tendencies to orient and act with respect to objectives and expect certain consequences from these objectives is concerned with how an individual integrates into an organization.

Nomothetic is the organizational dimension which encompasses institution regulations and policies that carry on the functions in a social system. Roles are obligations and responsibilities, a pattern of expectations applied to particular social positions which persist independently of the people occupying them, and expectations are the explicit performance behaviors within the roles.

Bowers and Seashore (1966) conducted a study to determine whether or not supervisory and peer leadership influence outcomes of satisfaction and factorial performance measures. They concluded, "that leaderships relation to outcome may best be determined when both leadership and effectiveness are multidimensional" (p. 238). The dimensions of leadership identified by these researchers were support, interaction facilitation, goal emphasis and work facilitation. These dimensions are related to Instrumental and Expressive activities. Support, which is indicative of behavior that enhances someone else's feeling of personal worth and importance, and interaction facilitation, which is concerned with behavior that encourages members of the group to develop close, mutually satisfying relationships, are concepts closely related to expressive activities. In addition to these, there is goal emphasis which is behavior that stimulates an enthusiasm for meeting the group's goal or achieving excellent performance. In a like manner, Parsons' instrumental activities are related to what Bowers and Seashore refer to as work facilitation or behavior that

helps achieve goal attainment by such activities as scheduling, coordinating, planning and by providing resources.

Kahn (1956) concluded that employee orientation and production orientation are independent dimensions of leadership. Again, overtones of instrumental and expressive activities permeate these leadership dimensions. For instance, employee orientation is behavior demonstrated by leaders who feel that it is important to consider staff members as human beings of intrinsic importance, to show that they accept their individuality and personal needs and take an interest in them. As such, employee orientation has the same goal as expressive activities; to let individuals know their worth in an organization. Likewise, instrumental activities which are concerned with planning and coordinating tasks necessary to achieve goals, are synonymous with Kahn's production orientation which is behavior that emphasizes production and the technical aspects of the job.

In an effort to reduce Stogdill's twelve dimensions of leadership, those identified as representation, demand reconciliation, tolerance uncertainty, persuasiveness, initiating structure, tolerance freedom, role assumption, consideration, production emphasis, predictive accuracy, integration and superior orientation; Brown (1967) performed a factor analysis using a principal axis factor solution. According to Brown, "this solution called for the extraction of six factors of which only two were found to be significant." A two-factor varimax rotation was

performed in order to distinguish the factors. Factor I - System Orientation and Factor II - Person Orientation, accounted for 76 percent of the total test variance. Initiating Structure, superior orientation, persuasion, role assumption, representation, and production emphasis comprise what Brown determined to be "perceived leader behavior that responds to the needs of the school qua system," or system-oriented leadership. Factor II - tolerance of freedom, tolerance of uncertainty, consideration, demand reconciliation, integration and predictive accuracy were found to be "measure(s) of perceived behavior that responds to the needs of staff members qua persons." This was referred to by Brown as Person-Oriented Leadership. Brown further defined Factor I as "behavior that responds to the needs of the school as an apersonalized system with its own goals, themes, and institutional existence" and Factor II as the "behavior that responds to the idiosyncratic personal and professional needs of fellow human beings on staff." He compares his identified leadership dimensions to those of Getzel, Barnard, Cartwright and Zander, which were mentioned earlier. Brown's comparison reinforces the idea of the relationship between dimensions of leadership and Parsons' four imperative functions. Brown's concept of person-oriented leadership is consistent with expressive activities and system-oriented leadership corresponds to instrumental activities. The above discussion reinforces Parsons' contention that both instrumental and expressive

activities are vital to a group. The discussion also suggests that to be effective, leaders must recognize the importance of these two activities. A further contention, that either activity without the other causes a group's equilibrium to be unequal is discussed in the next section which is concerned with principal-teacher interaction.

Communication in Schools: Principal-Teacher Interaction

In studying interactions in the school setting, Dror (1972) maintains that the relationship between principals and teachers is complex and that the complexity of this relationship influences the majority of interaction that take place between them. Dror surmises that it is the contradictions in the role of the principal that causes a communication problem between principals and teachers. "The relationship actually achieved when the administrator is simultaneously expected to be a watch dog and judge is something less than open, free and intimate" (p. 47). This situation, according to Dror, inherently transforms a professional relationship into a bureaucratic relationship which causes "insecurity and anxiety" in teachers. He explains that:

The weakness of the professional components in education engenders insecurity and anxiety in teachers and they usually avoid behavior which threatens their security in the organization and their chance for organizational rewards. They, therefore, conform to demands made by the hierarchical power positions, thus causing positional authority to take precedence over professional authority (p. 47).

The interaction between principals and teachers is the concern of many teachers and Watkins (1969) seemed to be reflecting on the uncertainty of principals-teachers interaction in his article, "An Inquiry Into the Principal Staff Relationship." He was interested in the nature of the interaction between the principals and their professional staffs in public schools. In order to study this interaction Watkins replicated Fiedler's (1958) research efforts which "investigated the relationship between psychological distance of the school principal and organizational effectiveness" (p. 11). Fiedler's assumption "that the way in which the group member perceives others affects his relationship with them," determined that leaders who develop an impersonal style in their relationships with group members are significantly more effective than are leaders who maintain a more impersonal style in their interaction with group members (p. 11).

Fiedler's work consisted of groups that conducted tasks which could easily be measured. However, this easily defined criteria does not exist in public schools. Therefore, Watkins used Halpin and Crofts (1964) Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire (OCDQ) which describes the morale of a school. After completing their study using this questionnaire, Halpin and Croft had pointed out that the chief consequence of the research had been their identification of the importance of "authenticity" in organizational behavior which was characteristic

of the Open Climate. The two concepts of thrust, which provided an index of the authenticity of the principal, and esprit, which provided an index of the authenticity of the morale of the group were deemed of pivotal importance.

On the basis of their findings, Watkins used the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire to measure effectiveness while studying the concept of psychological distance in the school situation.

Watkins conducted a study in forty-eight schools. Each of the principals had been at their current schools at least two years. The following hypotheses were tested:

- (1) schools which tend toward an Open Climate will have principals who maintain high psychological distance;
- (2) there will be a positive relationship between esprit (OCDQ) and Fiedler's concept of psychological distance; and
- (3) there will be a positive relationship between thrust (OCDQ) and Fiedler's concept of psychological distance.

Watkins concluded that:

There is a negative relationship between (assumed Similarity Opposite) concept of psychological distance of the school principals and: (1) the openness of the organizational climate of the schools as defined by the OCDQ, (2) the morale of the professional staffs as measured by the OCDQ dimension of Esprit, and (3) the authenticity of the behavior of school principals as established by the OCDQ dimension of thrust (p. 13).

These findings are consistent with other studies. For instance, Hoy and Appleberry (1970) also found that a principal's relationship with teachers has an impact on school climate and teachers morale.

Based on the hypothesis that principal-teacher and teacher-teacher interactions would be significantly different in schools with humanistic pupil control orientation from those in schools with a custodial orientation, Hoy and Appleberry identified these school types by using the Pupil Control Ideology Form and studied the principal-teacher interactions.

The researchers define schools with custodial orientation as having a rigid and highly controlled environment concerned with maintaining order. The students in this environment are often treated in accord with their appearance, behavior, and parents' social status. The teachers who work in schools with a custodial orientation perspective perceived the school as an autocratic setting having a rigid pupil-teacher-hierarchy with communication and power flowing unilaterally downward. In contrast, the humanistically oriented school was perceived as an "educational community in which students learn through cooperative interaction experience" (p. 28).

As anticipated by the researchers, there were several differences in the schools. Their study determined that humanistically oriented schools were more likely than custodially oriented schools to have:

- (1) teachers who work well together, that is pull together with respect to the teaching-learning task;
- (2) high morale and satisfied teachers, satisfaction growing out of a sense of task accomplishment and fulfillment of social needs;

- (3) principals who deal with teachers in an informal, face-to-face situation rather than "go by the book";
- (4) principals who do not supervise closely but instead attempt to motivate through personal example; and
- (5) an atmosphere marked by openness. Acceptance and authenticity in teacher-principal interactions.

The findings of Hoy and Appleberry reinforce the assertion that the principal's relationship with teachers (and students) has an impact on school climate and teacher morale. This study also reinforces Parsons' (1961) contention that both instrumental and expressive activities are necessary in a collectivity. This same attitude is reflected in Crooke's (1965) study in which he surveyed the nature of the supervisor-staff relationship in reference to staff morale. In Crooke's effort to assess the significance of administrative and supervisory practices on morale, and subsequently, upon the effectiveness of the total organization, he concluded:

. . . that building an accepting, understanding pattern of group interaction requires a supervisor to identify with the group physically as well as psychologically; to help participation by encouraging members to speak up; to promote thinking; and to detect unmet needs of the members of the organization (p. 94).

The same finding was the substance of Helwig's (1971) study in which he hypothesized that the amount of oral and written communication that goes on between a principal and his staff as a group, including the downward messages from the principal and his staff as a group, including the downward messages from the principal to the

teachers and the upward from the teachers to the principal, is significantly related to the quality of the school's organizational climate and the teachers' morale. The basis of this hypothesis stems from the assertion of organizational conflict theory which maintains that when organizational homeostasis become unbalanced the participants in conflict should communicate more.

Helwig tested this assertion by taking the average total frequency of principals' oral and written communication in thirty-seven schools over a twenty day period. The data were correlated with two empirically-determined variables school climate which explained the nature of homeostasis, and teacher esprit, the extent of teacher morale.

The results of two statistical analyses failed to substantiate his hypothesis or organizational conflict theory. Helwig concluded with an inquiry into whether or not there actually is ". . . a relationship between communication behavior and other organizational variables including morale" (p. 54). It is important to note that in this study Helwig considered only the frequency or amount of communication, not its nature nor the leadership style of the principal, which might more likely affect the variables of teacher morale and school climate.

In a study of how verbal expression can affect a school's climate, in a segment related to principal-teacher verbal interaction, Valentine, Tate, Seagren, and Lammel

(1975) concluded that how and what principals say makes a difference in the school climate.

For instance, principals who tended to be indirect in their verbal behavior administered schools that were perceived by teachers as stressing practicality and friendliness. The authors of the study reported that principals using this kind of verbal behavior increased the opportunity for teachers to give input because their verbal behavior reduced restraints and encouraged participation. When principals stated their decisions to their staff members, there appeared to be an emphasis on recognition of accomplishments rather than feelings of inferiority or shyness. The utilization of humor, when interacting with teachers, provoked a greater interest in achievement and a significant emphasis on hard work and a commitment to the goals of the school.

Another finding of this study suggests that one of the most significant verbal behaviors principals used was stating attitudes or values. The more the principals stated their attitudes or values, the more the staff became group-centered, they elicited public recognition for their accomplishments and the staff tended to be impetuous rather than reflective.

In a like manner, this study revealed that value statements by teachers were also a significant behavior. For instance, an increase of value statements initiated by teachers was consistent with increased teacher motivation

for achievement and success through personal effort and exhibiting hard work and a commitment to the goals of the school. In schools where teachers took the opportunity to make value statements following information given by the principal, there was considerable emphasis on change and flexibility. Conversely, when teachers initiated teacher-talk only at the content level, there was little expressiveness or emotion present among the school staff, also there was less pressure for reasoning and abstract thinking.

This study also noted that in schools in which cognitive level discussion frequently followed general information discussion by the principal, teachers tended to have a feeling of dependency upon other members of the organization as opposed to being self-reliant.

When the principal used direct administrative verbal behavior in which he gave directions to staff members it was found that the more frequently principals used this type verbal behavior following teacher talks, the more teachers perceived the organization as being constraining and restrictive with little opportunity for personal expression, little respect for the integrity of the person, and little personal autonomy. Nonetheless, it was also found that in schools in which directive communication was the norm, teachers expressed more respect for authority. This finding is consistent with the notion of a collectivity having to address instrumental needs. However, the study

also reinforces the fact that without expressive activity, instrumental activities are restricted.

In summary, this study of the verbal behavior of administrators revealed significant relationships between administrator communication and the climate of the administrator's school. Although the finding of administration-parent and administration-student studies are not discussed here because they are outside the subject matter of this study, it is of interest to note that parents and students, as well as teachers, were found to be responsive to the indirectness and directness of administrator communication. The more direct the principal, the more positive the attitudes of teachers, students and parents.

In summary, some communication behaviors were found to be more critical than others. The use of humor indicated a relaxed, positive human-relations atmosphere. The expression of personal values by principals and staff members provided a positive working relationship. The researchers reported that the amount and length of interactions, as well as the contents supported their conclusion that principals/administrators directly influence the teaching staff more than students or parents. As a result, these researchers contend that because administrator influence on teachers is the strongest and teachers have more contact with students and students have more contact with parents, the "domino effect" of the administrator's influence on the staff, is critical.

In a similar manner, these findings are reinforced by Lucietto (1970) who determined in her study that how a principal says what he has to say affects teacher and student involvement.

Lucietto's interest in the speech patterns of administrators was based on the belief that language contains the key to many questions concerning the interaction in the school situation. She hypothesized that the difference in the subject's score on Halpin's LBDQ leadership behavior questionnaire would be related to difference in their linguistic behavior.

First, Lucietto used a statistical analysis to determine the emphasis that subgroups of principals gave to different elements of spoken language. Then she used the General Inquirer System to identify language differences of principals and classify them into one of the dimensions of LBDQ - initiation of structure or consideration. Lucietto found that principals scoring high in initiating structure used relatively few self words and when they did use them they were in a direct, specific context. Whereas, principals demonstrating low initiating structure used more self words in a context of cooperative agreement.

In relation to the consideration dimension, principals demonstrating high consideration, as perceived by their teachers use ". . . language which demonstrates a concern for the individual child, whom they view as a many-faceted person, not just a pupil having relationships to the

school" (p. 4). On the other hand, principals showing low consideration, ". . . generally restrict themselves to viewing the child in the context of the school setting, judging him only by what goes on in school" (p. 4).

In this study it was shown that principals demonstrating low consideration do not appear to use clarifying language and seem defensive. The principals showing high consideration do a great deal of clarifying and are more open.

The ramifications of high consideration communication are positive. When the principal paraphrases teachers' comments this lets the teachers know the principal is listening and is concerned with their contributions. As a result, these teachers tend to feel accepted and secure.

It is apparent from the above that teachers have certain needs that influence their jobs. Chesler, Schmuck, and Lippitts' study (1963) investigating the significance of both staff norms and principal attitudes on the influence of creative teaching, found that teachers with the highest number of innovations were found in schools where teachers perceived that the principal supported their creative efforts. On the other hand, the teachers with the lowest number of innovations perceived that the principal was not supportive of their creative efforts.

As a result, these researchers concluded that staff norms are influenced by principals' leadership styles. It is important to note that the principals with highly

innovative staffs were more "professionally" oriented, and those principals who had less innovative staffs more "administratively" oriented. This is an example of how principals leadership behaviors can affect the performance of teachers.

If principals are serious about meeting the personal and professional needs of their staff, Hearn (1974) contends that the principals must provide the opportunity for teachers to express their needs. He further explains that if a principal fails to provide this, teachers may become alienated. Hearn explains that:

. . . alienation can very well be a result of the failure to communicate. When a teacher cannot communicate his needs, and when an administrator cannot, or does not care to, communicate the reasons why the institution cannot serve such needs, alienation will result (p. 135).

Hearn suggests that there are means of preventing alienation. School administrators can and should develop effective channels of communication and monitor the channels of communication to ensure that each message successfully reaches its destination.

Washington and Watson (1976) support Hearn's contention. They contend that not only is communication important in the principal-teacher relationship, the way it is done is even more important and is a reflection of the principal's leadership style. Washington and Watson contend that, "effective leadership means effective two-way communication. Face-to-face communication should have

priority over written communication so that areas of mutual concern can be discussed and clarified" (p. 6). This contention stems from the belief that when teachers feel they are part of a team, when they believe in their job and feel that the principal also values and respects the job they are doing, and when teachers believe in the administrative leadership, only then can they develop loyalty and positive morale. The end result of such positive interactions among teachers and principals is school staff satisfaction which Washington and Watson contend brings about beneficial results.

Teachers whose basic needs are satisfied tend to constantly strive for fulfillment of higher goals, and their efforts and attitudes ultimately will overflow to the student body resulting in more productive students (p. 6).

A principal who can and does assess the needs of teachers and help teachers develop a means of meeting those needs contributes only positive rewards for the teachers and a positive contribution to the school. Null (1970) feels that providing this kind of satisfaction is the main role of the principal as Null explains:

. . . the principalship exists to help teachers find satisfaction in the performance of their duties, and the position does not exist for the main purpose of imposing rigid, inflexible standards. . . . He (the principal) will then possess a theory base which will permit him to help each teacher make a total contribution that is both goal oriented and personally satisfying (p. 351).

Up to this point, all the literature seems to suggest that the principal's communication patterns affect

the school's climate and teacher morale. In a similar vein, but from a different point of view, McCleary (1968) looks at communication from the principal's perspective.

McCleary's contentions evolve from a nationwide study of practices and problems relating to intraschool communication. The study's research population was those schools which enrolled more than 1,000 students and whose principals who were members of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, the sponsors of the study.

The purpose of the study was to obtain information about methods and media of communication, characteristics of communication systems in operation, principals' perceptions of needs and priorities for improvement and some evaluation of the effectiveness of various practices.

The findings of the study were as follows: First, the methods used most frequently by principals to bring the entire staff or significant parts of it together in face-to-face situations are general faculty meetings, department meetings, principal's cabinet meetings, and meetings of department chairmen. Written communication was reported most frequently in the form of a daily or weekly bulletin. While principals in this study expressed dissatisfaction with written communication more than any other, they viewed this form of communication as an effective means to reinforce announced decisions, to follow up discussions, and to disseminate results of studies and deliberations. The researchers suggest that this attitude implies that

principals who use written communication effectively attempt to link it to other forms of communication and do not rely solely upon the written word to communicate changes in procedures or new ideas that run counter to current practices.

In reference to individual face-to-face communication, the researcher found this seemed to be a "perplexing dilemma for the principal of the large school." Respondents repeatedly noted the frustration of too little time to confer adequately with individual staff members. It was further noted that some principals felt their schools had expanded so much that they could no longer maintain an "open door" for teachers. Researchers concluded that it is apparent that principals want to relate directly and individually with their staff members and students but the size of many schools limits the opportunities for doing so.

The researcher of this study was also interested in determining the extent to which visual electronic media was utilized to overcome the problems caused by size and complexity of operation in schools. The only significant finding was the report on the extensive use of intercom systems. In response to the question, "What is needed most to improve schools," the principals' answers centered on the relationship between principal and staff members. The most frequently reported need was time to increase personal contacts with staff, to work with new teachers and to involve staff with planning and decision-making. The second most frequently reported concern was the need to consult

with staff in order to get feedback about the quality of teaching, problems of teacher-pupil and parent relations, and the interests teachers had in professional development.

Although it was not as frequently reported, many principals expressed serious concern about the value of expert help to systematize and improve the quality of communications. Many were also concerned about the use of electronic media to expedite routine messages and information handling.

In summary, the author concluded that the greatest needs expressed by principals were the need for improving communications, freeing teachers and department chairmen for group work within the school day and increasing the informal, direct contact of the principal with teachers in order to exchange ideas, discuss problems, and share experiences.

From the former discussion, it is apparent that the interactions between principals and teachers is not only complex, it is also important to the school climate. Principals' leader and communication behaviors seemed to be the two factors determining teacher morale and school climate. Principals who provided teachers with directives for task accomplishments and support for their efforts were perceived by teachers as supporting good staff relations and open, two-way communication.

Summary

To summarize, it is evident from research pertinent to leader behavior and communication that distinctive styles of leader behavior are discernible in school principals by the teachers they supervise and that these distinctive types of leader behavior affect teacher attitudes and performance and the climate of the school organization. Different patterns of leader behavior can also be identified and measured. Several researchers, particularly Halpin (1952, 1956, 1966) and Brown (1967) have revised and extensively used the LBDQ, developed by Hemphill and Coons (1957), to describe and measure leader behavior in the school setting. Their research has shown that leader behavior is multidimensional and that various dimensions are corollaries of Parsons' (1951) functional imperatives of goal attainment and adaption, which correspond to instrumental interaction; likewise pattern maintenance and integration, which comprise the expressive interaction in the school organization.

Other researchers, notably Cartwright and Zander (1953), Kahn (1956), and Getzels and Guba (1957), have also identified dimensions of leader behavior which appear to correspond closely to and provide additional support for the assumption of dichotomous variables that are similar to the identified task-oriented and person-oriented functional imperatives described earlier. Additionally, Brown (1967) has, through factor analysis, classified and reduced

Stogdill's (1962) twelve dimensions of leadership discussed in section two of this chapter, to the two factors of system or task-oriented and person-oriented leadership which are consistent with initiating structure and consideration activities, respectively.

Studies of communication and interaction between principals and teachers in schools, while not relating communication modes specifically to leadership behavior, have described the complexity of the principal-teacher relationship and the pervasive influence their interaction has on teacher attitude, creativity, loyalty, morale and satisfaction. Principal-teacher interactions were also found to be significant in determining the quality and tone of a school's organizational climate; particularly pervasive and influential because of the domino effect the principal-teacher interaction has in affecting teacher contacts with students and student contacts with parents, in the context of attitudes about and interaction with the school (Valentine, Tate, Seagren and Lammell, 1975).

In studies of principal-teacher interactions, some findings on communication modes determined that both how and what principals say is significant in how they are perceived and their effectiveness. For instance, whether their communication was direct or indirect, whether principals revealed their values and attitudes, whether they used humor, self-words and clarification and whether the communication was one- or two-way, written or oral, frequent

or infrequent all affect their interactions with teachers although there was not 100 percent agreement among all the researchers on all points.

Washington and Watson (1976) contended that not only is communication important in the principal-teacher relationship, the way it is done is even more important and reflects the principal's leadership style. This relationship between communication and leadership style or leader behavior is, of course, the subject of the study at hand and is examined in depth in the chapters to follow.

CHAPTER III

DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

The relevant literature pertaining to leadership and communication was reviewed in Chapter II. This chapter outlines the procedures utilized to answer the exploratory research posed in Chapter I. The purpose of this study was to determine whether or not principals' leader behaviors are related to the communication behaviors in schools.

The topics discussed in this chapter are: design of the study, development of the study, setting, study population, rationale for the instrumentation, analysis of the data, and the limitations of the methodology.

Design of the Study

The study has been designed to address five exploratory questions regarding principals' leader behavior and communication behaviors in school. These questions are as follows:

Do principals, who are perceived by teachers as demonstrating high Initiating Structure leader behavior, use more Instrumental communication than principals perceived by teachers as demonstrating low Initiating Structure?

Do principals, who are perceived by teachers as demonstrating high Initiating Structure leader behavior,

use more Expressive communication than principals perceived by teachers as demonstrating low Initiating Structure?

Do principals, who are perceived by teachers as demonstrating high Consideration leader behavior, use more Instrumental communication than principals perceived by teachers as demonstrating low Consideration?

Do principals, who are perceived by teachers as demonstrating high Consideration leader behavior, use more Expressive communication than principals perceived by teachers as demonstrating low Consideration?

Is there a relationship between the perceived instrumental and expressive communication patterns of principals and the perceived instrumental and expressive communication patterns of teachers?

Information to address these questions was obtained via a two-part questionnaire which was administered by the researcher to teachers in ten elementary schools in a middle size, urban school district.

Development

This study is part of a larger research project entitled, "Search for Effective Schools Study," which is being undertaken by the Center for Urban Studies at Harvard University, under a grant from The National Institute of Education (NIE). The purpose of the "Search for Effective Schools" project is to determine (1) what are the limits on educational achievements of poor children, and (2) what is the standard of achievement that can reasonably be expected of urban schools when working with this population of pupils (Fredericksen, 1980). Data for this project are being gathered in a number of school districts throughout the country, including the population for this study. The

sample of school districts selected represent some schools which are instructionally effective and others which are instructionally ineffective in teaching disadvantaged students.

The primary research tool utilized in the study is a survey-questionnaire. The questionnaire was designed by the research team to assess (1) instructional practices used by teachers, (2) teacher perceptions of curriculum, and (3) organization and administration of the school. In short, the project seeks to shed some light on how teaching urban disadvantaged can be improved.

The overall purpose of the "Search for Effective Schools Study," was to determine the differences between schools instructionally effective and ineffective in teaching disadvantage students. The objective of the researcher's study was to examine the role of principals' leader behaviors and communication behaviors which could be the determining factors of instructionally effective and ineffective urban schools. It was also felt that such a study would provide an important, neglected perspective on effective teaching, especially the urban disadvantaged.

Setting

This study was undertaken in a small urban city, which is the center of a metropolitan service area with a population of 400,000 people. The city's economy might be classified as service-industrial as more than two-thirds of the labor force is employed in either the automotive industry or education and government-related jobs. The

city's school district consists of forty-one elementary schools, five junior high schools and four senior high schools. During the 1979-80 school year 1,545 teachers and over 100 administrators (including principals) served the approximately 26,000 students enrolled in grades K-12. In regards to racial composition, 65 percent of the students are white, 22 percent black, 10 percent Latino, 1 percent Native American and 1 percent Asian.

Sample Population

The sample for the "Search for Effective Schools" project was chosen based on students' low socio-economic status and whether or not their reading and math test scores on the state-wide educational, assessment program were above or below average. The ten schools chosen represented a cross-section of the achievement levels of elementary schools in the district.

The author of this study served a dual research role. The first part of the research was conducted on behalf of the "Search for Effective Schools" project. This part of the research involved an interview with each teacher who volunteered to participate in the research project. Once the teachers had completed the interview and had received their honorarium, the second part of the research was conducted on behalf of the researcher's study. The teachers were asked to complete a two-part questionnaire relating to their principal's leader and communication

behaviors as well as the communication behaviors among teachers. Each teacher that volunteered to participate in the "Search for Effective Schools" project, volunteered to participate in the researcher's study. The specific methodology was as follows:

The researcher contacted the principal at each school regarding permission to discuss the purpose of "The Search for Effective Schools" project. The researcher met with principals and teachers during staff meetings at their individual schools. The researcher's meetings with the school staffs were scheduled such that each school was visited a week in advance of the actual interview. At this time, the teachers were informed that they would receive a \$20 honorarium for participating in "The Search for Effective Schools" project. Principals and teachers were assured that all responses would be confidential and anonymous; that is, that neither teachers nor principals would be referred to by name in the study. A week later, the researcher returned and conducted scheduled interviews. After each interview the teachers were asked to complete the questionnaire related to the researcher's study. The directions for completing the questionnaire were explicitly stated on the form. This process was repeated for each school in the population. The researcher spent approximately one week in each school. Out of a possible 173 teachers, sixty-three teachers (approximately 6.5 per school) volunteered to participate in the study.

The respondents (teachers) average number of years of experience at their current schools was 3.9 (ranging from 1 to 6.1; Table 3.1). Of the ten principals surveyed, five were male and five were female; in terms of race, three were Black, one was Mexican American and six were Caucasian. All of the principals had Masters degrees, three had graduate credits beyond the Master degree and one had earned a doctoral degree. The principals' average years of administrative experience was 9.3 (ranging from 1.5 to 17; Table 3.2).

Instrumentation

To determine whether principals' leader behaviors relate to communication behaviors in schools, five exploratory questions which were discussed earlier in this section, are addressed using the following instruments.

The Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire was used to identify perceived leader behavior of principals as Initiating Structure and Consideration. According to Halpin (1966), estimated reliability by the split-half method is .86 for the Initiating Structure scores, and .93 for the Consideration scores.

These two dimensions of leadership are derived from Stogdill's (1963) attempt to compare the leader-behavior of individuals thought to be effective with the leader-behavior of those thought to be somewhat ineffective in order to determine if there were significant

Table 3.1.--Characteristics of the Schools.

School Code	Grade Level	Number of Students	Number of Staff Members	Number of Participating Staff Members	Respondents' Average Number of Years Experience at This School
01	K-4	223	12	9	3.2
02	K-4	304	13	6	6.1
03	K-6	304	15	9	5.5
04	K-6	646	46	9	2.6
05	K-4	245	12	3	1
06	K-6	310	13	3	5.3
07	K-6	417	20	10	3.2
08	K-4	227	14	2	5
09	K-4	371	16	7	3.8
10	K-6	267	13	4	4.25

Table 3.2.--Characteristics of the Principals.

Principals	Sex	Race	Level of Education	Years of Administrative Experience
01	Male	White	M.A. Elementary Education	3
02	Male	White	M.A. Administration	12
03	Male	White	M.A. + 70 Administration	10
04	Female	Black	M.A. Elementary Education	17
05	Female	White	M.A. Administration	16
06	Male	White	M.A. + Elementary Education	1.5
07	Female	Black	M.A. Reading 9 hours Administration	3.5
08	Male	Mexican American	M.A. Teaching Culturally Disadvantaged	10
09	Female	White	M.A. Elementary Administration	7
10	Female	Black	Ph.D. Professional Development	13

differences between them. Based on their extensive studies of leadership, Hemphill and Coons (1950) developed the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ) to compare leader behavior. It was later refined by Halpin and Winer (1952).

Halpin (1952) used the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire to compare the behaviors of flight crews as part of a military leadership study. In the analysis two dimensions of leadership, Consideration and Initiating Structure, were the differentiating factors in leader behaviors. Initiating structure accounted for 34 percent of the variance and consideration accounted for 50 percent of the variance. These two dimensions are defined as follows:

Consideration includes behavior indicating mutual trust, respect, and certain warmth and rapport between the supervisor and his group. This does not mean that this dimension reflects a superficial "pat-on-the-back," "first name calling" kind of human relations behavior. This dimension appears to emphasize a deeper concern for group members needs and includes such behavior as allowing subordinates more participation in decision making and encouraging more two-way communication (Lowin et al., p. 238).

Initiating structure includes behavior in which the supervisor organizes and defines group activities and his relations to the group. Thus, he defines the roll he expects each member to assume, assigns tasks, plans ahead, establishes ways of getting things done, and pushes for production. This dimension seems to emphasize overt attempts to achieve organization goals (Lowin et al., p. 238).

These two dimensions of leadership provide a typology for studying leader behavior. The Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire provided a means of identifying these two

types of behavior. For this study, the LBDQ was used to determine whether perceptions of principals' leader behaviors were high or low on initiating structure or high or low on consideration.

As suggested by the definitions of initiating structure and consideration, the "dimensions are relatively independent of one another; the consideration and initiating structure factors seem to be separate and distinct dimensions, not opposite ends of the same continuum" (Hoy and Miskel, 1978, p. 183).

If principal's leader behaviors are perceived by teachers as initiating structure, it can be expected that the principals define the goals of the schools and their relationship with the teachers. Principals who initiate structure define the roles that they expect teachers to assume; they also assign tasks, establish ways of getting things done and push for production (Owen, 1970). On the other hand, leader behaviors perceived as consideration indicate mutual trust, respect, and a certain warmth and rapport. The principal so identified will also show concern for teachers' needs, participation in decision-making and encourage two-way communication (Owen, 1970).

From Halpin's perspective on leadership it can be expected that if principals are going to be good leaders they must contribute to the major objectives of the educational program (goal achievement) and provide an atmosphere

conducive to accomplishing tasks (maintenance). Halpin contends that:

practical men know that the leader must lead, must initiate action and get things done. But because he must accomplish his purpose through other people, and without jeopardizing the intactness or integrity of the group, the skilled executive knows that he also must maintain good "human relations" if he is to succeed in furthering the purposes of the group (p. 87).

Therefore, according to the constructs developed by Halpin and Winer (1952), principals should be "strong" in initiating structure and they should also show high consideration for teachers.

Interpretation of the LBDQ

Initiation of Structure and Consideration can be divided into high and low groups and then combined with one another to make the following four dichotomies:

1. High Initiation of Structure,
Low Consideration
2. High Initiation of Structure,
High Consideration
3. Low Initiation of Structure,
High Consideration
4. Low Initiation of Structure,
Low Consideration

Once each LBDQ answer sheet had been scored on each of the two dimensions, and the scores had been calculated from the sixty-three respondents which had been averaged separately by dimension, the two average scores were designated as the initiating structure and consideration index scores. Each principal was evaluated based on the position

of each dimension as compared with the other principals in the sample.

The index score of leader behaviors determined which set of dichotomies a person's leadership reflected. Those (persons) who scored above the mean on both dimensions were in set two. Those below the mean on both dimensions were in set four. Those who scored below the mean in consideration, but above the mean in initiating structure, were in set one. Those who scored below the mean on initiating structure but scored above the mean on consideration were in set three (Halpin, 1953). Because these dimensions of leadership could be "cross-partitioned," by using the mean scores, the nature of a principal's leader behavior was identified as being one of the four sets of dichotomies.

Attached to the preceding questionnaire was a questionnaire developed by the researcher which was used to survey the communication behaviors of principals and teachers. The items on the questionnaire were designed to measure the frequency and forms of instrumental and expressive communication utilized by principals and teachers.

In an attempt to assess the instrumental and the expressive communication behaviors in elementary schools it was necessary to develop an instrument that would allow the researcher to address the necessary inquiries. In order to coincide with the conceptual framework of this study it

was imperative that the questions reflect the concepts of instrumental and expressive communication.

Etzioni (1961) applied Parsons' instrumental and expressive activities to communication. He contends that communication in complex organizations is two-fold. One form is instrumental and task related to disseminate information and knowledge such as administrative directives, policies and curriculum objectives.

Expressive, the other form, is communication to integrate individuals into an organization. This type of communication is person oriented, it changes or reinforces attitudes, norms and values, and includes praise and expressions of acceptance.

The development of the Communication Behavior Questionnaire was based on the concepts of instrumental and expressive communication and the influence of the Downs and Hazen (1977) Communication Satisfaction Survey. This survey (CSS) was developed to determine how satisfied a person is with the amount and quality of information in their organization. The Communication Satisfaction Survey consist of forty items representing eight factors. The eight factors are:

1. General Organization Perspective. Items in this dimension reflect information relating to the overall functioning of the organization.
2. Personal Feedback. This factor relates to personal achievement and work and how they are recognized by the organization.

3. Organizational Integration. This reflects the individual's satisfaction with the information that he receives about the organization and the immediate work environment.
4. Communication with Superiors. These items refer to two-way communication with superiors.
5. Communication Climate. This broad factor reflects communication at the organizational and personal levels or the extent to which communication motivates and stimulates workers to meet goals.
6. Horizontal Communication. This factor relates to informal communication among fellow employees.
7. Media Quality. This reflects the degree to which employees perceive the major forms of communication (memos, publications) as functioning effectively.
8. Communication with Subordinates. These items focus on two-way communication with subordinates (Hoy and Miskel, 1978).

The response categories are:

1. very satisfied
2. satisfied
3. slightly satisfied
4. indifferent
5. slightly dissatisfied
6. dissatisfied
7. very dissatisfied

Categories on the CSS such as General Organizational Perspective, Personal Feedback, Organizational Integration, were somewhat related to the concepts of instrumental and expressive communication. Thus, after discussing these concepts, along with the concepts of instrumental and expressive communication with principals and teachers, the researcher used the Downs and Hazen Communication Satisfaction Survey, as a guide in which to develop the Communication Behavior Questionnaire. The purpose of the Communication Behavior Questionnaire instrument was to determine

how frequently principals communicated with teachers and how frequently teachers communicated with other teachers using instrumental and expressive communication. The instrument was also developed to determine which "forms" instrumental and expressive communication occurred. Each item addressed the concept of either instrumental or expressive communication.

Instrumental communication was defined as communication necessary to perform a task. Thus, the following items assessing the frequency of instrumental communication were related to administrative directives, goals and objectives, rules and regulations.

Instrumental Communication Questionnaire Items (Principals to Teachers):

1. How often does your principal communicate about school policies?
2. How often does your principal communicate about the goals of the school?
3. How often does your principal communicate about curriculum objectives?
4. How often does your principal communicate about rules and regulations regarding attendance?
5. How often does your principal communicate about district policies?
6. How often does your principal communicate administrative matters (i.e., finances, student population)?

7. How often does your principal communicate his/her expectations of your job?
8. How often does your principal communicate the goals of the district?

Instrumental Communication Questionnaire Items (Teachers to Teachers):

1. How often do teachers communicate about curriculum objectives?
2. How often do teachers communicate the rules and regulations regarding attendance?

The estimated reliability scale revealed by the covariance statistical technique for items pertaining to the principals and teachers interaction (1-4, 10-13) was .87. The reliability for the items pertaining to teacher interaction (18 and 19) among each other was .66.

Expressive communication was defined as communication related to helping an individual integrate into the organization. Therefore, the following items were related to expressing rewards, praise and acceptance.

Expressive Communication Questionnaire Items (Principals to Teachers):

1. How often does your principal communicate information about your performance?
2. How often does your principal listen and pay attention to you?

3. How often does your principal praise your efforts?
4. How often does your principal tell you that he/she trusts you?
5. How often does your principal motivate you and/or stimulate an enthusiasm for meeting educational program goals?
6. How often does your principal let you know that he/she is open to hearing your ideas?
7. How often does your principal communicate that he/she understands the problems you face doing your job?

Expressive Communication Questionnaire Items (Teachers to Teachers):

1. How often do other teachers praise your efforts?
2. How often do teachers motivate and stimulate an enthusiasm for meeting educational program goals?
3. How often do teachers make you feel you are a vital part of the school?

The covariance statistical technique indicated that the estimated reliability scale for items concerning the principals and teachers interaction (5-9; 14-17) was .90. The reliability for the items pertaining to teacher interaction (20-22) among each other was .83.

The questionnaire items were randomly ordered on the instrument. A copy of the combined instruments is in Appendix A.

The communication behavior instrument was also designed to determine the forms in which communication occurs. For instance, when a principal engaged in either instrumental and expressive communication, it was the researcher's intention to assess the form in which it occurred. In other words, do principals hold staff meetings or do they communicate with each teacher individually (individual vs. group meeting)?; do principals use bulletins, the intercom, or face-to-face communication (written vs. verbal messages)?; do principals plan meetings or do they have spontaneous meetings (scheduled vs. unscheduled)?; and when principals interact with teachers do they give feedback, ask questions or is the communication non-reciprocal (one-way vs. two-way)? These same inquiries were explored with communication among teachers.

The response to these questions on the survey questionnaire provided an indepth perspective on the nature of instrumental and expressive communication in schools as it related to initiating structure and consideration leader behavior.

Analysis of the Data

Two statistical techniques were used to answer the exploratory questions posed above.

In attempts to discover as well as clarify relationships "the correlation coefficient is a precise way of stating the extent to which one variable is related to

another" (Borg and Gall, 1971). Because the purpose of this study was to identify and explore the relationship between two sets of variables that produced interval data, the Pearson product moment correlation was an appropriate statistical technique.

A Pearson Product Moment correlation was used to measure the strength and direction of relationships between leader behaviors and the frequency of instrumental and expressive communication. The correlation technique postulates that the relationship between any two variables, say X and Y, ranges between -1 and +1. The magnitude or strength of the relationship is evidenced by the size of the correlation coefficient--the index of association. For example, a correlation coefficient falling between -1 and 0 (e.g., -.35) suggested that there was an inverse relationship between X and Y. If the correlation coefficient was between .40 and .70 the relationship was moderate; and a coefficient of over .70 represented a strong relationship.

The purpose of the chi-square test is to measure the differences between data in the form of frequency counts. Further this test determines the differences between the frequencies that occur and those frequencies that could be expected to occur by chance. Because this study was assessing the frequency of communication behaviors as measured by the following dichotomies: individual vs. group meetings; written vs. verbal messages; scheduled vs.

unscheduled meetings; and one-way vs. two-way communication, the chi-square test was used.

This test determined the relationship between two nominally scaled variables (high and low leader behaviors) by measuring the observed and expected frequencies. To determine whether systematic relationship exists, it was necessary to ascertain whether the probability of obtaining a value of chi-square was equal to or greater than the one calculated from the sample. The significance level was set at .05. Therefore the calculated chi-square value had to be equal to or greater than 3.8.

Summary

To determine if principals' leader behavior influences communication behaviors in schools, the exploratory questions outlined in this chapter served as the substance of the study.

Teachers from ten elementary schools served as the sample population. The teachers from these schools were asked to complete two questionnaires. The first questionnaire, the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire was used to assess the leader behaviors of principals as they were perceived by teachers. The second survey instrument, the Communication Behavior Questionnaire was used to measure the perceived frequency of instrumental and expressive communication, as well as the forms in which these behaviors occur.

Two statistical techniques were used to answer the exploratory questions. The Pearson Product Moment Correlation was used to measure strength and direction of relationships between leader behavior and instrumental and expressive communication. The chi-square test of statistical significance was used to determine the relationship between leader behavior and the forms in which communication occurred.

The analysis of the data collected from the aforementioned population will appear in the next chapter.

Limitations of the Methodology

There are three methodological limitations to this study. The first limitation is due to the fact that the data were not gathered from a randomly selected sample. The researcher used the study population of a current research project entitled "Search for Effective Schools" project. Secondly, not only is it a limitation because the teachers volunteered, but fewer than half of the teachers in all ten schools volunteered to participate (sixty-three out of one hundred and seventy-three). The third limitation is that the Communication Behavior Questionnaire, which was developed by the researcher, was not pilot-tested.

In summary, because the population sample was not randomly selected, fewer than half the teachers volunteered to participate and the Communication Behavior instrument was not pilot tested, the findings cannot be generalized beyond

this study population and any future research related to this study must consider these limitations.

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS

The procedures and methodology utilized in this study were discussed in Chapter III. This chapter seeks answers to the five exploratory research questions posed in Chapters I and III regarding principals' leader behavior and communication behavior in ten urban elementary schools. The purpose of this study is to determine whether or not principals' leader behaviors are related to the communication behaviors in schools. Two statistical techniques were used in the analysis. A bivariate correlation technique was used to measure the strength and direction of relationships between leader behavior (initiating structure and consideration) and communication behaviors (instrumental and expressive). The relationship between leader behavior and the various forms of communication was assessed with the chi-square test. The following exploratory questions are addressed:

1. Do principals, who are perceived as demonstrating high initiating structure leader behavior, use more instrumental communication than principals perceived by teachers as demonstrating low initiating structure?

2. Do principals who are perceived as demonstrating high initiating structure leader behavior, use more expressive communication than principals perceived as demonstrating low initiating structure?
3. Do principals who are perceived by teachers as demonstrating high consideration leader behavior use more instrumental communication than principals perceived by teachers as demonstrating low consideration?
4. Do principals who are perceived by teachers as demonstrating high consideration leader behavior, use more expressive communication than principals perceived by teachers as demonstrating low consideration?
5. Is there a relationship between the perceived instrumental and expressive communication patterns of principals and the perceived instrumental and expressive communication patterns of teachers?

Perceived Leader Behavior of Principals

While there are no set norms for mean scores pertaining to initiating structure and consideration leader behavior, Halpin's (1957) study of sixty-four educational administrators was used as a bench mark with which to compare the scores obtained in this study. In Halpin's study, the mean score for initiating structure was 37.9 and 44.7 for consideration. The mean scores for the ten elementary school principals surveyed in this study were 43.6 and 39.2, respectively. The difference in the mean scores might be attributed to the fact that, when scoring the LBDQ, very low or very high individual raw scores tend to skew the group mean.

As explained in Chapter III, because the dimensions of leader behavior are independent they can be divided into

high and low groups. The results of this analysis indicated that six of the ten principals were above the mean on both dimensions (high initiating structure, high consideration); two principals were below the mean on both dimensions (low initiating structure, low consideration); one principal was below the mean on initiating structure and above the mean on consideration (low initiating structure, high consideration); and one principal was above the mean on initiating structure and below the mean on consideration (high initiating structure, low consideration). The ideal principal is one with high initiating structure and high consideration leader behavior.

The number of years of administrative experience varied considerably among the principals surveyed in this study, ranging from 1 to 6.1 years. However, years of experience appeared to be unrelated to the principals' scores, as those with both the least and most experience exemplified the ideal type, i.e., high initiating structure and high consideration. On the other hand, there was a notable pattern along race and sex lines; Black and female principals also demonstrated high initiating structure and high consideration leader behavior.

The correlation analysis revealed that there was a statistically significant positive relationship between initiating structure and the frequency of instrumental communication ($r = .57$, $p > .001$; Table 4.1). Seven principals who were perceived by teachers as strongly pushing

Table 4.1.--The Correlations Between Leader Behavior and Communication.

Leader Behavior		Communication	Simple R
Consideration	vs.	Instrumental	.42
Consideration	vs.	Expressive	.69
Initiating Structure	vs.	Instrumental	.57
Initiating Structure	vs.	Expressive	.47

$p > .001$

for production, assigning tasks and defining their relationships with teachers (high initiating structure), were also perceived to discuss more information related to school policies, curriculum objectives and the goals of the schools (instrumental communication), than three principals perceived by teachers as not so strongly pushing for production, assigning tasks and defining their relationship with teachers (low initiating structure).

The analysis indicates that there was also a statistically significant positive relationship between initiating structure behavior and the frequency of expressive communication ($r = .47$, $p > .001$; Table 4.1). The seven principals who were perceived by teachers as strongly pushing for production, were perceived as expressing more praise for teachers' efforts and showing greater acceptance

of teachers (expressive communication) than the three principals perceived by teachers as not so strongly pushing for production.

Similarly, the analysis related to consideration leader behavior and instrumental communication indicated that there was a significant correlation ($r = .42$, $p > .001$; Table 4.1). This positive relationship indicates that as the ten principals strongly showed respect, warmth and built a rapport with teachers (high consideration), they also discussed district and school policies, curriculum objectives and the goals of the schools more. Likewise, the analysis revealed a statistically significant direct association ($r = .69$, $p > .001$) between consideration leader behavior and the frequency of expressive communication (Table 4.1). Thus, seven principals who were perceived by teachers as strongly demonstrating mutual respect and trust were perceived as expressing praise to teachers for their efforts more than the three principals who were perceived as not so strongly building a rapport with teachers. In contrast, the analysis further indicated that the association between the perceived instrumental and expressive communication patterns of principals and the perceived instrumental and expressive communication of teachers was not statistically significant (Table 4.2).

In summary, the results disclosed that there was a statistically significant relationship between initiating structure and consideration leader behaviors and the

Table 4.2.--The Correlations Between the Perceived Patterns of Principals' and Teachers' Instrumental and Expressive Communication.

Principals' Communication		Teachers' Communication	Simple R
Instrumental	vs.	Instrumental	.1562*
Instrumental	vs.	Expressive	.0666*
Expressive	vs.	Expressive	.0682*
Expressive	vs.	Instrumental	.1227*

*Not statistically significant.

$p < .001$

frequencies of instrumental and expressive communication behaviors (Table 4.1). However, the relationship between initiating structure and the frequency of instrumental communication is stronger than the relationship between initiating structure and the frequency of expressive communication. Likewise, the association between consideration leader behavior and the frequency of expressive communication is stronger than that between consideration behavior and instrumental communication (Table 4.1). The implications are that principals demonstrating either type of leader behavior, may use both types of communication. However, the frequency of communication may differ depending on whether the level of leader behavior is high or low.

This study further indicated that there was no statistically significant relationship between the perceived

frequency of principals' communication patterns and the perceived frequency of teachers' communication patterns. These findings suggest that the frequency of which principals discussed curriculum objectives, district policies, school rules and regulations, and expressed reward, praise and acceptance was not related to how often (frequency) teachers discussed curriculum objectives, district policies, rules and regulations of the school; and express rewards, praise and acceptance with each other.

Initiating Structure Leader Behavior vs.
Instrumental and Expressive Communi-
cation Used by Principals

In this section, the chi-square test was used to assess the relationship between leader behaviors and the selected forms of communication. Leader behavior was nominally classified as being either high or low and communication was measured according to the following four dichotomies: individual or group meetings; written or verbal messages; scheduled or unscheduled meetings; and one-way or two-way communication. The intent was to provide some insights into the forms in which principals and teachers communicate with one another. Further, a comparison between instrumental and expressive communication allows the researcher to determine if there are substantial differences between these two types of communication, as measured by the designated forms of communication. The

relationship between initiating structure leader behavior and instrumental communication was assessed first.

The chi-square test revealed that there are no statistically significant differences between initiating structure and instrumental communication, as measured by individual vs. group meetings and written vs. verbal messages dichotomies. Most principals, irrespective of how strongly they pushed for production or reassured teachers of their roles and assigned tasks, tended to use group meetings (Table 4.3) and verbal messages (Table 4.4) when discussing information necessary for teachers to do their jobs, i.e., curriculum objectives, district and school policies and the school's goals. However, initiating structure leader behavior crosstabulated with instrumental communication as measured by scheduled vs. unscheduled meetings and one-way vs. two-way communication, indicated statistically significant differences (Table 4.5 and 4.6). The differences occurred because it was expected statistically that those principals strongly pushing for production would use fewer scheduled and more unscheduled meetings than they were perceived as using. It was also statistically expected that those principals perceived as pushing less strongly for production would use more scheduled and fewer unscheduled meetings when discussing curriculum objectives, rules and regulations of the school, and district and school policies.

Table 4.3.--Initiating Structure Leader Behavior vs. Instrumental Communication as a Form of Individual vs. Group Meetings Used Between Principal and Teachers.

	Individual	Group	Total
High	(22.1) ^a 18	(192.8) 197	215
Low	(16.8) 21	(146) 142	163
Total	39	339	N = 378
$\chi^2 = 1.99$			
$p < .05$			
$df = 1$			

^aNumbers in parentheses are expected frequencies.

Table 4.4.--Initiating Structure Leader Behavior vs. Instrumental Communication as a Form of Written vs. Verbal Messages Used Between Principal and Teacher.

	Written	Verbal	Total
High	(21.7) ^a 20	(106.2) 108	128
Low	(18.2) 20	(88.7) 87	107
Total	40	195	N = 235
$\chi^2 = .363$			
$p < .05$			
$df = 1$			

^aNumbers in parentheses are expected frequencies.

Table 4.5.--Initiating Structure Leader Behavior vs.
Instrumental Communication as a Form of
Scheduled vs. Unscheduled Meetings Used
Between Principals and Teachers.

	Scheduled	Unscheduled	Total
High	(155.5) ^a 163	(24.4) 17	180
Low	(130.4) 123	(20.5) 28	151
Total	286	45	N = 331
$\chi^2 = 5.76$			
$p > .05$			
$df = 1$			

^aNumbers in parentheses are expected frequencies.

Table 4.6.--Initiating Structure Leader Behavior vs.
Instrumental Communication as a Form of One-
Way and Two-Way Communication Used Between
Principals and Teachers.

	One-Way	Two-Way	Total
High	(74.8) ^a 62	(130.0) 143	205
Low	(56.1) 69	(97.8) 85	154
Total	131	228	N = 359
$\chi^2 = 5.11$			
$p > .05$			
$df = 1$			

^aNumbers in parentheses are expected frequencies.

In reference to the type of communication, the chi square test revealed that those principals perceived as strongly pushing for production and assigning tasks, utilized less one-way communication and more two-way communication than anticipated when discussing curriculum objectives, district policies and the like. On the other hand, those principals perceived as pushing less strongly for production, used more one-way and less two-way communication when using instrumental communication.

As Table 4.7 shows, there was a statistically significant difference between initiating structure leader behavior and expressive communication as measured by individual vs. group meetings. The statistical difference between initiating structure and individual and group meetings arose because those principals perceived as strongly pushing for production used fewer individual meetings and more group meetings than expected when building friendships with teachers and expressing concerns for their needs. Secondly, those principals perceived as not so strongly pushing for production and defining their relationships with teachers used more individual meetings and fewer group meetings than expected when giving teachers praise for their efforts in their job. Therefore, it can be concluded that regardless of the degree to which principals push for production, they most often use individual meetings as a medium for indicating trust, respect and building rapport between themselves and teachers.

Table 4.7.--Initiating Structure Leader Behavior vs.
Expressive Communication as a Form of Individual
vs. Group Meetings Used Between Principals and
Teachers.

	Individual	Group	Total
High	(122.3) ^a 114	(53.6) 62	176
Low	(80.6) 89	(35.3) 27	116
Total	203	89	N = 292
$\chi^2 = 4.64$			
$p > .05$			
$df = 1$			

^aNumbers in parentheses are expected frequencies.

Table 4.8.--Initiating Structure Leader Behavior vs.
Expressive Communication as a Form of Written
vs. Verbal Messages Used Between Principal and
Teachers.

	Written	Verbal	Total
High	(13.5) ^a 14	(94.4) 94	108
Low	(7.4) 7	(51.5) 52	59
Total	21	146	N = 167
$\chi^2 = .0465$			
$p > .05$			
$df = 1$			

^aNumbers in parentheses are expected frequencies.

In contrast, the chi-square test indicated that there was no statistically significant difference between initiating structure leader behavior and expressive communication as measured by the written vs. verbal messages and scheduled vs. unscheduled meetings when principals build rapport with teachers (Table 4.9).

However, initiating structure and type of communication revealed statistical differences because those principals who strongly pushed for production were perceived as using less one-way and more two-way communication than was anticipated when building rapport with teachers. Whereas, those principals who were perceived as not so strongly pushing for production used more one-way and less two-way communication than expected when expressing praise and giving teachers rewards for their efforts. These findings suggest that two-way communication is used when principals give praises and rewards, regardless of how strongly they push for production.

Consideration Leader Behavior vs.
Instrumental and Expressive
Communication Used
by Principals

The following discussion is concerned with the relationships between consideration leader behavior and instrumental and expressive communication as measured by individual vs. group meetings; written vs. verbal messages; scheduled vs. unscheduled; and one-way vs. two-way forms of communication.

Table 4.9.--Initiating Structure Leader Behavior vs.
Expressive Communication as a Form of Scheduled
vs. Unscheduled Meetings Used Between Principal
and Teachers.

	Scheduled	Unscheduled	Total
High	(51.6) 53	(133.3) 132	185
Low	(29.3) 28	(75.6) 77	105
Total	81	209	N = 290
$\chi^2 = .133$			
$p > .05$			
$df = 1$			

^aNumbers in parentheses are expected frequencies.

Table 4.10.--Initiating Structure Leader Behavior vs.
Expressive Communication as a Form of One-
Way vs. Two-Way Communication Used Between
Principals and Teachers.

	One-Way	Two-Way	Total
High	(54.7) ^a 46	(167.2) 176	222
Low	(35.2) 44	(107.7) 99	143
Total	90	275	N = 365
$\chi^2 = 4.6$			
$p > .05$			
$df = 1$			

^aNumbers in parentheses are expected frequencies.

The chi-square test indicated that there are no statistically significant differences between principals perceived as developing mutual trust and respect when they discussed curriculum objectives, district and school policies and the goals of the school (instrumental communication), as measured by individual and group meetings; written and verbal messages; and scheduled and unscheduled meetings. The majority of principals who were perceived as developing mutual trust and respect with teachers tended to use group meetings (Table 4.11), verbal messages (Table 4.12), and scheduled meetings (Table 4.13) when they discussed information that would help teachers integrate into the organization or when giving praise and rewards.

In contrast, there was a statistical difference between consideration leader behavior and instrumental communication as measured by one-way vs. two-way types of communication. The statistical difference was a result of those principals who strongly built rapport, showed concerns for teachers needs and were perceived as utilizing less one-way communication and more two-way communication than expected. Further, principals who were perceived as not so strongly building a rapport and showing a concern for teachers' needs, used more one-way and less two-way communication than anticipated when discussing curriculum objectives, district and school policies; and goals of the school (Table 4.14).

Table 4.11.--Consideration Leader Behavior vs. Instrumental Communication as a Form of Individual vs. Group Communication Between Principals and Teachers.

	Individual	Group	Total
High	(17.2) ^a 20	(96.7) 94	114
Low	(21.7) 19	(122.2) 125	144
Total	39	219	N = 258
$\chi^2 = .705$			
$p < .05$			
$df = 1$			

^aNumbers in parentheses are expected frequencies.

Table 4.12.--Consideration Leader Behavior vs. Instrumental Communication as a Form of Written vs. Verbal Communication Between Principals and Teachers.

	Written	Verbal	Total
High	(23.65) ^a 22	(115.3) 117	139
Low	(16.34) 18	(79.6) 78	96
Total	40	195	N = 235
$\chi^2 = .342$			
$p < .05$			
$df = 1$			

^aNumbers in parentheses are expected frequencies.

Table 4.13.--Consideration Leader Behavior vs. Instrumental Communication as a Form of Scheduled vs. Unscheduled Meetings Between Principals and Teachers.

	Scheduled	Unscheduled	Total
High	(166.2) ^a 160	(33.7) 40	200
Low	(119.7) 126	(24.27) 18	144
Total	286	58	N = 344

$$\chi^2 = 3.3$$

$$p < .05$$

$$df = 1$$

^aNumbers in parentheses are expected frequencies.

Table 4.14.--Consideration Leader Behavior vs. Instrumental Communication as a Form of One-Way vs. Two-Way Communication Between Principals and Teachers.

	One-Way	Two-Way	Total
High	(80.2) ^a 59	(139.7) 161	220
Low	(50.7) 72	(88.2) 67	139
Total	131	228	N = 359

$$\chi^2 = 22.83$$

$$p > .05$$

$$df = 1$$

^aNumbers in parentheses are expected frequencies.

To summarize, the chi-square test indicated that there are no statistical differences between principals strongly pushing for production and information needed to do a job (i.e., curriculum objectives, district and school policies and goals of the school) as measured by individual vs. group meetings; and written vs. verbal messages. Most of the principals, whether or not they were perceived as strongly pushing for production used scheduled meetings. Principals perceived both ways also used two-way communication.

It was also the purpose of this analysis to determine if there was a statistical difference between consideration leader behavior and expressive communication, as measured by the aforementioned forms of communication. The chi-square test indicates that there were no statistically significant differences between principals who expressed rewards and praises as measured by individual vs. group meetings. Most of the principals in this study, who strongly and not so strongly developed mutual trust and respect with teachers were perceived as using individual meetings (Table 4.15).

However, the relationship between consideration leader behavior and written vs. verbal messages as forms of expressive communication was statistically significant. The statistical difference was created by those principals perceived as strongly developing mutual trust and respect and rapport with teachers, who used fewer written and more

Table 4.15.--Consideration Leader Behavior vs. Expressive Communication as Forms of Individual vs. Group Between Teachers and Principals.

	Individual	Group	Total
High	(121.6) ^a 124	(53.3) 51	175
Low	(81.3) 79	(35.6) 38	117
Total	203	89	N = 292
$\chi^2 = .371$			
$p < .05$			
$df = 1$			

^aNumber in parentheses are expected frequencies.

Table 4.16.--Consideration Leader Behavior vs. Expressive Communication as Forms of Written vs. Verbal Messages Between Principals and Teachers.

	Written	Verbal	Total
High	(13.2) ^a 9	(168.7) 173	182
Low	(7.72) 12	(98.2) 94	106
Total	21	267	N = 288
$\chi^2 = 3.97$			
$p < .05$			
$df = 1$			

^aNumbers in parentheses are expected frequencies.

verbal messages than expected, and from those principals perceived as not so strongly developing a rapport with teachers, who used more written and verbal messages than anticipated when giving praises and rewards (Table 4.16).

In contrast, consideration leader behavior and expressive communication via scheduled vs. unscheduled meetings and one-way vs. two-way communication were not statistically different. Principals perceived as strongly or not so strongly developing a rapport with teachers tended to be perceived as using unscheduled meetings (Table 4.17) and two-way communication (Table 4.18).

To summarize, the chi-square test indicated that there are no statistical differences between initiating structure leader behavior and instrumental communication as measured by individual vs. group meetings; and written vs. verbal messages. The majority of principals used group meetings and verbal messages when discussing district and school policies, goals of the school and curriculum objectives. Statistically significant was the finding that most principals perceived as strongly pushing for production, assigning task to teachers and defining their relationships with teachers; and those perceived as not so strongly pushing production both used scheduled meetings when discussing district and school policies, curriculum objectives and the goals of the school. Both those principals perceived as strongly and not so strongly pushing for production used two-way communication when discussing school and district

Table 4.17.--Consideration Leader Behavior vs. Expressive Communication as Forms of Scheduled vs. Unscheduled Meetings Between Principals and Teachers.

	Scheduled	Unscheduled	Total
High	(64.9) ^a 59	(133.06) 139	198
Low	(37.06) 43	(75.9) 70	113
Total	102	209	N = 311
$\chi^2 = 2.1$			
p < .05			
df = 1			

^aNumbers in parentheses are expected frequencies.

Table 4.18.--Consideration Leader Behavior vs. Expressive Communication as Forms of One-Way vs. Two-Way Communication Between Principals and Teachers.

	One-Way	Two-Way	Total
High	(57.6) ^a 53	(180.3) 185	238
Low	(30.3) 35	(94.6) 90	125
Total	88	275	N = 363
$\chi^2 = 1.44$			
p < .05			
df = 1			

^aNumbers in parentheses are expected frequencies.

policies, curriculum objectives and the like. This leader behavior crosstabulated with expressive communication (written vs. verbal messages; scheduled vs. unscheduled) revealed no statistical differences. Most principals perceived by teachers as either strongly or not so strongly pushing for production used verbal messages and unscheduled meetings when giving praise and rewards for their job efforts. The statistical difference between initiating structure leader behavior and expressive communication (i.e., individual vs. group meetings; and one-way vs. two-way communication) indicates that those principals perceived as strongly pushing for production used individual meetings, while principals perceived as not so strongly pushing for production used group meetings. Principals perceived as strongly pushing for production used two-way communication; likewise, those perceived as not so strongly pushing for production also used two-way communication when expressing praise and rewards to teachers.

In regard to consideration leader behavior, most principals perceived as strongly and not so strongly developing mutual trust and respect towards teachers used group meetings, verbal messages, and scheduled meetings when communicating information necessary for teachers to do their jobs. Those principals perceived as not so strongly developing mutual trust and respect toward teachers used one-way and two-way communication. On the other hand, consideration leader behavior crosstabulated with expressive

communication (i.e., written vs. verbal messages) indicated that principals perceived as strongly and not so strongly developing mutual respect and trust with teachers used verbal messages.

There were no statistical differences between principals strongly and not so strongly developing mutual trust and respect with teachers and expressing praise and acceptance to teachers (expressive communication) as measured by the various forms of communication. The analysis indicated that individual and unscheduled meetings, as well as two-way communication, are the forms principals tended to use in expressive communication and assessment of the leader behavior of principals and the various forms of communication used among teachers comprises the following section.

Initiating Structure Leader Behavior vs.
Instrumental and Expressive Communi-
cation Used by Teachers

This part of the analysis focuses on the relationship between initiating structure leader behavior and instrumental and expressive communication as measured by selected forms of communication (individual vs. group meetings; written vs. verbal messages; scheduled vs. unscheduled meetings; and one-way vs. two-way communication) among teachers. This information should provide some idea of how teachers communicate with each other based on the leader behavior and communication behavior of their principal.

The chi-square test revealed no statistically significant difference between principals who pushed for production, defined their relationship with teachers and assigned tasks; and information discussing district and school policies, the goals of the schools and curriculum objectives measured via individual vs. group meetings; written vs. verbal messages; and one-way vs. two-way communication dichotomies used among teachers. The majority of the teachers, irrespective of how strongly principals pushed for production, defined relationships and assigned task, used group meetings, verbal messages, and two-way communication when discussing curriculum objectives, the goals of the school district and school policies with each other. On the other hand, there is a statistically significant difference between initiating structure and instrumental communication measured on the scheduled vs. unscheduled meetings dichotomy. Those teachers who perceived their principals as strongly pushing for production used more scheduled and fewer unscheduled meetings than expected. Further, those teachers who perceived their principals as not so strongly pushing for production used fewer scheduled and more unscheduled meetings than expected when discussing the rules and regulations, school and district policies, and curriculum objectives.

The chi-square test revealed no statistically significant differences between initiating structure leader behavior and expressive communication as measured by all the

forms of communication used among teachers. The majority of the teachers, regardless of the perceived degree to which principals pushed for production, used individual meetings, verbal messages, unscheduled meetings, and two-way forms of communication when giving praise and reward for other teachers' efforts and making other teachers feel accepted and a part of the group.

Consideration Leader Behavior vs.
Instrumental and Expressive
Communication Used
by Teachers

In this section the analysis of the relationship between leader behavior and expressive communication used by teacher is discussed.

The cross tabulation of consideration leader behavior and instrumental communication as measured by individual vs. group meetings; written vs. verbal messages; scheduled vs. unscheduled meetings; and one-way vs. two-way communication dichotomies revealed no significant differences. The majority of the teachers irrespective of whether their principal strongly or not so strongly established mutual trust and respect with teachers used group meetings, verbal messages, both scheduled and unscheduled meetings, and two-way communication forms when discussing goals of the school, curriculum objectives and school district policies with each other.

The same leader behavior, crosstabulated with expressive communication among teachers as measured by the

selected forms of communication, showed that there were no statistically significant differences. The majority of teachers, who perceived their principal as strongly and not so strongly building mutual trust and respect with teachers, used individual meetings, verbal messages, unscheduled meetings and two-way communication as mediums for expressing praise and rewarding each other's efforts.

Summary

In this chapter the relationship between principals' leader behavior and communication behaviors was analysed using data obtained via a survey questionnaire which was administered to teachers in ten schools of a middle-sized urban school district. A correlation statistical technique was used to measure the strength and direction of relationships between leader behavior and the frequency of instrumental and expressive communication. The chi-square test was used to measure the association between the two types of leader behavior and the various forms of instrumental and expressive communication used between principals and teachers and among teachers. A final summarization, conclusions and recommendations are presented in Chapter V.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The purpose of this study was to determine whether or not principals' leader behaviors are related to the communication behaviors in schools. The nature of principals' and teachers' communication behaviors were assessed to determine whether they were related to principals' leader behavior. Specifically, five exploratory questions regarding the association between leader behavior and communication were examined. They were:

- #1. Do principals, who are perceived by teachers as demonstrating high Initiating Structure leader behavior, use more Instrumental communication than principals perceived by teachers as demonstrating low Initiating Structure?
- #2. Do principals, who are perceived by teachers as demonstrating high Initiating Structure leader behavior, use more Expressive communication than principals perceived by teachers as demonstrating low Initiating Structure?
- #3. Do principals, who are perceived by teachers as demonstrating high Consideration leader behavior, use more Instrumental communication than principals perceived by teachers as demonstrating low Consideration?
- #4. Do principals, who are perceived by teachers as demonstrating high Consideration leader behavior, use more Expressive communication than principals perceived by teachers as demonstrating low Consideration?

- #5. Is there a relationship between the perceived instrumental and expressive communication patterns of principals and the perceived instrumental and expressive communication patterns of teachers?

Data for the study were obtained from teachers in ten elementary schools in a middle sized, urban school district. The teachers were asked to complete two questionnaires, the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire, which was used to assess the perceived leader behaviors of principals, and Communication Behavior Questionnaire, which was used to measure the frequency of instrumental and expressive communication.

Two statistical techniques were used to answer the five exploratory questions. The Pearson product moment correlation was used to measure strength and direction of relationships between leader behavior and instrumental and expressive communication. The chi-square test was used to determine the relationship between leader behavior and the various forms of communication.

Conclusions

The analyses revealed the following:

1. Principals who are perceived as demonstrating high initiating structure used more instrumental communication than those demonstrating low initiating structure.
2. Principals who are perceived as demonstrating high initiating structure used more expressive

communication than those demonstrating low initiating structure.

3. Principals who are perceived by teachers as demonstrating high consideration, used more instrumental communication than those demonstrating low consideration.
4. Principals who are perceived as demonstrating high consideration, used more expressive communication than those demonstrating low consideration.
5. There was no significant relationship between the perceived instrumental and expressive communication of principals and the perceived instrumental and expressive communication patterns of teachers.
6. There was no statistically significant differences between initiating structure and instrumental communication as measured by individual vs. group meetings, and written vs. verbal messages. The majority of principals tended to use group meetings and verbal messages with instrumental communication.
7. Principals perceived as showing both high and low initiating structure used scheduled meetings and two-way communication.
8. Principals perceived as demonstrating high initiating structure used individual meetings and two-way communication. Those perceived as low initiating structure used group meetings and two-way communication.

9. Most principals tended to use verbal messages and unscheduled meetings when using expressive communication.
10. Principals perceived as demonstrating high consideration used two-way communication and principals perceived as low consideration used one-way communication.
11. Most principals, regardless of high or low consideration leader behavior tended to use group meetings, verbal messages and scheduled meetings.
12. There was a statistically significant difference between consideration and expressive communication as measured by verbal vs. written messages. Both high and low consideration used verbal messages.
13. There was no statistically significant difference between consideration leader behavior and expressive communication as measured by individual vs. group meetings; scheduled vs. unscheduled meetings; and one-way vs. two-way communication. Regardless of high or low consideration leader behavior principals tended to use individual and unscheduled meetings and two-way communication.

The next section is concerned with the relationship between perceived leader behavior of principals and the interaction among the teachers themselves. Generally stated, the question is whether certain types of teacher/teacher

interaction are related to certain types of principal leader behavior.

Regardless of the level of initiating structure leader behavior, the teachers in these ten schools tended to use group meetings, verbal messages and two-way communication among themselves when discussing curriculum objectives, rules and regulations of the school, school and district policies and administrative directives (instrumental communication). Those teachers who perceived their principals as both high and low on initiating structure used scheduled as opposed to unscheduled meetings. Teachers used individual meetings, verbal messages, unscheduled meetings and two-way forms of expressive communication (acceptance, rewards and praises of job efforts) among each other.

Teachers who perceived their principals as demonstrating consideration leader behavior, tended to use group meetings, verbal messages, both scheduled and unscheduled meetings and two-way forms of instrumental communication among themselves. However, when using expressive communication among each other, teachers tended to use individual meetings, verbal messages, unscheduled meetings and two-way communication as mediums of communication. In summary, the study did not detect any significant differences in type or quantity of teacher/teacher interaction despite perceived differences in leader behavior.

Discussion

The conceptual framework of this study was derived largely from the work of Parsons (1951, 1953) who maintains that every collectivity, organization or group, must address four functional problems or imperatives. Of these, two are instrumental activities: goal attainment and adaptations; and two are expressive activities: pattern maintenance and integration.

The instrumental activities of goal attainment and adaptation, serve two different functions. Goal attainment serves the function of coordinating activities so that the system moves toward attainment. Adaptation is obtaining the means necessary to reach system goals.

The expressive activities of pattern maintenance and integration also have distinctive functions. Pattern maintenance reconciles the norms and demands of participation in one social with the demands of another social system (i.e., the person as a system fitting into the organization system). It is maintaining a level of motivation sufficient for the performance of tasks necessary to achieve the stated goals. The fourth functional imperative, integration, addresses relationships between members of an organization. It establishes and maintains a level of solidarity and cohesion among individuals.

According to Parsons, every organization must cope with all four functional imperatives to maintain an adequate operation. Attention to only one imperative could

cause disequilibrium within the organization. A system moves toward dynamic equilibrium of the four functional imperatives over time.

Because initiating structure and consideration leader behavior and instrumental and expressive communication are conceptually synonymous with Parsons' four functional imperatives, it was not surprising to find a positive relationship between these two sets of variables (Table 4.1). Further, it is possible that the concepts of leadership and communication are so closely related that to question the existence of this relationship is unwarranted by mere virtue of their inherent form.

As the following illustration shows each statistical correlation between initiating structure and consideration leader behavior and instrumental and expressive communication was positive.

	Leader Behavior	
	Initiating Structure	Consideration
Communication		
Instrumental	+ .57	+ .42
Expressive	+ .47	+ .69

Each type of leader behavior prompted both types of communication behavior. This implies that no matter what type of leader behavior is used, some type of communication behavior will be necessary. In light of these consistent positive

relationships, one could conclude that leadership cannot exist without communication; they are synonymous concepts within this context. When principals project leader behavior it is through a type of communication behavior.

Several researchers support the notion of leadership and communication as being tautological. Thayer (1961) contends that "the administration (leadership) of any organization can be accomplished only through communication" (p. 3); Merrihue (1960) maintains that communication projects leadership, and Gerloff and Cummins (1977) view leadership as dependent on communication. However, "the stronger relationships between principals who push for production, assign tasks and defined their role with teachers; and the type of communication needed to do a job are worthy of recognition. This finding can be attributed to the fact that these types of leader behavior strongly motivate corresponding types of communication behaviors.

" This study also revealed a positive relationship between principals perceived as demonstrating high consideration and initiating structure leader behaviors and instrumental communication than principals perceived as low consideration and initiating structure. Yet, the findings also indicated a positive relationship between principals demonstrating low consideration and initiating structure and expressive communication. A collectivity or group requires both types of interactions, just as it calls for both types of leader behavior. Further, these findings not

only substantiate the notion that leader behavior is multi-dimensional, but also provide strong evidence that communication behaviors are multi-dimensional. Thus, Tannenbaum's (1966) assertion that leadership style influences communication style appears to be correct for the leaders themselves. However, there are indications from the analysis that the frequency of teachers' communication patterns are not consistent with principals' communication patterns. This disputes an earlier contention that principals' communication behaviors will be reflected in the communication behaviors of teachers (Chapter 1, p. 6). This exploratory hypothesis was derived from Halpin's (1950) conclusion that changes in the attitude of group members toward each other and group characteristics such as harmony, intimacy and procedural clarity are significantly associated with the leadership style of the leaders. Strongly pushing for production, assigning task and defining relationships with staff (teachers) combined with strongly developing mutual trust and respect and friendship with teachers are associated with favorable changes in group attitudes.

Since principals' leadership styles can affect the attitude, morale and climate of a school, the natural order of logic was to infer that teachers' communication behaviors would, likewise, be associated with principals' communication behaviors. While this study suggests that this is not the case, it must be left to future research to

determine the actual relationship between principal and teacher communication behaviors.

The various forms of communication as defined in this study appear to reflect the organizational structure of a school.

The forms of instrumental and expressive communication used between principals and teachers and among teachers were basically consistent. There are several reasons for this consistency. Given the nature of instrumental communication (information necessary to do a job) it is not unusual that it occurs most often in scheduled group meetings; this definitely is the standard procedure in public schools. On the other hand, the finding that instrumental communication is conveyed by verbal messages more often than written messages is surprising. Verbal messages are expected in staff meetings, but written messages are so frequently viewed as the appropriate medium for disseminating information (McCleary, 1968) pertaining to school rules and regulations, district goals and policies and curriculum objectives (instrumental communication).

Because initiating structure leader behavior denotes pushing for production and giving directives, the finding that two-way interaction was the most frequent form of instrumental communication used by principals demonstrating both high and low initiating structure leader behavior was unanticipated. Consideration, as the type leader behavior that establishes rapport, mutual trust, and friendship would

seem most likely to occur in two-way communication. Yet, the findings indicated that those principals perceived as demonstrating low consideration used one-way communication. Given the differences between the characteristics of these two leader behaviors it was ironic that both high and low initiating structure leader behavior were associated with two-way instrumental and expressive communication.

This brings us to the notion that leader behavior can be situational. As Fiedler (1967) contended, leadership is contingent upon nonleadership variables. He found that if relationships between the members and the leader are bad, tasks and the position of the leader not clearly established, then attention to interpersonal leadership or something close to consideration is critical. This suggests that while two-way communication may be natural or even more palatable, it is not always appropriate.

The findings regarding expressive communication are not far from predictable. Since expressive communication encompasses information giving praise and helping people integrate into a system, it was appropriate that this type of "semi-personal" communication would take place in unscheduled and individual meetings. These situations are conducive to spontaneous conversations and planned personal conferences held before and after school in the classrooms and corridors or in the principal's office.

Another characteristic of expressive communication is its two-way nature; thus it was expected that this type

of communication would be reciprocal. As it is frequently casual rather than planned, verbal messages instead of written messages seem likely and the study confirmed this expectation.

In summary, the findings of this study indicate that leadership and communication are indeed related and that there is a relationship between principals' leader behaviors and their communication behaviors. Further, not only is leader behavior multi-dimensional, but communication within the organization appears also to be multi-dimensional; according to Parsons (1951, 1953), the equilibrium of an organization can be maintained if both dimensions are functional. Lastly, Fiedler contends that leadership (and this researcher maintains that the same holds for communication) is situational. Thus, it is possible that much of principals' behavior leadership or communicative behaviors takes place in an interpersonal situation and thus may represent initiative action or reaction to communication from others.

Implications for Future Research

To begin, the Communication Behavior Questionnaire was developed by the researcher. While a test of internal consistency established the fact that this instrument is reliable, there is no doubt that more elaborate testing could be done to refine the instrument.

Secondly, the study sample for this population was limited to ten elementary schools. While this study provided some insights into the relationship between leadership and communication in elementary schools, it would be interesting to compare these findings to other elementary, junior high and secondary schools in different parts of the country./ Thirdly, as noted in Chapter IV it appears that those principals with the most and the least years of experience demonstrated both high initiating structure and consideration leader behavior, which is theoretically ideal. Given the complexity of urban schools, further research should compare leader behaviors between principals in urban, suburban, and rural schools, and according to the sex and race of principals. In this study, the Blacks who happened to be female were perceived as demonstrating high consideration and high initiating structure behavior.

Lastly, it would be worthwhile to compare the findings with student achievement scores and the morale of the teachers. Once this is done perhaps some conclusions about the impact of principals' leader and communication behavior on schools can be drawn.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bales, Robert. "In Conference" in Amitai Etzioni (Ed.), Readings on Modern Organizations. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 1969.
- Barnard, C. I. The Functions of the Executive. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1938.
- Becker, Gerald et al. Issues and Patterns in Elementary School Administration. Corvallis: Center University, 1970.
- Borg, Walter, and Gall, Meredith D. Educational Research: An Introduction. New York: David McKay Company, Inc., 1971.
- Bowers, David, and Seashore, Stanley. "Predicting Organizational Effectiveness with a Four-Factor Theory of Leadership." Administrative Science Quarterly 11, 1966.
- Brown, Alan. "Reactions to Leadership." Educational Administrative Quarterly 3, 1967.
- . "Research in Organizational Dynamics: Implications for School Administrators." The Journal of Educational Administration 5, 1967.
- Cartwright, Dorwin, and Zander, Alvin. Group Dynamics Research Theory. Evanston, Ill.: Row Peterson, 1953.
- Chesler, Mark; Schmuck, Richard; and Lippitt, Ronald. "The Principal's Role in Facilitating Innovation." Theory Into Practice, 1963.
- Crooke, Henry. "The Supervisor and Staff Morale." National Association of Secondary School Principal Bulletin.
- Downs, Cal, and Hazen, Michael D. "A Factor Analytic Study of Communication Satisfaction." Journal of Business Communication 14, 1977.

- Dror, Rachel Elboim. "The Management System in Education and Staff Relations: Part I." Journal of Educational Administration and History 4, 1972.
- Etzioni, A. A Comparative Analysis of Complex Organizations. New York: Free Press, 1961.
- Fiedler, Fred E. A Theory of Leadership Effectiveness. New York: McGraw Hill, 1967.
- Frederiksen, John R. "Models for Determining School Effectiveness." Presented at the American Education Research Association, April, 1980.
- Getzels, Jacob, and Guba, Egon. "Social Behavior and the Administrative Process." School Review 65, 1957.
- Gross, Neal, and Herriott, Robert. Staff Leadership in Public Schools: A Sociological Inquiry. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1965.
- Halpin, Andrew. Administrative Theory in Education. New York: Macmillan, 1967.
- _____. "The Leadership Behavior and Combat Performance of Airplane Commanders," in A. W. Halpin (Ed.), Administrative Theory in Education. New York: Macmillan, 1967.
- _____. "Studies in Aircrew Composition: III," in A. W. Halpin (Ed.), Administrative Theory in Education. New York: Macmillan, 1967.
- Halpin, Andrew, and Winer, James B. "The Leadership Behavior of the Airplane Commander," in A. W. Halpin (Ed.), Administrative Theory in Education. New York: Macmillan, 1967.
- Hearns, James. "Alienation: Another Administrative Agony," Contemporary Education 45 (2), Winter 1974.
- Helwig, Carl. "Organizational Climate and Frequency of Principal-Teacher Communication in Selected Ohio Elementary Schools."
- Hemphill, John K., and Coons, Alvin E. Leader Behavior Description. Columbus, Ohio: Personnel Research Board, the Ohio State University, 1950, in A. W. Halpin (Ed.), Administrative Theory in Education. New York: Macmillan, 1967.

- Hemphill, John K. et al. Administrative Performance and Personality. New York: Teachers College, Bureau of Publications, Columbia University, 1962.
- Hersey, P., and Blanchard, K. H. Management of Organizational Behavior: Utilizing Human Resources. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1972.
- Hoy, W. K., and Miskel, D. G. Educational Administration: Theory, Research, and Practice. New York: Random House, 1978.
- Kahn, Robert L. "The Prediction of Productivity." Journal of Social Issues 12, 1956.
- Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire - Manual. Copyright, 1957.
- Lindgren, H. C. Effective Leadership in Human Relations. New York: Hermitage House, 1954.
- Lowin, Aaron; Hrapchak, William J.; and Kavanagh, Michael J. "Consideration and Initiating Structure: An Experimental Investigation of Leadership Traits." Administrative Science Quarterly 14, 1964.
- Lucietto, Lena. "Speech Patterns of Administrators." Administrator's Notebook 18, 1970.
- McCleary, Lloyd. "Communications in Large Secondary Schools: A Nationwide Study of Practices and Problems." National Association of Secondary School Bulletin 52, 1968.
- Null, Eldon. "The Hierarchy of Personal Needs: Is Significance to School Principals." Peabody Journal of Education 47, 1970.
- Owen, Robert G. Organizational Behavior in Schools. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1970.
- Parsons, Talcott. The Social System. New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1951.
- Parsons, Talcott; Bales, Robert; and Shils, Edward. "Phase Movement in Relation to Motivation, Symbol Formation, and Role Structure." Working Papers in the Theory of Action. The Free Press of Glencoe, 1953.

- Simon, Herbert. Administrative Behavior. New York: Macmillan, 1976.
- Spain, Charles; Drummond, Harold; and Goodland, John I. Educational Leadership in the Elementary School. New York: Rinehart and Company, 1956.
- Stogdill, Ralph. Manual for the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire. Form XII. Columbus: Bureau of Business Research, Ohio State University, 1963.
- _____. "Personal Factors Associated with Leadership: A Survey of the Literature." Journal of Psychology, 1948, in R. G. Omen, (Ed.), Organizational Behavior in Schools. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1970.
- Tannenbaum, R.; Weschler, I. R.; and Massarik, F. Leadership and Organization: A Behavioral Science Approach. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1961.
- Thayer, Lee O. Administrative Communication. Homewood, Illinois: Richard D. Irwin, Inc., 1961.
- Valentine, Jerry; Tate, Bradford; Seagren, Alan; and Lammel, John. "Administrative Verbal Behavior: What You Say Does Make a Difference." National Association Secondary School Principal Bulletin 59, 1975.
- Washington, Roosevelt, and Watson, Hoyt. "Positive Teacher Morale--The Principal's Responsibility." NASSP Bulletin 60 (399), April 1976.
- Watkins, Foster. "An Inquiry Into the Principal-Staff Relationship." Journal of Educational Research 63, 1969.
- Woffard, J. C. "Factor Analysis of Managerial Behavior Variables." Journal of Applied Psychology 54, 1970.
- Woffard, Jerry; Gerloff, Edwin; and Cummins, Robert. Organizational Communication: The Keystone to Managerial Effectiveness. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1977.

APPENDIX

DIRECTIONS:

- READ each item carefully.
- THINK about how often the principal engages in the behavior described by the item.
- DECIDE whether he/she: 1. very frequently, 2. frequently, 3. seldom, 4. never acts as described by the item.
- If you answer very frequently, frequently, seldom, never, please indicate if the communication is (in): individual meeting, group meeting, written message, verbal message and whether or not the meeting or message is: scheduled, unscheduled and if the communication is: one-way (nonreciprocal), two-way (reciprocal). The principal communicates information to the teacher and does not allow the teacher to respond, two-way (reciprocal communication): The principal communicates information to teacher and allows teacher to respond)

If you answer never, go to the next item on the questionnaire.

	a.				b. Does the communication occur in:							
	very frequently	frequently	seldom	never	individual meeting	group meeting	written message	verbal message	scheduled	unscheduled	one-way	two-way
1. How often does your principal communicate about school policies?												
2. How often does your principal communicate the goals of the school?												
3. How often does your principal communicate about curriculum objectives?												
4. How often does your principal communicate about rules and regulations regarding your job?												
5. How often does your principal communicate information about your performance?												
6. How often does your principal listen and pay attention to you?												
7. How often does your principal praise your efforts?												
8. How often does your principal tell you that he/she trusts you?												
9. How often does your principal motivate and stimulate an enthusiasm for meeting education program goals?												
10. How often does your principal communicate about district policies?												
11. How often does your principal communicate administrative matters, i.e., finances, student population?												
12. How often does your principal communicate his/her expectations of your job?												
13. How often does your principal communicate the goals of the district?												
14. How often does your principal let you know that he/she is open to your ideas?												
15. How often does your principal communicate that he/she understands the problem you face doing your job?												
16. How often does your principal take care of conflicts appropriately?												
17. How often does your principal make you feel a vital part of the school?												
18. How often do teachers communicate about curriculum objectives?												
19. How often do teachers communicate the rules and regulations regarding your job?												
20. How often do other teachers praise your efforts?												
21. How often do teachers motivate and stimulate an enthusiasm for meeting educational program goals?												
22. How often do teachers make you feel you are a vital part of the school?												

MICHIGAN STATE UNIV. LIBRARIES



31293103814087