Andrews University Digital Commons @ Andrews University

Dissertations

Graduate Research

1993

Staff Satisfaction and Leadership Behavior of Theory X- and Theory Y-Oriented Principals in the Greater Chicago Public School System

Lynn Schiffer Gillman Andrews University

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.andrews.edu/dissertations

Part of the Education Commons, and the Gender and Sexuality Commons

Recommended Citation

Gillman, Lynn Schiffer, "Staff Satisfaction and Leadership Behavior of Theory X- and Theory Y-Oriented Principals in the Greater Chicago Public School System" (1993). *Dissertations*. 395. https://digitalcommons.andrews.edu/dissertations/395

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate Research at Digital Commons @ Andrews University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ Andrews University. For more information, please contact repository@andrews.edu.



Seek Knowledge. Affirm Faith. Change the World.

Thank you for your interest in the

Andrews University Digital Library of Dissertations and Theses.

Please honor the copyright of this document by not duplicating or distributing additional copies in any form without the author's express written permission. Thanks for your cooperation.

INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. Each original is also photographed in one exposure and is included in reduced form at the back of the book.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality $6^{\circ} \times 9^{\circ}$ black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

U·M·I

University Microfilms International A Beil & Howell Information Company 300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA 313/761-4700 800/521-0600

Order Number 9334298

Staff satisfaction and leadership behavior of Theory X- and Theory Y-oriented principals in the greater Chicago public school system

Gillman, Lynn Schiffer, Ed.D.

Andrews University, 1993

Copyright ©1993 by Gillman, Lynn Schiffer. All rights reserved.



Andrews University

School of Education

STAFF SATISFACTION AND LEADERSHIP BEHAVIOR OF THEORY X- AND THEORY Y-ORIENTED PRINCIPALS IN THE GREATER CHICAGO PUBLIC SCHOOL SYSTEM

A Dissertation

Presented in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Education

by Lynn Schiffer Gillman July 1993

© Copyright by Lynn Schiffer Gillman 1993 All Rights Reserved

STAFF SATISFACTION AND LEADERSHIP BEHAVIOR OF THEORY X- AND THEORY Y-ORIENTED PRINCIPALS IN THE GREATER CHICAGO PUBLIC SCHOOL SYSTEM

A dissertation presented in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree Doctor of Education

by

Lynn Schiffer Gillman

APPROVAL BY THE COMMITTEE: Chair: Dr. Edward Streeter Director, Graduate Programs Dean, School of Education Member Wilfred Futcher п. Member 30, 1993 External: Date appro

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF	TABLES	v
ACKNOV	WLEDGEMENTS	vi
Chapter		
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
	Statement of the Problem Purpose of the Study Significance of the Study Definition of Terms Limitations Organization of the Study	3 4 5 9 11 12
II.	REVIEW OF LITERATURE	13
	Basic Assumption Organizational Theory The Structure of Organization Leadership X and Y Theories Principal as Instructional Leader Female Administrators/Related Studies Summary	14 14 16 18 22 28 38 41
III.	METHODOLOGY	43
	Specific Procedures	43 45 48 48 49
IV.	PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA	51
	Descriptive Analysis Testing the Hypothesis	53

Hypotheses 9 and 10	60
V. SUMMARY, FINDINGS, DISCUSSION, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	65
Purpose	65 66 67 67 67 67 68 71
APPENDICES	
 A: Request for Principal's Approval and General Correspondence B: Instrumentation C: Lists of Raw Data 	74 79 97
BIBLIOGRAPHY	
VITA	106

_

LIST OF TABLES

1.	Survey Sampling by County	44
2.	Distribution of Principals	53
3.	Managerial Style	55
4.	Table of Sex by Theory	56
5.	Means: Hypotheses 1 to 3	58
6.	Analysis of Variance: Hypotheses 1 to 3	58
7.	Means: Hypotheses 4, 5, and 6	59
8.	Analysis of Variance: Hypotheses 4 to 6	60
9.	Means: Hypotheses 5, 7, and 8	62
10.	t-Test: Hypothesis 9	63
11.	t-Test: Hypothesis 10	63

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Many people have joined in the efforts to complete this study. I would like to thank Dr. Jimmy Kijai, Dr. Edward Streeter, Janelle McCoy, Dr. Wilfred Futcher, and Dr. Bernard Lall.

I would also like to thank the efforts put forth by busy principals and teachers to complete the instruments.

I would like to thank my parents for their countless hours of caring for my two children Seth and Sarah. And last, I am indebted to my companion Alan, who gave me the confidence and courage to finish when my energy had been depleted.

ABSTRACT

STAFF SATISFACTION AND LEADERSHIP BEHAVIOR OF THEORY X- AND THEORY Y-ORIENTED PRINCIPALS IN THE GREATER CHICAGO PUBLIC SCHOOL SYSTEM

by

Lynn Schiffer Gillman

Chair: Edward A. Streeter

ABSTRACT OF GRADUATE STUDENT RESEARCH

Dissertation

Andrews University

School of Education

Title: STAFF SATISFACTION AND LEADERSHIP BEHAVIOR OF THEORY X- AND THEORY Y-ORIENTED PRINCIPALS IN THE GREATER CHICAGO PUBLIC SCHOOL SYSTEM

Name of researcher: Lynn Schiffer Gillman Name and degree of faculty chair: Edward A. Streeter, Ed.D. Date completed: July 1993

Purpose

The purpose of this study was to examine any difference in the perceived staff satisfaction in both inner city and suburban elementary and secondary schools administrated by male or female Theory X- or Theory Yoriented principals. Further, it was intended to determine if there was any reliability to the notion that the staff would rather be administered by male Theory X- than female Theory Y-oriented principals, working on the assumption that staff would prefer working in a school that was administered by Theory Y-oriented principals rather than by Theory-X oriented principals. The perceived staff satisfaction was measured by the "Diagnostic Survey for Leadership Improvement" (DSLI) developed by Mullens (1975). The managerial philosophies of principals were identified by the utilization of the "Management Philosophy Scale" (MPS) developed by Jacoby and Terborg (1975).

The independent variables were female and male principals and the Theory X versus the Theory Y style. The dependent variable was satisfaction of the management style. For this study, however, the information about Theory X male principals was used only in a comparison situation with Theory Y female principals.

Population and Instrumentation

The population consisted of 150 schools that had at least one principal and a staff of at least 10 members. Schools were selected from the 1990 Directory of Greater Chicago Public Schools, located in the superintendent's office. There is a total of 363 schools to sample. An equal representation was selected randomly from inner city, suburban, elementary, and secondary schools. Also, an equal representation was sent out for male and female principals. Each envelope included 30 copies of the Diagnostic Survey for Leadership Improvement (DSLI), one copy of the Managerial Philosophy Scale (MPS), a brief description of the study, directions, and a return self-addressed stamped envelope. Fifty-six envelopes were returned and only one school was eliminated. The principal was clearly neither X- nor Y-oriented in leadership style.

Null Hypotheses, Methods of Analysis, and Conclusions

Ten null hypotheses were tested and conclusions were drawn. Three null hypotheses were rejected.

Based on the statistical analyses of this study, differences were found between gender and administrator's style. It appeared that females tend to demonstrate a "Y" management style more than males. There was also a significant difference in staff satisfaction between female X- and Y-oriented principals in both inner-city schools and suburban schools. There was no significant difference in staff satisfaction between elementary and secondary schools when led by a male or female, X- or Y-oriented principal. There was also no difference in satisfaction between a male and female in managing a school. However, there was a significant difference between staff satisfaction, X-management orientation, and a Y orientation. Staff satisfaction was significantly higher with a Y-oriented principal as opposed to an X-oriented principal whether or not the administrator was male or female.

In conclusion, staffs in elementary and secondary schools indicated a degree of dissatisfaction with the leadership of X-oriented principals. In general, it would seem that satisfaction was not related to the sex of the leadership or building level, only management orientation. The statistics did not reveal a significant difference in the satisfaction of female principals of suburban and inner-city schools. The satisfaction was highest with female Y principals in the inner-city schools.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

In general, society agrees that quality administration is necessary to have excellent schools. The designs and strategies that are formulated to create these conditions have been the subject of debate for years. The attempt to provide quality administration is a concept as old as civilization itself. At the heart of this dilemma is the idea of what makes a great administrator. What are the leadership qualities that move a staff, a body of students, or a community in a positive productive direction?

Bennis (1985) drew attention to the four competencies he found in highly successful leaders: attention through vision, meaning through communication, trust, and self-development. Examining schools in this context, it would appear that principals should have a clear understanding of the purpose of schools; should be able to communicate in such a way as to motivate teachers to utilize and to focus their energies toward teaching children; should behave in a manner that creates an atmosphere of trust; and should promote self-confidence by "recognizing strengths and compensating for weaknesses" (p. 59). An examination of managerial styles and the extent to which management types impact on the success of existing schools is discussed in this study.

The development of a leadership style could be a mechanism for achieving mutual organizational goals and satisfying needs. When an organization (the school) is healthy and its administrator (the principal) is functioning in an appropriate manner, it usually is the result of the administrator's attitude and assumptions toward human nature. McGregor (1960) pointed this out: Human behavior is seldom a direct response to objective reality, but is rather a response reflecting the individual's perception of that reality. A manager's beliefs about the nature of man and about cause-effect relationships in human behavior exert considerable influence over the actual behavior exhibited by that manager when directing the activities of others. McGregor (1960) developed two assumptions about the nature of man in the workplace. He utilized the expression of Theory X and Theory Y to identify these two concepts. These two diverse assumptions have influenced management thought during the last half of the 20th century. McGregor (1960) in formulating Theory X presents the conventional approach, in which three assumptions are held:

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

2. Because of this human characteristic of dislike of work, most people must be coerced, controlled, directed, or threatened with punishment to get them to put forth adequate effort toward the achievement of organizational objectives.

3. The average human being prefers to be directed, wishes to avoid responsibility, has relatively little ambition, wants security above all. (pp. 33, 34)

Jacoby and Terborg (1975) explained that:

In contrast Theory Y assumptions portray man as being self-activated, inner-controlled, ambitious, and desiring responsibility. Managers espousing this view of human nature judiciously apply rewards and sanctions, try to avoid unnecessary conflict, and accept the emotional and social aspects of the employee. (p. 17)

Knesevick (1969) stated that "leadership is influenced by the administrator's perception of those with whom he works" (p. 94).

People within the school structure must constantly interact with administrators based on their reactions to situations. This interaction and perceived satisfaction with the administrator's behavior was the focus of the study.

Statement of the Problem

People within the school structure must constantly interact with administrators based on their reactions to situations. This interaction between perceived staff satisfaction with the administrator's behavior and leadership abilities is the focus of the problem. Various questions presented in the area are:

1. Is the perceived staff satisfaction different in schools administered by either male or female Theory X- or Theory Y-oriented principals?

2. Is the perceived staff satisfaction different in schools administered by either male Theory X- or female Theory Y-oriented principals? 3. Is the perceived staff satisfaction different in inner city schools and suburban schools administered by female Theory X- or Theory Yoriented principals?

4. Is the perceived staff satisfaction different in elementary and secondary schools administered by female Theory X- or Theory Y-oriented principals?

5. Do staff prefer to work for a male Theory X-oriented principal rather than a female Theory Y-oriented principal?

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to examine any difference in the perceived staff satisfaction in both inner-city and suburban elementary and secondary schools administrated by male or female Theory X- or Theory Yoriented principals. Further, it was intended to determine if there was any reliability to the notion that the staff would rather be administered by male Theory X- than female Theory Y-oriented principals, working on the assumption that staff would prefer working in a school that was administered by Theory Y-oriented principals.

The perceived staff satisfaction was measured by the Diagnostic Survey for Leadership Improvement (DSLI) developed by Dr. David Mullens (1975). The managerial philosophies of principals was identified by the utilization of the "Management Philosophy Scale" (MPS) developed by Jacoby and Terborg (1975).

Significance of the Study

Likert (1967) pointed out the importance of integration and the dynamics between administrator and the school organization: "every aspect of a managerial system is related to every other part and interacts with it" (p. 123).

The success of a school is dependent upon the collective performance of all the staff. This direction or focus hinges on the setting and managerial philosophy that the principal exhibits. The school principal identifies and communicates a vision for the school, based on the style of leadership.

The task of the administrator is to manage and direct the motivation and achievement of the staff in order to attain goals and yet assume selfsatisfaction among the members of the organization.

The expectation of this study was to obtain information which delineated characteristics an administrator must exhibit to maintain a working team.

Edgar H. Schein (1975) contended:

The successful manager must be a good diagnostician and must value a spirit of inquiry. If the abilities and motives of the people under him are so variable, he must have the sensitivity and diagnostic ability to be able to sense and appreciate the differences. Managers and principals must be flexible and adapt their leadership styles. (p. 4)

Reilly (1980) stated, "Effective school research indicates that effective schools have effective leaders" (p. 40). Such school leaders are usually described as people who have high expectations for staff and students, are knowledgeable in their jobs, and set the tone for the school.

These behaviors are very typical of the Theory Y manager. If effective schools have effective managers and effective managers display Theory Y-type characteristics, why are there many Theory X managers leading schools, and why is there not an overwhelming staff satisfaction with Theory Y managers? The impact of this research lies in the question concerning the insight into integrating the personnel goals of the manager or principal and the congruence between the school's goals and meeting the needs of the staff members.

McGregor (1960) believed:

Every managerial act rests on assumptions, generalizations, and hypotheses--that is to say, on theory. Our assumptions are frequently implicit, sometimes quite unconscious, often conflicting: nevertheless, they determine our predictions that if we do A, B will occur... Proceeding without explicit examination of theoretical assumptions leads, at times, to remarkable inconsistencies in managerial behavior. (pp. 6-7)

Knowledge of this information should assist the principal in increasing the effectiveness of the school. Administration is a collection of information regarding the combination of human and material resources to accomplish objectives formulated by policies. This study contends that school improvement requires an educational leadership style for active engagement by students, teachers, and others who have a vital interest in the work of the school.

The humanistic tendencies superimposed on the process of administration clearly reflect a determined set of beliefs. The Theory X principal, while no longer desirable to be perceived as such, takes a narrow view of defining the teacher's job. Close supervision is used while continually updating tasks and objectives derived by the principal, not the teacher. The Theory X-oriented principal limits the channels for innovations in teaching strategies and lessens the amount of group judgment made.

The style of school supervision clearly divides the Theory X- and Theory Y-oriented manager. As Goldman (1983) indicated:

The Theory X supervisor relies on short, preferably unscheduled observations of teachers, as the primary purpose of these visits is what has sometimes been called "snoopervision"--to check up on the teacher and to demonstrate that an authoritarian might be watching at any moment. (p. 306)

The issue with an observation such as this indicates the administrator's direction of growth for the teacher. The emphasis leads toward deficiencies of the instructor, not the positive teaching strategies that are present. Goldman (1983) noted that the major reason for evaluating teachers is to detect poor performance, and by extension, to dismiss undesirables from the organization. In reality, the Theory X evaluator is an administrative fault-finder.

The advocacy of Theory X is also reflected in teacher recruitment. Theory X principals employ teachers who show minimal motivation, fair to standard competence, and closely resemble one another. Another reflection of the Theory X orientation is the realm of staff development. The manner of staff development in a Theory X-oriented situation benefits only the organization. For example, inservice for teachers to understand the implementation of a new curriculum is often planned so that teachers will learn about something that will profit the principal's objectives. Theory Xoriented principals display unilateral decision making. Committee chairpersons and teams are not generated within the organization or school. Fortney and Raines (1979) stated, "Unless back-to-basic movement results in a move toward rigid standards of procedure and activities in the classroom, Theory X will continue to be out-of-step in most schools" (p. 19).

Morton (1975) indicated that "It is clear that McGregor considered Theory Y implementation to be synonymous with creating a climate that arouses man's better nature and causes him to identify with the employing organization and its goals" (p. 25).

Allen (1973) stated, "McGregor revived Rousseau's idea that people are essentially good, but their institutions make them bad and that he emphasized the need to integrate individual and organizational objectives and to help people feel an emotional ownership in their work" (p. 168).

Theory Y identifies with Participative Management. Maslow (1964) described Theory Y as "an example of high synergy" in which "people within the organization are coordinated with each other and work as colleagues and teammates rather than as rivals" (p. 161).

Goldman (1983) stated, "The supervisor who believes in Theory Y values a participatory management system because of the assumed consensus and commitment on the part of teachers in order to achieve organizational goals" (p. 307). The supervisor or principal becomes a facilitator in the role of clinical supervision, not evaluation. The teacher provides the multiple criteria for observation, and personal goal setting takes place.

In the area of staff development, the Theory Y-oriented principal expects expanded responsibilities from the team, guides personal professional growth in jointly agreed areas, and sets complex goals which

move the entire school toward a central focus. Theory Y-oriented principals hire teachers who will move toward self-actualization.

Chung (1970) stated:

A high teacher-centered leadership style will reduce the incompatibility between the social and psychological needs of teachers and the bureaucratic characteristics present in educational management. Teacher-centered leadership is characterized by teacher participation in decision making, little administrative routine work assigned to teachers, less close supervision, high support for professional growth, and open, personal relationships. (p. 4)

The significance of this study was to provide an understanding of the enormous impact Theory X- and Theory Y-oriented principals have on evaluation, staff development, teacher recruitment, and climate in a school.

Definition of Terms

<u>Clinical Supervision</u>: Teachers are provided with training to acquaint them with teaching skills based on research on effective teaching.

<u>Effective School</u>: One in which essentially all of the students acquire the basic skills and other desired behavior within the school.

<u>Elementary Schools</u>: In this study, only schools with grades 1

through 5 or 6 are included.

Empowerment: An essential component in organizational leadership style that pulls rather than pushes; a strategy that attracts and energizes.

<u>Formal Leadership</u>: People officially designed by the organization as having responsibility for the actions of others. Leadership Quality: Direction, course, action, or opinions by one who is vision-oriented.

<u>Manager</u>: One who brings about, accomplishes, has charge of, or is responsible for the conduct of others.

<u>Managerial Philosophy</u>: The behavioral tendency of an individual identified by the Managerial Philosophies Scale as either predominantly Theory X or Theory Y.

<u>Organization</u>: A social entity consisting of a group of united persons having specific goals and objectives.

<u>Participatory Management</u>: Through cooperative processes, groups of individuals share achievements, visions, and responsibilities.

<u>Perceived Satisfaction</u>: An attitude concerning the state of leadership as reflected by intensity scores. Intensity scores range from 0 to 15. As scores move away from one, satisfaction increases.

<u>Power</u>: The basic energy to initiate and sustain action translating intention into reality.

<u>School Climate</u>: The concern for safety and order, care of facility, and academic rewards for positive behavior.

Secondary Schools: Institutions with grades 7 through 12.

<u>Staff Development</u>: Any activity or process intended to improve skills, attitudes, understanding, or performance in present or future roles.

<u>Teacher</u>: A certificated person assigned to a school, subordinate to the principal and, in this study, at times referred to as a staff member.

Theory X Managerial Philosophy: A human philosophy characterized by a view which considers individuals as having a dislike for work; as needing coercion, control, and threats of punishment to get them to put forth effort; and as wishing to avoid responsibility, having little ambition, and wanting security above all.

<u>Theory Y Managerial Philosophy</u>: A human philosophy characterized by a view which considers individuals to find work as natural; considers them to exercise self-control in the service of objectives to which they are committed; considers individual's most important rewards to be self-respect and personal improvement; considers the average person to seek responsibility and to exercise imagination, ingenuity, and creativity.

<u>Theory X Principals</u>: Principals whose score on the MPS more closely resembles the Theory X profile than the Theory Y profile.

<u>Theory Y Principals</u>: Principals whose score on the MPS more closely resembles the Theory Y profile than the Theory X profile.

Limitations

The limitations of this study were as follows:

1. All subjects were from one region of the country.

2. Age, race, and years of experience were not considered within the random selection, only sex of the principals and the level of the institution.

3. The Theory X and Theory Y orientation was decided by the Managerial Philosophies Scale and does not take into account the complexity of human nature.

4. The satisfaction with the leadership style was analyzed only by the Diagnostic Survey for Leadership Improvement which does not take into account other social or emotional factors.

Organization of the Study

There are five chapters in this study.

Chapter 1 deals with the following areas: statement of the problem, significance of the study, purpose, hypotheses, delimitations, definition of terms, and the organization of the study.

Chapter 2 presents the review of literature. This review of literature includes a theoretical background, organizational theory, leadership styles, the role of female administration, and related administrative studies.

Chapter 3 outlines the type of research, the population, the method of gathering the data, the questionnaires, and the treatment of the data.

Chapter 4 presents the analysis of the data, and chapter 5 concludes the study by summarizing the findings. Recommendations for further research are also presented.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

This chapter reviews the literature as it relates to a theoretical

background of administration including topics such as female

administration, leadership qualities, and other related topics.

One way to study leadership is to examine what a leader does. In his definition of leadership, Knesevick (1969) placed an emphasis on the leaders' actions related to the goals of the organization:

Leadership is, in essence, concerned with human energy in organized groups. It is a people phenomenon. It is a force that can initiate action among people, guide activities in a given direction, maintain such activities, and unify efforts toward common goals. Leadership is of prime importance to administrators because people are a part of all organizations. It demands understanding of fellow workers and their interrelationships to accomplish the objectives of the organization. (p. 81)

Knesevick (1969) asserted that a leader is a person who has something to contribute to the effective functioning of a group. Group needs or demands determine leadership functions. Criteria for leadership are based on what the leader does to help the group establish goals, reach objectives, and maintain solidarity.

This review of literature involved the survey of subordinates'

(teachers) perceived satisfaction with leadership, specifically Theory X and Theory Y in selected organizational processes. The writer has attempted to determine the relationship, if any, between perceived satisfaction with leadership behavior and the way the leader perceives the nature of man in an organizational setting.

Basic Assumption

The basic assumption a person holds regarding human nature determines the administrative style.

McGregor (1960) stated:

The human side of enterprise is "all of a piece"--that the theoretical assumptions management holds about controlling its human resources determine the whole character of the enterprise. They determine also the quality of its successive generations of management. (p. vii)

The assumptions that administrators hold about the human nature of their staff also determine the effectiveness of the school. Based on these assumptions, a review of organizational theory is presented including aspects of classical and motivational theory and McGregor's Theory X and Theory Y and their relationship to school administration.

Organizational Theory

Taylor (1947) pointed out that "the principal objects of management should be to secure the maximum prosperity for the employee, coupled with the maximum prosperity for each employer" (p. 9). Taylor (1947) believed that in scientific management a true common focus of employees and employer was the best approach. Taylor stated that "the initiative of the workman is obtained with absolute uniformity and to a greater extent than is possible under the old system" (p. 36). Taylor (1947) defined management "as knowing exactly what you

want men to do, and then seeing that they do it in the best and cheapest

way." Taylor (1947) believed that a workman should "be called upon to turn

out a maximum amount of work and that each man should be paid 30% -

100% beyond the average class" (p. 29).

Taylor's philosophy of management states that:

With initiative and incentive, each workman is called upon to use his own best judgment so as to do the work in the quickest time, and from this results in all cases a large variety in the shapes and types of implements which are used for specific purpose. (p. 118)

Theory X and Theory Y orientation evolved from two different

conceptual frameworks. The Theory X management evolved from a

classical theory of management.

McGregor (1960) stated:

The carrot and stick theory of management which goes along with Theory X works reasonably well under certain circumstances. The means for satisfying men's physiological and (within limits) safety needs can be provided or withheld by management. Man tends to live for bread alone when there is little bread. (p. 21)

Taylor (1947) also believed "The best management is a true science,

resting upon clearly defined laws, rules, and principles, as a foundation"

(p. 7).

Taylor (1947) concluded:

Under scientific management the initiative of the workmen is obtained with absolute uniformity and to a greater extent than is possible under the old system; and in addition to this improvement on the part of men, the managers assume new burdens, new duties, and responsibilities never dreamed of in the past. The managers assume the burdens of gathering together all of the traditional knowledge which in the past has been possessed by the workmen. (p. 36) The foundations of Theory X become relevant when examining Maslow's (1964) Hierarchy of Human Needs. Paul Mort (1946) developed a theory of common sense in administration. His two main aspects were strong links in developing Theory X and Theory Y. "Most believed in getting the most out of the control placed by laws close to the people and exercising this control as close as possible to those affected" (p. 116). Mort did believe in promoting the vision of education through the teachers; however, his strategies were bureaucratic, not participative in nature. Weber (1947) indicated that there were three types of legitimate authority in economic organizations--rational, traditional, and charismatic grounds. The following principles of bureaucracy developed:

1. The tendency to "levelling" in the interest of the broadest possible basis of recruitment in terms of technical competence

2. The dominance of a spirit of formalistic impersonality, without hatred or passion and hence without affection or enthusiasm (p. 29).

The Structure of Organization

Barnard (1951) examined the theory of management. Two elements of management were discussed--formal and informal organization. Barnard believed that informal organization was a separate type structure that was present alongside the formal structure. This formal organization was a predecessor of a Theory X orientation. One key issue was that all people in the organization did not need to understand the total concept. With specialization, the individual and the subgroup must know and accept

the immediate purpose which they must attain, but they need not know or understand the total situation (p. 137).

Closely associated to Theory X and Theory Y orientation is Ouchi's (1981b) Theory Z. This concept of management is implicit rather than explicit, dependent upon a common culture shared by key managers, and to <u>some</u> extent by all workers. It involves the feelings of the firm towards customers, employees, local communities, and competitors. Building these concepts and believing assumptions takes a long period of time. This was the theory Ouchi used in development of his Theory Z. The two main ideas were:

1. A broad concern for employee welfare as a natural part of a working relationship

2. A holistic approach to management which tended to offset segmentation and a hierarchial attitude.

These concepts of organization, however, did not rely entirely on the goal orientation of each employee.

"A motivation theory that is based on goals, or ultimate needs rather than on 'existing drives,' will not need so heavy an emphasis on the situation or environment," stated Maslow (1964, pp. 28-29). Herzberg (1959) developed a "study of the sources of job satisfaction and dissatisfaction among managerial and professional people suggesting that these opportunities for self-actualization are the essential requirements of both job satisfaction and high performance" (pp. 114-115).

The early stages of Theory Y were coined as the human relations approach. From this premise, McGregor (1960) developed the idea that all

members of an organization could achieve their own goals best by "directing their efforts towards the success of enterprise" (p. 49). The integration of the individual and an organization should be evident.

Getzel (1957) viewed administration as a social process:

When an administrator and a consultant agreed on the expectations, they tended to rate the actual consultation favorable; when they disagreed, unfavorable. The success or failure was apparently independent of the specific character either of the expectations or of the manifest behavior provided that the participants' perception of the expectations, whatever their character, overlapped. (p. 160)

Daniel Griffiths (1988) looked at administration as the "dynamic of human activity, not the mechanics of organization" (p. 120). Two key words, perceived and perceptions, were expressed by Griffiths to indicate the theory of administration.

Herzberg (1966) talked about two different employees as hygiene seekers and motivation seekers. The motivation seekers were employees channeled down an effective path by the manager or administrator. This basic Theory Y assumption indicated that people were not lazy, they trusted their employer, and they engaged in collaboration within the organization.

Conceptually, Bennis (1985) described Theory Y-orientation people as those who naturally wanted to work. It was not a fixed point of view, however; it was a belief in an individual's need to grow. This in turn created a task commitment that led to effectiveness.

Leadership

The basis of McGregor's (1960) research evolved from the question "Are successful managers born or made?" (p. 179). The answer he was seeking centered around two facets--Were there certain characteristics a person might acquire to become successful, or did certain persons possess these abilities innately? If these qualities could be modeled, why would not promising leaders want to emulate the characteristics? An important finding in his research indicated that leadership was not the property of the individual, but rather a complex blending of qualities.

Bennis (1985) described the leadership environment under three major contents: "commitment, complexity, and credibility" (p. 6). A major survey indicated that commitment in the 1980s was a troubling statistic. These were the results: "Fewer than one out of four jobholders said that they were currently working at full potential. One-half said they did not put effort into their job over and above what was required to hold it" (Yankelovich, 1983, pp. 6-7).

"Even more troubling was the possibility that the tendency to withhold effort from the job might be increasing" (Bennis, 1985, p. 7).

Drucker (1966) stated that effectiveness was the job of the executive.

His concept of the "effective executive" is portrayed in five major practices:

- 1. Effective executives know where their time goes. They work systematically at managing the little of their time that can be brought under their control.
- 2. Effective executives gear their efforts to results rather than to work. They start out with the question, "What results are expected of me?" rather than with the work to be done, let alone with its techniques and tools.
- 3. Effective executives build on strengths--their own strengths, the strengths of their superiors, colleagues, and subordinates; and on the strengths in the situation, that is on what they can do. They do not build on weakness. They do not start out with the things they cannot do.

- 4. Effective executives concentrate on the few major areas where superior performance will produce outstanding results. They force themselves to set priorities and stay with their priority decisions. They know that they have no choice but to do first things first--and second things not at all. The alternative is to get nothing done.
- 5. Effective executives, finally, make effective decisions. (Drucker, 1966, p. 20)

"Effective executives know where their time went. They worked" (Drucker, 1966, pp. 20-24).

Bennis (1985) categorized the art of leadership into four major areas of competency. These four areas were: "attention through vision, meaning through communication, trust through positioning, and deployment of self through self-regard" (pp. 26-27). In light of education and administration, the deployment of self through positive self-regard becomes vitally important. Bennis stated, "The leaders in our studies seemed to retain many of the positive characteristics of the child: enthusiasm for people, spontaneity, imagination, and an unlimited capacity to learn new behavior" (p. 60). After Bennis conducted a study of 90 top managers, five skills emerged:

- 1. The ability to accept people as they are, not as one would like them to be.
- 2. The capacity to approach relationships and problems in terms of the present rather than the past.
- 3. The ability to treat those who are close with the same courteous attention that one extends to casual acquaintances.
- 4. The ability to trust others, even if the risk seems great.
- 5. The ability to do without constant approval and recognition from others. It should not really matter how many people like leaders. The important thing is the quality of work that results from collaborating with them. (pp. 65-68)

Bennis promoted the concept that empowerment was the key to a successful <u>leadership style</u>. "The essential thing in organizational leadership is that leaders' style pull rather than push people on."

Peters and Austin (1985) recognized:

The concept of leadership is crucial to the revolution now underway--so crucial that we believe the words "managing" and "management" should be disregarded. "Management," with its attendant images--cop, referee, devil's advocate, dispassionate analyst, pronouncer--connotes controlling and arranging and demeaning. Leadership connotes unleashing energy, building, freeing, and growing. (p. xix)

Peters and Austin looked at the solutions of modern management. They focused on this aspect of leadership and used such terms as "cheerleader, coach, facilitator, and builder" (1985, p. 165) to define the term "leader."

The term "coaching," if related to clinical supervision, was nurturing. "It's demanding that the team play as a team. If focusing on a new skill is important, then do it for the team success" (p. 336).

Hersey and Blanchard (1970) concurred:

The importance of a leader's diagnostic ability cannot be overemphasized. In other words, managers must be able to identify clues in an environment. A leader must demonstrate flexibility and various skills. Lastly, if needs are differentiated between other employees, they must then be treated differently. (p. 307)

Hersey and Blanchard (1970) developed two different leadership scales: Task Behavior Dimensions and Behavior-Relationship Dimensions. Once a style was delineated, the leader could be described by one of the following styles: leader-made decisions, leader-made decisions with dialogue and explanation, leader/follower-made decisions with encouragement from leader, and lastly, follower-made decisions. "The latter two are closely related to a Theory Y orientation."

X and Y Theories

McGregor (1960) was one of several theorists who challenged the relevance of the traditional classical organization of management. McGregor described two differing management styles that examined a manager's assumptions about people. After examining various approaches to managing people and organizations, McGregor concluded that the styles or approaches to management could be examined and understood in the light of a manager's assumptions about people.

Theory X (the traditional view of management) was based on the following set of assumptions:

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

2. Because of this human characteristic of dislike of work, most people must be coerced, controlled, directed, or threatened with punishment to get them to put forth adequate effort toward the advancement of organizational objectives.

 The average human being prefers to be directed, wishes to avoid responsibility, has relatively little ambition, and wants security above all.

McGregor (1960) contended that while these assumptions are rarely openly stated by managers, they become apparent to one who examines how

organizations are structured and how policies, procedures, and work rules are established:

Theory X is not a straw man for purposes of demolition but is in fact a theory which materially influences managerial strategy.... Moreover, the principles of organization which comprise the bulk of the literature of management could only have been derived from assumptions such as those of Theory X.... Theory X provides an explanation of some human behavior in industry. These assumptions would not have persisted if there were not a considerable body of evidence to support them. (p. 35)

McGregor (1960) further contended that a tough or soft approach to managing may be used by those embracing Theory X. One Theory X manager may drive his employees at work because he thinks they are lazy and this is the only way to get things accomplished. Another may look at employees in the same way but feels the way to get lazy ones to work is to be nice and coax productivity out of them.

The administrator subscribing to Theory X will design rigid organizational patterns and controls based on imposed authority (institutionalized authority along the lines of Max Weber's bureaucratic model). He will employ careful supervision, give detailed instructions, insist on complete compliance, and will use threats of firings or economic harm to motivate the recalcitrants.

Theory Y (management by integration and self-control) suggests that greater flexibility be built into organizational structure and modes of leadership and control so that greater individual freedom and imagination can be exercised by workers. This alternative requires a different set of management assumptions which McGregor (1960) labeled Theory Y:

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

- 3. Commitment to objectives is dependent on rewards associated with their achievement. The most important rewards are those that satisfy needs for self-respect and personal involvement.
- 4. The average human being learns, under proper conditions, not only to accept but also to seek responsibility.
- 5. The capacity to exercise a relatively high degree of imagination, ingenuity, and creativity in the solution of organizational problems is widely, not narrowly, distributed in the population.
- 6. Under the conditions of modern industrial life, the intellectual potentialities of the average human being are only partially utilized. (pp. 47-48)

The only limits placed on the manager holding Theory Y assumptions were those of the manager's ingenuity. Basically the Theory Y assumptions were consistent with the higher level needs as set forth by Maslow. McGregor (1960) identified integration of the individual into the

organization as the single most important key to motivation (p. 49).

The Theory Y manager in McGregor's scheme was not completely worker-oriented at the expense of the organization. He set high goals and objectives but tried to enlist support and help in attaining the goals by tapping into the worker's higher level needs. One of the keys to high performance which McGregor submitted was a "commitment" to achieving goals. The Theory Y manager achieved organizational commitment by integrating individual higher level needs and organizational goal achievement.

Perfect integration of organizational requirements and individual goals and needs is, of course, not a realistic objective. In adopting this principle, we seek that degree of integration in which the individual can achieve his goal best by directing his efforts toward the success of the organization. (Morphet, Roe, & Reller, 1982, p. 55)

Proper motivation in management increases workers' potentials and allows employees to engage in meaningful, creative work. When this occurs, workers become self-directing and channel their efforts toward the achievement of organizational goals. Theory Y assumptions do not deny the importance of extrinsic rewards but do emphasize people's inherent potential for growth and development. Intrinsic rewards stem from the requirements of the job itself. They allow for feelings of achievement, autonomy, self-respect, and self-fulfillment and are believed to be more powerful motivators than extrinsic rewards.

Managerial practices based on Theory Y philosophy emphasize selfcontrol and autonomy. Managers operating under this philosophy are not necessarily soft. They design positions that have higher standards.

If the executive of an organization assumes that Theory X describes the nature of most of the workers in his/her organization and if the majority of the workers are more like Theory Y, destructive conflict will surely arise and the executive cannot be a leader in that organization. (Morphet, et al., 1982, p. 112)

Consequently, according to McGregor's (1960) theory, managers make one of two kinds of assumptions about people within an organization. The theory implies that school principals can be divided into two groups (i.e., those who subscribe to Theory X and those who subscribe to Theory Y). An important question is: "How is the perceived satisfaction of a school staff related to the way in which the principal views the nature of man in an organizational setting?" If principals do not differ significantly from teachers under Theory Y principals in their perceptions of leadership interaction patterns, then the natures and behavior patterns of the principals do not influence teachers' points of view. Therefore, whether the principal was a Theory X or Theory Y leader would not affect organizational efficiency and effectiveness since both behavior tendencies evoked essentially the same reactions from teachers. If, on the contrary, teachers working under Theory X principals perceive leadership patterns as significantly different from those teachers under Theory Y principals, then the natures and behavior tendencies of the principals do influence teachers' points of view. A significant question is: "How does the nature and behavior patterns of the principal affect the health or satisfaction level of the school organization?"

Obviously, Theory Y philosophy is in sharp contrast to the Theory X assessment. Theory X views people as being mechanistic while Theory Y portrays people as self-activating, inner-controlled, and desiring responsibility. Theory Y assumptions do not deny the importance of extrinsic rewards but do emphasize people's inherent potential for growth and development. (Jacoby & Terborg, 1975, p. 3)

In the work setting, Theory X philosophy promotes hard workers through punishment and extrinsic rewards, such as food, safety, money, and fringe benefits. These controlled organizational decisions are used to manipulate employees, not to increase self-esteem.

In contrast to this concept, employees working under a Theory Y manager are encouraged to test their abilities and imaginations of their own positions (Jacoby & Terborg, 1975). Theory Y makes managers responsible for harnessing talent to benefit the organization. McGregor (1960) said the satisfaction of ego and self-actualization

needs can be direct products of efforts directed toward organizational

objectives. He felt that management could create a climate of

"participative" management by:

- 1. discouraging the satisfaction that comes from tackling problems and finding successful solutions.
- 2. feeling a greater sense of independence and of achieving some control over one's destiny.
- 3. receiving satisfactions that come by way of recognition from peers and superiors for having made a worthwhile contribution to the solution of an organizational problem. (p. 47)

"Theory Y's definition should be clarified to mean the utilization of

man's higher level motivations to reach organizational objectives

regardless of prevailing synergism levels" (Morton, 1975, p. 25).

The idea was to arouse man's better person. Maslow (1964), whose

description of hierarchial needs provided McGregor's basis for Theory Y,

believed that Theory Y is an example of high synergy, in which people

within the organization are coordinates with each other and they develop

into colleagues and teammates rather than into rivals.

Given the rapidly changing world with its ever-fluid and technological developments, the evolving needs of young teachers for more autonomy and the efforts of teachers to pattern instruction to fit the continuously shifting interests and abilities of students, the participatory or Theory Y approach may be more appropriate. (Fortney & Raines, 1979, p. 19)

Theory X will continue to be an out-of-step management system for most schools.

Principal as Instructional Leader

In each profession, the professional is concerned with the most effective use of knowledge in the achievement of specified objectives. This body of knowledge surrounding the managerial styles aids principals above and beyond their personal experience and observation. One of the attributes concerning an effective principal is the ability to lead teachers in the instructional process. This display of management is central to the task of management. In school environments, concerns about levels of staff satisfaction or productivity are legitimate. Efforts to improve either satisfaction or productivity are impacted by climate and the approach of management styles.

DeBevoise (1984) stated, "We broadly interpret the concept of instructional leadership to encompass those actions that a principal takes or delegates to others, to promote growth in student learning" (p. 39).

The studies reviewed in this section focus on the role of the principal as a leader and the impact of this role in creating an effective school.

Blumberg and Greenfield (1980) conducted studies in effective principalship. Their in-depth case studies included eight effective principals--male-female and elementary-secondary. Their analysis revealed the following characteristics that were found in each principal:

1. A propensity to set clear goals and to have these goals serve as continuous sources of motivation

2. A high degree of self-confidence and openness to others

3. A tolerance for ambiguity

4. A tendency to test the limits of interpersonal and organizational

systems

- 5. A sensitivity to the dynamics of power
- 6. An analytical perspective
- 7. The ability to be in charge of their jobs.

The importance of this study lies in the fact that each principal's style was different; however, the strategies within the style remained the same.

Principals in quality elementary schools exhibit strong effective leadership skills, they inspire those around them to become immersed in the school's mission and dedicated to its attainment. Through their attitudes and conduct, they demonstrate the values and beliefs that are at the core of the school's operations and expectations. (NAESP, 1984)

The Association of Elementary Principals determined that leadership should be shared. Principals of quality schools encourage leadership on the part of others--students, teachers, staff, and involved parents--in order to accomplish the school's mission.

Another study evaluating 31 principals conducted by the Florida State Department reinforced Blumberg's and Greenfield's findings. The study concluded that "all 31 principals use a participatory style" (DeBevoise, 1984, pp. 15-20).

The University of Texas conducted a 5-year study of leadership skills in elementary and secondary schools. The findings mirrored the research of Blumberg and Greenfield (1980), Theodore Sizer, and the Florida State Department. Two areas were discussed in great detail that were not mentioned in the previous study. Leaders continuously monitor progress. The more effective principals provide not only specific details about the performance of their teachers but insights into why the teachers performed as they did. Secondly, effective principals intervene in a supportive or corrective manner. These principals look for positive features and then directly and sincerely recognize and praise teachers that are responsible.

In 1982, Edmonds said of the effective school: "It need not bring all students to identical levels of mastery, but it must bring an equal percentage of its highest and lowest social class to minimum mastery" (p. 4). The effective school's level has become a model by which schools circulate their successes and failures. The essence of the model is continuous improvement. The definition of an effective school is one in which all the students learn the intended curriculum.

Additionally, Cuban (1984) indicated that studies of effective schools stressed the pivotal role of the principal as being the most important. The words usually used were a strong administrative presence, an active style of management, and empirically derived principal behavior. This correlation tied in ideally with the massive amounts of research in management. Bennis (1985) stated: "The new leader is one who commits people to action, who converts followers into leaders, and who may convert leaders into agents of change" (p. 3). This is "transformative" leadership. Bennis and Manus (1985) stated that "Managers are people who do things right and leaders are people who do the right things" (p. 21). Bennis and Manus (1985) contributed beneficial new information from their research. They stated that:

- 1. Leadership is not a rare skill.
- 2. Leaders are not born, they are made.

31

3. Leaders are not charismatic.

4. Leaders do not exist only at the top of an organization.

5. Leaders do not control, direct, prod, or manipulate.

Sometimes, this concept is new to principals.

Bennis and Manus (1985) developed four major themes after they observed managers. All 90 leaders displayed the following strategies:

1. Attention through vision--an intense agenda that pulls people into the mainstream

2. Meaning through communication--all people who effect or are effected by a decision have a say in the decision

3. Trust through positioning--an indication of accountability and reliability that creates a cohesive organization

4. Development of self through positive self-regard--incorporates the identification of strengths and weaknesses and the nurturing of specific skills.

Effective schools not only need leaders, they also need masters of curriculum and masters of instruction. Because many burdens and responsibilities fall to the instruction leader, the majority of the leadership literature dealt with the principal's role as instructional leader.

Studies concerning the principal's role were numerous. The principal was the middleman in education. The perception was of students, teachers, and parents being the subordinates and the central office, assistants, and superintendents being the superordinates. This leaves the principal sandwiched in between two very important audiences.

Barth (1981) stated:

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

The bottom line of effective principalship is their personal characteristics and their instructional skills. The combination of these outcomes will lead to the attainment of long range building improvement. Effective principals have a disproportionate influence upon what teachers teach and students learn. (p. 2)

Research begins with the personal characteristics of an effective principal, and the most important items are communication skills. A principal must be able to successfully articulate desired goals and to convey these goals in a diplomatic fashion. A principal should leave channels open for communication and provide everyone with information in order to avoid misinterpretation.

John R. Schermerhorn, Jr. (1984) offered 10 commandments of communicating:

- 1. Clarify your ideas before communication.
- 2. Examine the true purpose of each communication.
- 3. Consider the total physical and human setting.
- 4. Consult with others in planning communication.
- 5. Be aware of overtones as well as the content of your message.
- 6. Take every opportunity to communicate something of help or value to the receiver.
 - 7. Follow up your communication.
 - 8. Communicate for tomorrow as well as today.
 - 9. Be sure your actions support your words.
 - 10. Be a good listener.

These 10 areas are crucial to managing the other functions of the job such as planning, organizing, leading, and controlling. Facilitating instructional improvements is the second vital area of an effective principal. Principals must, as instructional leaders, continue to read and take courses in areas such as (1) effective school research and (2) curriculum mapping, mastery learning, and the essential elements of instruction. Mitchel (1986) indicated that if a principal does not understand good teaching, he/she will not be assertive in the instructional role (p. 7). In the instruction area, the principal must have focus. With the growing expanse of curriculum, the hours in a day are overburdened. The principal must set priority items--essential skills met with mastery levels. Being armed with the latest knowledge allows for assertive behavior. If a principal has the expertise to offer researched alternatives to classroom instruction, the teachers will grow from the experience. To accomplish this task effectively, the principal must visit classrooms daily, observe teachers teaching, determine classroom needs, and offer quality growth opportunities for teachers.

To discuss the principal as a leader, it is necessary to have communication skills with the broad knowledge base of instruction. This concept, along with the principal's delegation of duties and creating collegial relationships with and among teachers, is essential. Personal traits, however, are unreliable predictors of success in this area. There are four areas, however, that seem to have a common thread in effective schools. This thread exists when principals have:

1. A tendency to test the limits of interpersonal and organizational systems

2. A sensitivity to the dynamics of power

- 3. An analytical perspective
- 4. An ability to be in charge of their jobs (DeBevoise, 1984).

As a leader, an effective principal is perceived as being forceful, energetic, and goal directed. However, all of these qualities must be controllable. DeBevoise (1984) stated, "It is hard for teachers to carry a school with a weak principal, but a strong principal doesn't always make a good school" (p. 17). Principals must have the support of teachers, parents, students, and community. Otherwise their leadership exists in a vacuum. This common leadership is produced by communicating the school purpose, rewarding good work, and providing staff development based on sound needs assessments.

Gersten and Carnine (1981) stated there are five areas of administrative functions that reflect the leadership of a principal; but not all of these functions must be carried through solely by the principal. These areas are:

- 1. Implement programs of known effectiveness
- 2. Monitor teacher performance
- 3. Monitor student performance
- 4. Demonstrate visible commitment
- 5. Provide emotional support and incentives.

Three crucial areas that have a direct impact on the effectiveness of a principal are: (1) communication skills, (2) sound instructional knowledge, and (3) leadership skills. In a sense, the school principal has been rediscovered (DeBevoise). Literature suggests that behind every successful school is a successful principal. The professional attention this area is receiving is necessary because of the profound influence it has on existing schools.

Perhaps the most effective power an administrator has to influence the quality of schools is the power he or she has to change the structure, climate, and focus of a building. Much is known about the factors of a building and the factors and processes that bring about an effective school. Principals facilitate the process of problem definition, solution selection, and implementation but prefer to let the process be teacher dominated. This strategy demands an active faculty who are accepting of leadership expectations. Research indicates that principals must clearly and specifically state expectations for professional work, "modelling" or demonstrating and rewarding behavior. Teachers who take risks to achieve expectations should be openly rewarded.

The importance of instructional leadership to school effectiveness has been a recurring theme in recent educational research findings. Accompanying the emphasis on instruction and leadership has been the significance of the principal as the chief provider of instructional leadership.

Instruction is the heart and soul of schooling. Instruction incorporates what teachers are teaching, how teachers are teaching, and what, how much, and how well students are learning.

Although most principals consider instructional leadership to be one of their most important responsibilities, many studies show that the amount of time spent on instructional activities is far less than time spent on managerial tasks. Consequently, in schools where there is not adequate

instructional leadership, there is lack of consensus about what teachers should be teaching, lack of attention paid to how teachers are teaching and ambivalence about what, how much, and how well students are learning.

The principal, who must be an instructional leader (Edmonds, 1978), incorporates six techniques:

1. Frames the academic mission of the school (Academic mission is a clearly defined set of goals and objectives to be accomplished by staff and students. Parents and teachers work with the leader to develop the mission statement.)

2. Communicates the academic mission of the school (The leader is the communication link between the superintendent and district on one end and the staff, parents, and students on the other end. The leader ensures that all are conversant with the school's mission through the use of formal, written statements and through presentations at meetings.)

3. Coordinates curriculum and instruction (The leader assures curriculum congruence between and within grade levels. There are goals and objectives to be accomplished for each course. Textbooks and materials complement the objectives. Tests are aligned closely with both the content taught and the textbooks used.)

4. Assigns students to instructional groupings using procedures which do not track or label students (Grouping students is one of the most consequential as well as controversial dimensions of instructional leadership. The negative effects of homogeneous grouping and tracking can be avoided by assigning students heterogeneously for initial instruction and practice on common objectives. Temporary assignments to

homogeneous groups can be used for remedial instruction or for acceleration or enrichment.)

5. Supervised instruction to assure that the school's mission is being translated into classroom practice (The leader monitors closely the instructional program through direct observations of teachers and students, review of lesson plans, analyses of student progress, and verbal or written reports from teachers and parents.)

6. Evaluates teacher performance in the classroom. The evaluation dimension of instructional leadership often is the most visible role and may be the most demanding one. The evaluation criteria should include attention to:

a. classroom management strategies

b. academic learning time

c. curriculum and objectives in accordance with the school's academic mission

d. instructional techniques which provide opportunities for both guided and independent practice, ensure a high rate of success, and allow all students the opportunity to respond to questions

e. classroom grouping procedures

f. homework assigned in reasonable amounts with clear instructions and graded in a timely manner.

In summary, the techniques that should be considered by the effective principal are as follows:

1. Active participation (Time and effort are the factors for success in this program.)

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

2. Observation of the classroom (Without a proper perspective of what occurs in the classroom, a principal will not be able to effectively interact with the teacher.)

3. Instructional leadership (A principal must not restrict himself/ herself to administrative duties only.)

4. Offer alternatives. (If there is a problem, never criticize without suggesting an alternative.)

Leadership is the key. Without it, a school faculty is nothing more than a handful of employees. With effective leadership, however, there is no limit to what a group of teachers can accomplish (Edmonds, 1982).

The essence of effective schools is cooperation; however, the complexities and magnitude of this accomplishment are overwhelming. The National Association of Elementary School Principals (1984) stated, "The fundamental responsibility for establishing such organization lies within the school's principal, and in a quality school, a principal effectively integrates and coordinates instruction, administration, and day-to-day operations to fulfill the written goals" (p. 3).

Female Administrators/Related Studies

When looking at public schools, one finds an organization that is somewhere between the traditional and the emerging nontraditional (Griffiths, 1988). Educational administration, even though abundant with female teachers, is occupied by men as a profession (Ortiz & Marshall, 1988). An emphasis on Taylor's scientific management turned schools to a modern bureaucratic rather than collaborated control. Also, careers in

administration did not hinge on the open competition market (Griffiths, Goldman, & McFarland, 1965).

Many actions in the history of public education have influenced the domination of men as administrators. In 1967, the Draper Report discussed the fundamental tasks of the superintendent. The implication of these findings (supervision of instructors and managing school business) led to the domination of graduate education programs full of men. This adoption of the business mode of managing schools secured men's control of the administrative field.

"Available historical data on women principals show a steady decline. Women constituted 55% in 1928. That number was 11% in 1980" (Ortiz & Marshall, 1988, p. 127). The profile of the typical woman

administrator differs drastically from that of her male counterpart. Specifically, women in all levels of administration are older than men in similar positions, are less likely to be married, are more often members of minority and ethnic groups, more often come from more urban backgrounds, are politically more liberal, identify as non-Protestant, are more likely to have been a teacher for a longer period of time, and earn less for doing the same job as a man. (Shakeshaft, 1989, p. 61)

The average age of the female principal in 1984 was 47; the average male was 46. Focusing on the principalship, women belong to more professional organizations than do men (Pharis & Zachariya, 1979). The female principal is more likely to hold liberal views and be supportive of women's rights. The career path of female administrators determines that women have more chance of being top-level administrators in small districts. In 1977, female principals were in schools with fewer than 1,000 pupils (Drust, 1977). The most common entrance path towards a solid career ladder for females was through specialist positions, supervisory posts, and an elementary principalship. In 1982, 75.4% of the principals were White male, 12.5% were White female, and 2.5% were Black female (Ortiz & Marshall, 1988, p. 128). Corresponding to this statistic, in 1982, educational administration degrees were granted to 858 males and 555 females.

Kanter (1977) revealed in one of his studies that women overemphasized the job at hand, making their job the focus of satisfaction and self-esteem. Relating this to leadership, Kanter (1977) indicated that women focused on being well-liked in their positions because they did not perceive rapid chance for advancement.

"Women administrators take a more active stance toward instructional leadership" (Wheatly, 1981, p. 269). In a study conducted by Kmetz and Willover (1982, p. 63), the woman principal spent more time in unscheduled meetings, made fewer trips from the school building, and observed teachers considerably more often than male principals. Furthermore, female principals spent more time in the classroom or with teachers in discussions about the academic content of the school than do males (Gilbertson, 1981). "Women have been found to view the job of principal more as that of a master-teacher or educational leader whereas men more often view the job from a managerial-industrial perspective" (Shakeshaft, 1989, p. 173). "Research has documented that women's educational leadership concentrates heavily on areas most closely aligned with the instructional tasks" (Ortiz & Marshall, 1988, p. 133).

Being that communication is one of the major tasks of principalship, it is important to look at the female/male aspect of this skill. Over 70% of an

elementary principal's time is spent directly involved in communication, oral and written. In particular, women talk more than men to subordinates. Women managers supply more information and are more receptive to subordinate's ideas.

"Locating the gender issue within the major development themes in educational administration has helped to identify not only long-standing problems but also gains both for women in education and for education" (Ortiz & Marshall, 1988, p. 139).

In a study of motivation in the workplace, overall differences were reported in profiles of male and female managers. The women reported lower basic needs and higher needs for self-actualization. Compared to males, female managers are more concerned with opportunities in growth, autonomy, and challenge and less concerned with work environment and pay. Further analysis revealed that the male-female differences in personal motivation occur primarily among average achievers (Donnell & Hall, 1986).

Summary

There are many views of the leader's role, male or female. In general, it can be assumed that the various components of a school organization function together under the leadership of an effective manager. There is a common set of strategies and characteristics that compose this effective leader.

Several threads are exposed in the previous discussion of leadership. The first is that leadership is a relationship between the power of one

person to stimulate a worker or workers. Secondly, leaders cannot lead in isolation.

The range of effectiveness and who possesses the effectiveness is determined by status and how the leader's group performs. In this particular discussion, how well a staff emits an effective school community is the important issue. Attention is paid to the interaction of personal and situational factors with various leadership dimensions.

McGregor concluded that the analysis of a person's management style was determined from the assessment of how they viewed people, the workers. He felt that if the person disliked work and was not self-directed, that person would need to be coerced into performing their designated tasks. If, however, a person was internally motivated, committed to all tasks and objectives of the organization and displayed a high level of imagination, that person would only be limited by the ingenuity of the manager.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship of perceived satisfaction of staff with male and female Theory X- and Theory Y-oriented principals. An examination was also made of the perceived satisfaction in inner-city and suburban schools and elementary and secondary schools administered by female Theory-X and Theory Y-oriented principals. This chapter includes a description of the population, data, questionnaires, and treatment of data.

Population

The population of this study consisted of the 363 elementary and secondary schools of the north, south, east, west, and inner-city regions of the greater Chicago public school system. This was taken from the Directory of Chicago Public Schools in 1990. These regions are extremely diverse, including some of the most affluent and most deprived school populations in the State of Illinois. The regions include both urban and suburban schools. There is almost an equal number of male and female principals. There are approximately 500 staff members averaging 10 staff members per school responding to the questionnaire. The principals were

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

chosen from the state school listing so that all schools were public and follow generally the same guidelines. Schools were selected to represent anequal sampling of high, middle, and elementary schools. Based on district records, an equal representation of poor, middle, and affluent schools were selected (Table 1).

TABLE 1

SURVEY SAMPLING BY COUNTY

County	<u>Number</u>	<u>% of Total</u>
Boone	1	1
Cook	70	46
DuPage	22	15
Grundy	5	3
Kane	5	3
Kankakee	6	4
Lake	21	14
McHenry	9	6
Will	<u>12</u>	8
Total	151	100

Of these schools, 100 were invited to participate in the study, and 56 responded positively. Many schools returned packets with uncompleted data. These were not used. As one of these principals could not clearly be categorized as Theory X- or Theory Y-oriented, that school was dropped, leaving the sample size at 55 schools.

Instrumentation

The Managerial Philosophies Scale (MPS) and the Diagnostic Survey for Leadership Improvement (DSLI) are the two instruments that were used in this study. Appendix B contains a copy of the MPS. Also included is the score tabulation form. On this, the Theory X score is obtained by summing the numbers in the shaded areas. The Theory Y score is obtained by summing the scores in the non-shaded areas. The appendix also contains the Philosophy Scoring Graph (with norms) and instructions for determining the Theory X or Theory Y orientation.

The Managerial Philosophies Scale, developed in 1975 and revised in 1986 by Jacoby and Terborg, classifies managers as predominantly Theory X or Theory Y in their style of administration.

McGregor's conceptualization of Theory X and Theory Y managerial philosophies has exerted considerable influence on managerial thinking and training for over a decade. Little empirical work exists either to confirm or deny these views. To remedy this, a Managerial Philosophies Scale was developed. "Based upon data collected from 161 supervisors and 275 non-supervisors, a 24-item Theory X scale and a 12-item Theory Y scale were constructed, each having reasonable internal consistency (Cronbach coefficient alpha = .85 and = .77, respectively), test - retest reliability (r = .68 and r = .59), and correlating as predicted with several other variables"

(Jacoby & Terborg, 1975). The MPS is a Likert-type instrument with 36 items. Two scores are received, one for Theory X and one for Theory Y.

The Diagnostic Survey for Leadership Improvement (see Appendix B) is a Likert-type instrument and is designed to measure perceptions of subordinates as they relate to superordinates. The organizational processes are communication, control, decision making, interactioninfluence, and confidence and trust in leadership.

The DSLI was, from it inception, intended to serve as a diagnostic tool, to diagnose the organizational health in schools. The reliability of the DSLI was calculated by the corrected split-half procedure because no equivalent form of the DSLI exists. The Spearman coefficient was computed rather than the more typically employed Pearson product moment because the intensity score is a non-parametric statistic. The reliability coefficients exceeded .96 and were significant at the .0001 level.

The DSLI is based upon the theoretical model developed by Rensis Likert, who has been conducting research in industry and schools about leadership (management) systems which contribute to organizational effectiveness. Likert claims that organizations too often secure measurements dealing only with end-result variables such as profit in industry and student achievement in schools. There are two other sets of variables, "casual" and "intervening," which directly affect "end-result" variables and, consequently, should also be examined. All three sets of organizational variables are defined by Likert (1967):

"Casual variables" include the structure of the organization and management's policies, decisions, business, and leadership strategies, skills, and behavior.

The "intervening" variables reflect the internal state and health of the organization, e.g., the loyalties, attitudes, motivation, performance goals, and perceptions of all members and their collective capacity for effective interaction, communication, and decision making.

The "end-result" variables reflect the achievements of the organization, such as its productivity, costs, scrap loss, and earnings. (p. 29)

For strategic planning purposes the 20 items in the DSLI were designed to diagnose the discrepancies and the intensity of these discrepancies as relates to the "is's" and "should be's" of the items in defined organizational processes. As a survey instrument, however, the subjects responded only to the "IS" component of each item. The satisfaction score was obtained by summing the weights assigned to the responses. The maximum possible score on the instrument was then 80 points. The total score of individual teachers were totaled by school.

Work on the development of the DSLI began in 1970. Between the years 1970 and 1973, five school systems representing rural, urban, and suburban populations participated in developmental studies.

In each of these studies, reliability and factor analytic treatments were applied as a basis for further refinement. In all, 5,000 students from grades 9 through 12 and 1,500 certified staff from middle and senior schools were involved in these early studies.

In 1973, a research grant was applied for and received from the National Institute of Education to do a developmental study on a national basis A stratified random sampling of school systems from around the country was selected by Research Triangle Institute, and during the 1974-75 years, approximately seven schools from each of the 23 school systems across the nation participated in a pre- and post-survey using the DSLI. Over 10,000 students and 10,000 certified staff (teachers, department chairpersons, counselors, librarians, assistant principals, and principals) participated in the pre- and post-phases of the national study.

Specific Procedures

Principals selected for this study were contacted by letter (see Appendix A) that included the following:

- 1. Brief explanation of the study
- 2. One copy of the Managerial Philosophies Scale for the principal
- 3. Copies of the Diagnostic Survey for Leadership Improvement for each staff member
 - 4. Return self-addressed, stamped envelopes.

The packets were sent out in March to all principals and teachers.

The Managerial Philosophies Scale was administered to the principals of 55 schools in the north region of Illinois. The Diagnostic Survey for Leadership Improvement (DSLI) was administered to the staff of the above 55 schools. On the average, each school had approximately 10 staff members.

Hypotheses

In this study there were 10 hypotheses which are presented in the null form:

1. There is no significant difference in staff satisfaction in schools administered by male or female principals.

2. There is no significant difference in staff satisfaction in schools administered by Theory-X or Theory-Y oriented principals.

3. There is no significant interaction between gender (male and female) and administrative orientation (Theory X- and Theory Y-oriented principals).

4. There is no significant difference in staff satisfaction between inner-city and suburban schools administered by female principals.

5. There is no significant difference in staff satisfaction between Theory X- or Theory Y-oriented female principals.

6. For females, there is no significant interaction between type of school (inner-city or suburban) and administrative style orientation (Theory X- and Theory Y-oriented principals).

7. There is no significant difference in staff satisfaction in elementary or secondary schools administered by female Theory X- or Theory Y-oriented principals.

8. There is no significant interaction between school levels (elementary or secondary) and female administrative orientation.

9. There is no significant difference in staff satisfaction in schools administered by male or female Theory X-oriented principals.

10. There is no significant difference in staff satisfaction in schools administered by male or female Theory Y-oriented principals.

Statistical Methods and Treatment of Data

The study is ex post facto and was statistically dealt with by a twoway Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) and t-tests for means of independent

groups. The independent variables are female and male principals and the Theory X versus Theory Y style, also type of schools—city/suburban and elementary/secondary. The dependent variable is satisfaction with the management style. The intensity score for the total DSLI instrument, the individual items, and each factor was obtained.

Hypotheses 1-3 were tested by ANOVA with the two dimensions being male vs. female and Theory X vs. Theory Y orientation.

Hypotheses 4-6 were tested by ANOVA with the two dimensions being city vs. suburban and Theory X vs. Theory Y orientation, for female principals only.

Hypotheses 7 and 8 assumed a repetition of Hypothesis 5. These were tested by ANOVA with the two dimensions being elementary vs. secondary and Theory X vs. Theory Y orientation, for female principals only.

Hypotheses 9 and 10 were tested by the t-test for means of two independent samples.

All hypotheses were tested at the .05 significance level.

CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

This chapter is divided into four sections. The data is presented in the following order: description of the demographics of the population, the statistical data yielded from 10 hypotheses, the explanation of test instruments used in the study, and a chapter summary.

Overview

The present study sought to investigate the perceived satisfaction with selected leadership styles of female and male Theory X and Theory Y principals as they interact with teachers in an elementary and secondary setting. Two instruments were used in this study: The Managerial Philosophies Scales (MPS) by Jacoby and Terborg and the Diagnostic Survey for Leadership Improvement (DSLI) by Mullens (1975).

The purpose of this study was to examine any difference in the perceived staff satisfaction in both inner-city and suburban, elementary and secondary schools, administrated by male or female Theory X- or Theory Yoriented principals. Further, it was intended to determine if there is any reliability to the notion that staff would rather be led by a male Theory Xrather than a Theory Y-oriented female.

Principals were classified as Theory X or Theory Y based on their responses to the 36 items on the Managerial Philosophies Scales. A behavior predomination was determined for each principal by converting X and Y scores to percentiles on the "Philosophy Scoring Graph" that accompanied the instrument (See Appendix B).

Scores were plotted for the Theory X- and Y-orientation in the columns located in the Philosophy Scoring Graph. The graph extends from "Agree Very Much" to "Disagree Very Much." This percentile score in each X and Y area determines the principal's orientation in comparison to the 4,907 comprising the normative samples. In all cases in this study, except for one principal, the differentiation between "Agree Very Much" to "Disagree Very Much" in relationship to the X and Y orientation of leadership style was easily determined for all 55 principals. Twenty-four principals ranged from 80-99 on the Theory X percentile score and below the 30th Y percentile score. However, 31 ranged from 90-99 on the Theory Y percentile score and 30 or below on the X percentile score. One principal who was close to the 50th percentile on the X and 40th percentile on the Y scale was not included because an orientation to X or Y could not be determined. In other words, a typical principal indicating an X Theory had a score of 97 on the Philosophy Scoring Graph in the X column and a 7 in the Y column.

Staffs at various elementary and secondary schools responded to the DSLI by indicating their perceptions of their principal. The perception of satisfaction of leadership was obtained as the summated weights of the 20 items on the questionnaire.

The data collected were analyzed using the SAS Statistical Analysis System available through Andrews University, Berrien Springs, Michigan.

Specifically, a two-way analysis of variance and a t-test program were run for data analysis.

Descriptive Analysis

A planned sample of 100 schools was selected to participate based on setting, grade levels of the school, and sex of the principal. Of the 100 schools selected, 55 schools responded to all the directions correctly.

There were 31 elementary schools in the study, representing 56.4% of the group and 24 secondary schools, representing 43.6% of the population. Of the 55 principals participating in the study, 24 principals were female, which represents 43.6% of the study; 31 principals were male, representing 56.4% of the group. Also represented in the study was 27 inner-city schools, which is 49.1% of the sample and 28 suburban schools, representing 50.9% of the sample (see Table 2).

TABLE 2

. <u> </u>	Elen Male	nentary Female	Seco Male	ndary Female	To Male	otal <u>Female</u>
Inner City	4	6	12	5	16	11
Suburbs	9	12	6	1	15	13
Total	13	18	18	6	31	24

DISTRIBUTION OF PRINCIPALS

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Table 2 shows the distribution of principals by sex, type, and location of school. Inner-city and suburban schools were differentiated by their location in respect to the city limits of Chicago proper.

The mean satisfaction scores recorded by teachers on the DSLI for the 55 principals was 59.482. The maximum possible total was 80. This represents a moderate degree of overall satisfaction.

The Managerial Philosophies Scales renders both a Theory X and a Theory Y raw score. There are 24 items pertaining to Theory X and 12 pertaining to Theory Y. There are different means for the X and Y totals. The means of the normative groups are specified by the developers.

Principals were rated as Theory X- or Theory Y-oriented in accordance with the procedures outlined in Chapter 3 and Appendix B.

For one principal, no dominant orientation was evident. This principal was, therefore, omitted from the sample.

This 36-item instrument employs a Likert response format with seven response categories ranging from "I disagree very much" to "I agree very much."

It yields two scores--Theory X scale indicates the degree to which the respondent subscribes to a pessimistic, reductive view of mankind, and the Theory Y scale measures the amount of subscription to more positive assumptions about the nature of people at work. (Jacoby & Terborg, 1975, p. 8)

Of the principals, 43.64% represented the X Theory style of management and 56.36% represented the Y management style. Table 3 shows how the principals were divided and gives a distribution of X and Y theory styles. Table 4 shows the frequency and percentage of sex by theory X or Y.

Testing the Hypotheses

Ten null hypotheses were stated. Several of these were grouped in sets of three for a two-way Analysis of Variance and are discussed in these sets.

Hypotheses 1, 2, and 3

<u>Hypothesis 1</u>. There is no significant difference in staff satisfaction in schools administrated by male or female principals.

<u>Hypothesis 2</u>. There is no significant difference in staff satisfaction in schools administered by Theory X- or Theory Y-oriented principals.

<u>Hypothesis 3</u>. There is no significant interaction between gender (male and female) and administrative orientation (Theory X- and Theory Yoriented principals).

TABLE 3

		Elementary		Secondary		Total	
		Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
City	X	3	0	11	2	14	2
	Y	1	6	1	3	2	9
Sub	urban X	3	1	3	1	6	2
	Y	6	11	3	0	9	11
Tota	ıl	13	18	18	6	31	24

MANAGERIAL STYLE

Sex	Theory X	Theory Y	<u> </u>
Female % of grand total % of row total % of column total	4 7.27 16.67 16.67	20 36.36 83.33 64.52	24 43.64
Male % of grand total % of row total % of column total	20 36.36 64.52 83.33	11 20.00 35.48 35.48	31 56.36
Total % of grand total	24 43.64	31 56.36	55 100.00

TABLE OF SEX BY THEORY

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Table 5 gives the cell and marginal means related to these hypotheses. The cell frequencies are given in parentheses.

Table 6 shows the result of the Analysis of Variance to test Hypotheses 1 to 3.

Table 6 indicates that Null Hypothesis 3 is retained. There is no significant interaction between sex and leadership theory. It is therefore legitimate to look at the two main effects.

Null Hypothesis 1 is rejected. There is a significant sex effect. Staff satisfaction with female principals is significantly higher than with male principals.

Null Hypothesis 2 is rejected. There is a significant style effect. Staff satisfaction with Y-oriented principals is significantly higher than with X-oriented principals.

Hypotheses 4, 5, and 6

<u>Hypothesis 4</u>. There is no significant difference in staff satisfaction between inner-city and suburban schools administered by female principals.

<u>Hypothesis 5</u>. There is no significant difference in staff satisfaction between Theory X- or Theory Y-oriented female principals.

<u>Hypothesis 6</u>. For females, there is no significant interaction between type of school (inner-city or suburban) and administrative style orientation (Theory X- and Theory Y-oriented principals).

Table 7 is the table of means with which these hypotheses are involved.

	Theory X	Theory Y	Total
Male	50.183	67.662	56.385
	(20)	(11)	(31)
Female	47.864	66.606	63.482
	(4)	(20)	(24)
Total	49.797	66.981	59.482
	(24)	(31)	(55)

MEANS: HYPOTHESES 1 TO 3

Note: Cell frequencies are in parentheses.

TABLE 6

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE: HYPOTHESES 1 TO 3

Source	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F	р
Sex X Style Y X x Y Error	1 1 1 51	681.38 3335.42 3.62 6506.23	681.38 3335.42 3.62 127.57	5.34 26.15 0.03	.0249* .0001* .8668
Total	54	10,526.65			

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

	Theory X	Theory Y	Total
Inner City	59.061	66.895	65.470
	(2)	(9)	(11)
Suburban	36.667	66.370	61.800
	(2)	(11)	(13)
Total	47.864	66.606	63.482
	(4)	(20)	(24)

MEANS: HYPOTHESES 4, 5, AND 6

Note: Cell frequencies are in parentheses.

Table 8 gives the Analysis of Variance for the testing of hypotheses 4 through 6, and it is clear that Null Hypotheses 4 and 6 are retained. There is no interaction effect, and there is no significant difference between satisfaction means for inner-city and suburban principals. Null Hypothesis 5 is rejected. For female principals, there is a significant style effect. The Y-oriented principals received a significantly higher satisfaction rating than X-oriented principals.

On further study of Table 7, some degree of interaction is evident. The (Y-X) difference for suburban teachers is much greater than the (Y-X) difference for inner-city teachers. While Table 8 indicated no statistically significant interaction, it is so close to significance that one may be justified in questioning whether the rejection of Hypothesis 6 is due only to the suburban teachers. For this reason, two "simple effects" tests were made for inner-city and suburban teachers separately.

Source	df	SS	MS	F	P
Style Location Style x Location Error	1 1 1 20	1195.6551 80.2440 397.8941 2203.6673	1195.6551 80.2440 397.8941 110.1834	10.85 0.73 3.61	.0036* .4035 .0719
Total	23	3877.4604	• • · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE: HYPOTHESES 4 TO 6

For the inner-city teacher, the t-test yielded t = -0.3772, with 9 df and p = .769. For the suburban teacher, the test yielded t = -5.677, with 11 df and p = .038. Thus, the significant difference between satisfaction scores for Y-and X-oriented principals is due to those in suburban schools.

Hypotheses 7 and 8

Hypotheses 7 and 8 involve a retest of hypothesis 5.

<u>Hypothesis 7</u>. There is no significant difference in staff satisfaction in elementary or secondary schools administered by female Theory X- or Theory Y-oriented principals.

<u>Hypothesis 8</u>. There is no significant interaction between school levels (elementary or secondary) and female administrative orientation.

Table 9 gives the means for the testing of Hypotheses 5, 7, and 8.

Because there is only one case in cell Elementary/X, Analysis of

Variance cannot be undertaken. No interaction effect (Hypothesis 8) can be

tested. The main effect for school (Hypothesis 7) must be tested by the t-test for independent means.

We have: $X_1 = 63.993$, $S_1 = 11.625$

$$X_2 = 61.952, S_2 = 17.67$$

The test, using the Welch correction for unequal variance, yielded t = 0.26 with p = .802. Therefore, the Null Hypothesis 7 is retained. There is no significant difference between the means scores of satisfaction with female principals in elementary and secondary schools.

The test of Hypothesis 5 has already indicated that the Theory Y satisfaction mean (66.6) is significantly greater than the Theory X mean (47.9). It is of interest to test whether this difference is significant for the secondary school teachers. (It is not possible to test the difference for elementary teachers, as there is only one Theory X principal in elementary schools.)

The two means are 53.0773 for the three X-oriented female secondary school principals and 70.826 for the three secondary Y-oriented female principals.

While the difference between the two means is great, the sample sizes are very small. The null hypothesis is retained, with t = 1.32 and p = .318, using Welch's correction for unequal variances. There is no significant difference between X-oriented and Y-oriented female principals in secondary schools. This would appear to be due to a very large variance among the three X-oriented principals (S = 23.065). For these three principals, the satisfaction scores were 38.455, 41.111, and 79.667. On the other hand, there was little variance among the satisfaction scores of the Yoriented principals (S = 3.507). Their three satisfaction scores were 68, 69.73, and 74.75.

TABLE 9

	Theory X	Theory Y	Total	
Elementary	32.225 (1)	65.862 (17)	63.993 (18)	
Secondary	53.0773 (3)	70.826 (3)	61.952 (6)	
Total	47.864 (4)	66.606 (20)	63.482 (24)	

MEANS: HYPOTHESES 5, 7, AND 8

Note: Cell frequencies are in parentheses.

Earlier, in chapter 1, mention was made of the researcher's suspicion that teachers would prefer working for a Theory X-oriented male principal rather than for Theory Y-oriented female principal. From Table 5, the mean satisfaction score for the Theory Y-oriented males is 50.183, while for the Theory Y-oriented females it is 66.606. Thus, the suspicion is clearly unfounded.

Hypotheses 9 and 10

<u>Hypothesis 9</u>. There is no significant difference in staff satisfaction in schools administered by male or female X-oriented principals.

Table 10 gives the result of the t-test for this hypothesis.

Table 10 indicates that the null hypothesis must be retained. There is no significant difference between the satisfaction scores of male and female X-oriented principals.

<u>Hypothesis 10.</u> There is no significant difference in staff satisfaction in schools administered by male or female Y-oriented principals.

Table 11 (see p. 60) gives the result of the t-test for this hypothesis and indicates that the null hypothesis must be retained. There is no significant difference between the satisfaction scores of male and female Y-oriented principals.

TABLE 10

t-TEST: HYPOTHESIS 9

<u>Sex</u>	N	Mean	STD	t	df	Prob
Female Male	4 20	47.86 50.18	21.53 12.05	-0.21	22	0.85

TABLE 11

t-TEST: HYPOTHESIS 10

Sex	N	Mean	STD Dev	STD Error	t	df	Prob
Female	20	66.61	8.3	1.861	2935	29	0.77
Male	11	67. 66	10.2	3.077			

Summary of Hypotheses Tests

The analysis of this data has resulted in the retention of six null hypotheses and a rejection of three null hypotheses, while one null hypothesis could not be tested.

There is greater staff satisfaction, overall, with female principals than with male principals. From Table 5, it is clear that this is because there were more female than male Y-oriented principals and fewer female than male X-oriented principals. There is greater staff satisfaction with Yoriented than with X-oriented principals. Finally, for female principals in suburban schools, there is greater staff satisfaction with Y-oriented than with X-oriented principals.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, FINDINGS, DISCUSSION, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The study was based on the concept that males and females demonstrate a behavior as leaders in a school setting that either satisfies or does not satisfy their staffs. These sets of behaviors have been characterized by two separate orientations--Theory X and Theory Y. The need for this study pinpoints the qualities of a principal who lead an effective school with a satisfied staff. At the heart of this dilemma is the concept of what makes an excellent administrator. The expectation of this study was to obtain information which delineates characteristics an administrator must exhibit to maintain a true working team.

Summary

The summary of the study is divided into four sections: (1) purpose; (2) review of related literature; (3) population and instrumentation; and (4) null hypotheses, method of analysis, and conclusion.

Purpose

The purpose of this study was to review the differences in the perceived staff satisfaction with the following factors: X- or Y-oriented leadership styles, gender of principal, suburban or urban location in the

greater Chicago area, and elementary or secondary school settings. By reviewing these findings, coupled with the review of related literature, educators and administrators should be able to determine effective leadership styles in correlation with particular educational locations. The dynamics between administrator and the school organization are very important. The success of a school is dependent upon the collective performance of all the staff. This direction or focus hinges on the setting and managerial philosophy that the principal exhibits.

Review of Literature

Basically, three observable themes are discussed in the review of literature. The first theme is leadership qualities, the second is background history of organizational theory, and third, credibility. The effective schools movement focused on leadership which is a major correlate for successful schools. The question of what makes a greater leader was highlighted. DeBevoise (1984) believed that empowerment increased staff satisfaction. Blumberg and Greenfield (1980) studied principals' styles and discovered that <u>all</u> effective principals used a participatory style of leadership. Kelley affirmed that the leadership quality of the principal remained the single most important tool in American school administration.

It was found that there were very few females in educational administration. Actually, a steady decline is in effect. The profile of the woman administrator differs drastically from that of her male counterpart.

Female administrators in 1989 only comprised 15% of the total administrative population. Relating this to the characteristics discussed in the study, evidence was determined that women focus on being well-liked in their positions because they did not see a rapid chance for advancement.

Finally, based on organizational theory and research depicting the principal as a leader and the representation of female administrators, the following results shed light on the integration of all of these components.

Population and Instrumentation

The population consisted of 100 schools that had a least one principal and a staff of at least 10 members. Schools were selected from the Directory of Greater Chicago Public Schools. An equal representation was selected randomly from inner-city, suburban, elementary, and secondary schools. Also, an equal representation was sent out to male and female principals. Each envelope included 30 copies of the DSLI (Diagnostic Survey for Leadership Improvement), one copy of the MPS (Managerial Philosophies Scales), a brief description of the study, directions, and a return selfaddressed stamped envelope. Fifty-six envelopes were returned and only one school was rejected. The principal was clearly neither X- or Y-oriented in his/her leadership style.

Conclusions

Null Hypotheses and Methods of Analysis

Ten null hypotheses were tested and conclusions were drawn. Three null hypotheses were rejected.

Based on the statistical analyses of this study, differences were found in relationship to gender and administrator's style. There was evidence that females tend to demonstrate a "Y" management style more than males. There is also a significant difference in staff satisfaction with female X- or Y- oriented principals in a suburban school. Staff satisfaction is greater with female Y-oriented principals in a suburban location than with male X-oriented principals. There is also no difference in satisfaction between a male or female in managing a school. However, there is a significant difference in staff satisfaction, between X-management orientation and a Y orientation. Staff satisfaction is significantly higher with a Y-oriented principal as opposed to an X-oriented principal, whether or not the administrator is male or female.

In conclusion, staffs in elementary and secondary schools indicated a degree of dissatisfaction with the leadership of X-oriented principals. In general, it would seem that the satisfaction is not related to sex or building level, only management orientation. The statistics did not reveal a significance difference in the satisfaction of female principals in suburban and inner-city schools. The satisfaction was highest with female Y principals irrespective of a suburban or inner-city setting.

Implications

In school administration theory, there are a variety of models from industry and the behavioral sciences. School leaders tend to adopt a pragmatic approach to management in order to accommodate the various

tasks. One realizes that from this study, Theory Y is a scientific foundation for satisfaction.

Research has indicated that there can be a systems approach to leadership by analyzing specific traits, characteristics, and management practices that satisfy a staff of teachers. There are numerous ramifications for leadership improvement. Administrators who are interested in improvement can intervene with such changes as organizational structure, policies, decision-making skills, and, most importantly, their behavior. Other variables are loyalties, attitudes, motivations, and perceptions of subordinates.

There is evidence that staff satisfaction is higher with Y-oriented administrators. In an analysis of those traits, one can extrapolate various strategies which compose that satisfaction. By modeling these behaviors and thoughts, one can assume that a satisfied staff is one that will work toward a common set of goals to achieve a productive workplace.

Theory Y-orientation assumes self-control and self-direction. When fostering a climate of empowerment with staff members, the instructional leader is beginning to rely on these feelings. Administrators can grasp the implications of leadership style on staff members when they begin modifying their attitudes. The Y administrator must facilitate new foundations. One foundation is that human beings bring varying patterns of needs and motives into the workplace. One central need is to achieve a sense of competence. It is also vital that there is a fit between task and organization. The foundation of goal setting is complex. Goal setting with

a Y-oriented manager works if, once one goal is reached, a new higher one is set.

Given the global new environment with social and technical changes, the Theory Y approach allows a school to run on process and high motivation. Theory X-orientation will continue to be out of sync with schools. Training and practice in adaptations of appropriate styles cultivates participative management. A feeling of "better nature" describes a school climate with a Y-oriented principal.

Direct influences in a school of Theory Y-orientation are those characteristics of a certain position which act directly upon an employee's needs for esteem and fulfillment.

Most importantly, the Y manager should create well defined and clear responsibilities, the concept of middle management should be eliminated and all communication channels opened, productivity should be exhibited to peers, there should be no fear of failure, and lastly, opportunities should exist to merge self-actualization designs with organizational responsibilities. An analysis of these characteristics shows that they fall into two categories, those that directly affect a person's higher level motivations and those that have an indirect effect on these tendencies.

The expression that Theory Y management promotes selfactualization is not always seen in a positive perspective. This selfactualization is actually Maslow's highest level of motivation. In schools, measures taken which stimulate teachers to make mistakes, join diverse organizations, and attend professional meetings expand the horizons of their abilities in the classroom.

Lastly, it does not follow that successful leadership is not dependent upon the possession of a single universal pattern of inborn traits and abilities. There is a relationship between the leader and the staff that effects the climate and productivity of our schools. The supervisor who believes in Theory Y values a participatory management system because of the assumed consensus and commitment on the part of teachers in order to achieve organizational goals. Theory Y-orientation has a fundamental advantage of linking benefit of the individual with benefit to the organization.

Recommendations for Future Research

Based on the review of literature and the findings of this study, the following recommendations are made:

1. That this study expand to other regions of the country so as to not portray the midwest ideals

2. That the age of the administrator be examined along with educational training to expand on the Theory X- and Theory Y- orientation

3. That other possibilities for study lies within the confines of the relationship between staff satisfaction and building achievement levels (In other words, does a satisfied staff promote higher levels of student achievement?)

4. That further research be conducted to examine the effect classroom or departmental organizational health has upon student achievement

6. That further research is needed to determine why the number of female principals has declined drastically over the past 20 years, even

though data gathered in this study indicated that females tend to be Theory Y managers and Theory Y-oriented principals have more satisfied staffs. APPENDICES

•

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

APPENDIX A

Requests for Principals and Staff Participation ir. the Study

and

General Correspondence

ELEOMETRICS INTERNATIONAL

DEDICATED TO HELPING YOU MAKE A DIFFERENCE

July 12,, 1989

Hs. Lynn Badgly 925 Dunsinane Road Signal Mountain, Tennessee 37377

. .

Dear Lynn,

Thank you for inquiring about our Managerial Philosophise Scale as a possible research instrument for your dissertation. The instrument and its reliability/validity information are enclosed along with a bibliography of studies which have utilized the instrument. Please be aware that the bibliography is complete only to the extent that researchers have let us know about their projects; you will no doubt find a more complete list by making use of APA's computer search service. I have also included reprints of two studies which you might find interesting.

If you decide to use the MPS, you will automatically be entitled to a 10% educational discount. At times, we grant a special price to graduate students of \$1.00 per copy; to qualify for consideration you need only submit a draft of your research proposal to us. If the grant is made available to you, we ask that, in return, you send us a copy of your dissertation when it is finished.

Because the instrument is copyrighted and cannot be reproduced in any way, we further ask that, rather than including it in the appendix of your dissertation, you include a copy of the front cover — front and back with the copyright notice showing — and 2 or 3 sample questions. This procedure has been acceptable to colleges and universities, as well as University Microfilms, in the past.

We offer best wishes to you for success in your project and hope you will let us know how we might be of service to you.

Sincerely,

Susan M. Donnell Vice President, Marketing

SMD/jv Snos.

> 1755 WOODSTEAD COURT I THE WOODLANDS, TEXAS I 77380 (713) 367-0060 AMSTERDAM - BOGDTA - COPENHAGEN - LONDON - MALMO - 05LO - PARIS - SAO PAULO - STOCKHOLM - STUTTGART - SYONEY

I ELEOMETRICS INTERNATIONAL

DEDICATED TO HELPING YOU MAKE A DIFFERENCE

September 11, 1990

Ms. Lynn Badgley Matteson School District 162 210 Illinois Street Park Forest, Illinois 60466

Dear Ms. Badgley,

Thank you for sending us your dissertation proposal, Staffs' satisfaction and leadership behavio of female elementary and secondary X and Y oriented principals in the greater Chicogo public school system. We were pleased to grant your request for a special research price of \$1.00 per copy for 150 copies of our Managerial Philosophies Scale for use in your research. In return, we ask that you send us a copy of your dissertation when it is finisched.

Because our instruments are copyrighted and cannot be reproduced in any way, we further ask that, rather than including one in the appendix of your dissertation, you include a copy of the front cover — front and back with the copyright notice showing — and 2 or 3 sample questions. This procedure has been acceptable to colleges and universities, as well as University Microfilms, in the past.

Your instruments were shipped on August 23, and I trust they arrived in good condition. We offer best wishes to you for success in your project and hope you will let us know how we might be of service to you.

Sincerely,

16 Lel

Susan M. Donnell Vice President

SMD/lr

1755 WOODSTEAD COURT O THE WOODLANDS, TEXAS O 77380 O (713) 367-0360

AMSTERCAM - BOGDTA - COPENHAGEN - LONDON - MALMO - OSLO - PARIS - SAO PAULO - STOCKHOLM - STUTTGART - STONET

I ELEOMETRICS INTERNATIONAL

DEDICATED TO HELPING YOU MAKE A DIFFERENCE

August 6, 1990

Ms. Lynn Badgley 18429 Aberdeen Banewaad, Illinois 60430

Dear Ms. Badgley,

Thank you for inquiring about our Managerial Philocophies Scale as a possible research instrument for your dissertation. Enclosed, along with a bibliography of studies which have utilized the instrument, is a copy of its new companion instrument, the Reality Check Survey — I truly believe it might be what you are looking for. Please be aware that the bibliography is complete only to the extent that researchers have let us know about their projects; you will no doubt find a more complete list by making use of APA's computer search service.

The instrument sells for \$6.95 each and, as a graduate student, you are automatically entitled to our 10% educational discount. At times, we grant a special price of \$1.00 per copy; to gualify for consideration you need only submit a draft of your research proposal to us. If the grant is made available to you, we ask that, in return, you send us a copy of your dissertation when it is finished.

Because our instruments are copyrighted and cannot be reproduced in any way, we further ask that, rather than including one in the appendix of your dissertation, you include a copy of the front cover — front and back with the copyright notice showing — and 2 or 3 sample questions. This procedure has been acceptable to colleges and universities, as well as University Microfilms, in the past.

We offer best vishes to you for success in your project and hope you will let us know how we might be of service to you.

Sincerely, Susan M. Donnell Vice President 90/lr Encs.

1755 WOODSTEAD COURT CI THE WOODLANDS, TEXAS CI 77380 CI (713) 367-0060

AMSTERDAM + BOCOTA + COPENHAGEN + LONDON + MALINO + OSLO + PARIS + SAO PAULO + STOCKHOLM + STUTTGART + SYONEY

147 Chinquapin Way Athens, Ga. 30605 August 25, 1990

Ms. Lynn Badgley 18429 Aberdeen Homewood, Ill. 60430

Dear Ms. Badgley:

This letter is my release of copyright restrictions for the Diagnostic Survey for Leadership Improvement instrument written by David J. Mullen. This release shall be used only for the use in your dissertation and shall include the number of copies you need to make to complete your survey.

I hope that the materials I am sending you will be of use in your dissertation. If you need further help, be sure to call me so that I may look through Dave's files to see if he has the material you might need.

If you would like to talk to a former graduate student here in Athens that used the DSLI in her study, call or write to Dr. Sandra Gardner, 110 Highland Dr., Athens, Ga. 30606. Phone: 404-549-0530. If she cannot help, I am sure she will be able to refer you to another former graduate student of Dave's who used it, too.

Since I only have been able to find the last copy of the manual for the DSLI. I will have to xerox the pertinent pages and will include them with this material.

The reason that I want to help you is that Dave had a great interest in his students and tried in every way possible to help them. I am only trying to continue what he would have wanted me to do. He was a remarkable man and the scholarship I have established in his name will. I hope, help other graduate students at the University of Georgia continue with their studies. If you wish to contribute to this scholarship send your check filled out to the David J. Mullen Memorial Scholarship Fund and send to the Office of the Dean of the College of Education, University of Georgia, Athens, Ga. 30602.

Good luck and do keep me informed about how you are doing in your graduate studies.

Sincerely

Rosemary C. Muller

APPENDIX B

Instrumentation

Managerial Philosophies Scales

and

The Diagnostic Survey for Leadership Improvement

PLEASE NOTE

Copyrighted materials in this document have not been filmed at the request of the author. They are available for consultation, however, in the author's university library.

80-96

University Microfilms International

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

APPENDIX C

Lists of Raw Data

01	F	Y	E	I	71 68 67 63 64 71 63 68 72 73 69 68 68 67
02	М	х	S	I	71 63 63 62 51 47 59 67 68 63 79
03	М	Х	E	I	63 62 62 62 62 41 42 43
04	М	х	S	S	69 30 61 47 54 34 56 42 47 53
05	М	Х	Ε	S	39 47 51 44 45 62 58 49
06	М	Х	S	S	69 68 63 68 63 69 67 69
07	F	Y	Ε	S	65 67 39 56 56 59
08	F	Y	E	S	71 73 70 65 72 69 71
09	М	Х	S	Ι	69 67 68 67 59 58 63 67
10	F	Y	Ε	S	49 44 38 40 47 48 48 37
11	F	Х	S	Ι	32 33 37 38 39 41 47 41 42 36 37
12	F	Y	Ε	S	71 50 73 59 71 65 72
13	М	Х	Ε	S	56 49 46 59 52 51 59 39 42 51 39 52 66 47 62 43 58 33 44 52
14	F	Y	E	S	77 80 77 75 54 68 55 68 71 74 80 54 56 56 79
15	М	Y	S	S	37 44 37 68 53 73 48 58 56 33 44 36 35 33 28 32 30 31
16	F	Y	E	Ι	68 53 67 56 55 64 66 53 69 58 69 71 55 63 56 62 62 55 56 61 46
17	F	Y	E	Ι	69 71 72 68 67 63 59 67 71
18	F	Y	Ε	Ι	69 68 77 80 75 54 55 79 56 80 74 74 80
19	F	Y	Ε	Ι	80 74 74 69 71 75 76 71 77 67
20	F	Х	S	S	36 37 44 37 33 32 56 58 37
21	F	Y	Ε	S	67 67 56 53 79 80 74 71 73
22	F	Y	Ε	S	67 71 72 68 71 71 62 68 80

98

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

23	F	x	E	S	33 36 29 33 34 32 31 29 33	
24	F	Y	E	S	39 77 75 68 55 71 68 74 74	
25	F	Y	E	S	80 80 80 77 78 73 77 78	
26	F	Y	S	I	68 71 77 77 78 69 67 75 80 80 78 77	
27	F	Y	S	I	69 77 77 75 73 68 64 65 64 55 80	
28	F	Y	S	I	77 75 73 73 63 63 62 61 61 67 67	
29	М	х	S	I	33 34 33 31 37 38 42 55 57 33 34	
30	М	х	S	I	41 42 47 33 32 38 41 43 44	
31	М	Х	S	Ι	78 79 80 80 80 80 71 77 68 67 63 63 64 65	
32	М	Y	E	S	80 79 79 80 80 77 73 74 73 72 73 74 63 58	
33	М	Y	Ε	S	80 77 78 77 79 80 80 80 79 63 67 68 64	
34	М	Х	S	Ι	33 34 32 32 31 29 32 33 41 43 44	
35	М	х	S	Ι	33 37 37 33 36 37 38 39	
36	М	Y	S	Ι	64 67 68 69 77 73 74 74 74 78 79 80 80 80	
37	М	Y	Ε	S	63 62 61 43 47 49 62 64 53 48 47 61	
38	М	Y	S	S	69 69 70 77 73 74 75 77 78 80 80	
39	М	x	Ε	Ι	33 34 47 47 51 52 34 33 39 36 37 38	
40	М	х	S	Ι	34 35 37 38 39 40 41 41 42 43 44 45	
41	М	Y	E	Ι	79 78 80 80 79 73 74 76 76 76 43 49 52 59	
42	М	Y	Ε	S	80 77 77 73 76 74 74 74 76 73 72 73	
43	М	Y	Ε	S	80 80 80 79 73 74 67 63 64 64 63 68 67 67 67 68 69	
44	М	Y	E	S	63 62 62 64 64	

45	М	х	S	S		37 37		56	53	53	54	44	49	47	53	51
46	М	Х	S	Ι	44 38	47	48	51	51	52	53	47	44	43	37	36
47	М	Х	E	Ι	47 62		52	52	53	54	54	55	57	58	59	61
48	М	Х	S	Ι			37 44		37	38	39	41	42	42	43	41
49	М	Х	S	Ι						48 33		51	52	43	47	51
50	М	Y	S	S	79	78	76	41	42	76	77	80	80	80	79	78
51	М	X	Ε	S		74 68		72	71	71	72	73	74	75	77	77
52	F	х	S	I	80	80	80	79	79	80						
53	F	Y	Ē	S	79	73	74	75	78	73	73					
54	F	Y	Ε	S	80	80	77	76	63	41	42	73				
55	F	Y	E	I	44	43	44	55	56	63	33	49	51	53	54	

- F = Female
- M = Male
- Y = Theory Y Style
- X = Theory X Style
- E = Elementary Principal
- S = Secondary Principal
- I = Inner-City School
- S = Suburban School

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Allen, L. (1973). Professional management. New York: McGraw-Hill.

- Andrews, P.J. (1984). Performance-self-esteem and perceptions of leadership emergence: A comparative study of men and women. Journal of Speech Communications, 1, 48.
- Argyris, C. (1964). <u>Integrating the individual and the organization</u>. New York: Harper & Row.
- Barnard, C. (1951). <u>The function of the executive</u>. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Barth, R.S. (1981, May 2). A principal's center. <u>The Journal of Staff</u> <u>Development, 2</u>, 1.
- Bennis, W., & Manus, L. (1985). <u>The strategies for taking charge</u>. New York: Harper & Row.
- Blumberg, A. & Greenfield, W. (1980). <u>The effective principal: Perspectives</u> on school leadership. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Chung, (1970). <u>Teacher centered management style of school principals</u> and job satisfaction of teachers. Paper presented at American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting. Minneapolis: (EDDA 2259, 24 pgs.)
- Cuban, L. (1984). Effective schools. Howard Educational Review, 54(2), 145.
- DeBevoise, W. (1984). Synthesis of research on the principal as instructional leader. <u>Educational Leadership</u>, p. 4.
- Donnell, S. & Hall, J. (1986). <u>Men and women as managers: A significant</u> <u>case of no significant differences</u>. Woodlands, Texas: Teleometrics, International
- Drucker, P. (1974). Management. New York: Harper & Row.

Drucker, P. (1966). The effective executive. New York: Harper & Row.

- Drust, B. (1977). Factors related to the employment of women as junior high school and high school principals, assistant superintendents in the California public schools. <u>Dissertation Abstracts International</u>, <u>37</u>, 5479A, (University Microfilms No. 77-4825).
- Fortney, N. & Raines, S. (1979, May). What is lacking in Theory Y? <u>NASSP</u> <u>Bulletin, 63</u>,(427), 16.
- Gersten, R. & Carnine, D. (1981). <u>Administrative and supervisory support</u> <u>functions for implementation of effective educational programs</u>. Center for Educational Policy, University of Oregon.
- Getzel, J. (1957). <u>Administration as a social process</u>. University of Chicago.
- Gilbertson, M. (1981). The influence of gender on the verbal interactions among principals and staff members. Exploratory study in P.A. Schmuck & W.W. Chorters, <u>Educational policy and management:</u> <u>Sex differentials</u>. New York, Academic Press.
- Goldman, J. (1983, March). <u>The supervisor's beliefs about people and the</u> <u>supervisory plan:</u> <u>McGregor's 'Theory X' and 'Theory Y' in the</u> <u>schools clearing house</u>, <u>56</u>(7), 306.
- Griffiths, D. (1988). Administrative theory. <u>Handbook of Research on</u> <u>Educational Administration</u>. Norman Boyan ed. Longman, New York.
- Griffiths, D., Goldman, S., & McFarland, W.J. (1965). Teacher mobility in New York City. <u>Educational Administration Quarterly</u>, <u>1</u>, 15-31.
- Hersey, P. & Blanchard, K. (1970). Situational leadership.
- Herzberg, J., & Terborg, J.R. (1975). <u>Managerial philosophies scales</u>. Connor, Texas: Teleometrics International.
- Jacoby, J. & Terborg, J.R. (1975, Spring). <u>Development and validation of</u> <u>Theory X and Theory Y</u>. Scales for Assessing McGregor's Managerial Philosophies, Purdue University, Teleometrics International.
- Kanter, R.M. (1977). <u>Men and women of the corporation</u>. New York: Basic.
- Kelley, E. (1980). Improving school climate. <u>National Association of</u> <u>Secondary School Principals</u>, Reston, Virginia, p. 41.
- Kmetz, J.T. & Willover, D.J. (1982). Elementary school principal's work behavior. <u>Educational Administration Quarterly</u>, 18(4), 62-78.

- Knesevick, S.J. (1969). <u>Administration of public education</u>. New York: Harper & Row.
- Likert, R. (1967). <u>The human organization: Its management and value</u>. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Maslow, A. (1964). Synergy in the society and in the individual. <u>Journal of</u> <u>the Individual Psychology</u>, <u>20</u>, 161.
- McGregor, D. (1960). <u>The human side of enterprise</u>. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Mitchel, C. (1986, January). Making instructional improvements. <u>The</u> <u>Effective Schools Report</u>. p. 7.
- Morphet, E., Roe, J., & Reller, T. (1982). <u>Education. organization. and</u> <u>administration</u>. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Mort, P. (1946). <u>Principles of school administration</u>. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Morton, J.D. (1975). Theory Y is not participative management. <u>Human</u> <u>Resource Management</u>, 14(4), 25-28.
- Mullens, D. (1975). <u>An explanation and guide for the use of diagnostic</u> <u>survey for leadership improvement</u>. University of Georgia, Athens, Georgia.
- Mullens, D.J. (1975). <u>Diagnostic survey for leadership improvement</u> (DSLI). Iowa City, Iowa: MRC.
- NAESP (1984). Quality elementary schools. <u>National Association of</u> <u>Elementary School Principals</u>, Reston, Virginia.
- Ortiz, F. & Marshall, C. (1988). Women in educational administration. <u>Handbook of Research on Educational Administration</u>. New York: Norman Boyan ed. Longman, pp. 123, 127.
- Ouchi, W.G. (1981a). <u>How American business can meet the Japanese</u> <u>challenge</u>. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Ouchi, W.G. (1981b). <u>Theory Z</u>. Reading MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Peters, T. & Austin, N. (1985). <u>A passion for excellence</u>. New York: Random House, Inc.
- Pharis, W.L. & Zachariya, S.B. (1979). <u>The elementary school principal in</u> <u>1978</u>. A Research Study. Washington, D.C.: National Association of Elementary Principals.

- Reilly, W. (1980). Effective leaders a major factor in good schools. In D. Brundage, <u>The journalism research fellows report: What makes an</u> <u>effective school?</u>. Institute for Educational Leadership.
- Schein, E.H. (1975). Relationships between sex role stereotypes and requisite management characteristics among female managers. Journal of Applied Psychology, 60(3).
- Schermerhorn, J. R., Jr. (1984). <u>Management for production</u>. New York: Wiley & Son, Inc.
- Shakeshaft, C. (1989). <u>A framework for studying schools as work settings</u> for women leaders. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Associations, New York.
- Taylor, F. (1947). Scientific management. New York: Harper & Row.
- Weber, M. (1947). <u>The theory of social and economic organizations</u>. Free Press.
- Wheatly, M. (1981). The impact of organizational structures on issues of sex equality. <u>Educational policy and management</u>: <u>Sex differentials</u>. New York Academics, p. 269.
- Yankelovich, D. (1983). <u>Work and human values</u>. New York: Public Agenda Foundation.

VITA

Name:	Lynn Schiffer Gillman
Date of Birth:	June 4, 1955
Place of Birth:	Mishawaka, Indiana
Education:	BS Education Indiana University
	MS Education Indiana University
	Gifted and Talented Endorsement Purdue University
	Ed. D. Administration and Supervision 1993 Andrews University
Employment:	Mishawaka School City Gifted Education Resource Teacher Director of Gifted and Talented
	Indiana State Education Department Gifted and Talented Consultant
	Matteson Elementary School District 162 Principal, Sauk Elementary School
	James B. Eads Elementary Principal Munster, Indiana