Wayne State University Dissertations

1-1-1999

Personality types and leadership styles of principals in accredited and unaccredited elementary schools

James F. Orwin

Follow this and additional works at: http://digitalcommons.wayne.edu/oa_dissertations

PERSONALITY TYPES AND LEADERSHIP STYLES OF PRINCIPALS IN ACCREDITED AND UNACCREDITED ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

by

JAMES F. ORWIN

DISSERTATION

Submitted to the Graduate School

of Wayne State University

Detroit, Michigan

in partial fulfillment of the requirements

for the degree of

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

1999

MAJOR: CURRICULUM AND
INSTRUCTION

Approved by:

_____ 1-14-99
Advisor   Date

_____

_____

_____

Dedication

For Ann, Jennifer, Mark, Jay, and Katie

Thank you for your love and understanding

Acknowledgments

I would like to take this opportunity to thank the people who have provided assistance and guidance through the completion of this dissertation.

First, I would like to thank Dr. Burnis Hall for his support as my advisor for this research project. I especially want to thank Dr. Hall for assuming this position after Dr. Ronald Urick retired. Special thanks to Dr. Thomas McLennan and Dr. Frances Sosnowsky for their efforts as committee members in providing support and encouragement during my program. I would like to thank Dr. Urick for assisting with this study through the proposal stage.

I would like to acknowledge the principals of both accredited and nonaccredited schools who took time from their busy schedules to participate in this study.

Special thanks go to Dianna Kassuba, Pat Drummonds, Gayle Lambrix, and Larry Kessell for their encouragement and technical assistance.

A very, very special thank you to June Cline. June is one of the brightest women I know. Without her guidance, work ethic, and encouragement, this project would not have been possible. June is the only person I know who can enter data, watch television, play a video game, and listen to music at the same time. While she is doing these tasks, she is also receiving faxes and talking on the telephone. A truly amazing woman. Thank you June.

I would also like to thank my family Ann, my wife, and my children Jennifer, her husband Mark, Jay, and Katie who supported me through this effort.

Thanks to everyone!!!!

Table of Contents

List of Tables

List of Figures

Chapter I

Introduction

<u>Background</u>

The view of what leadership is and the type of people who exhibit it has changed considerably. Managers are not necessarily leaders. Leadership is a "process of creating a vision for others and having the power to translate it into a reality and sustain it" (Kotter, 1988). Stodgill (1974) emphasized group action and interaction, group cohesiveness, and group task performance as factors in solid functioning leadership teams.

Rebecca Jones (1995) cited a leader as someone who is:

1. Wise enough to mentor a young faculty and intellectual enough to be familiar with the latest educational theories, yet game enough to sit on the school roof if kids read 500 books.

2. Clever enough to foil a hacker who's toying with computerized records, charismatic enough to pull together a feuding faculty, and brave enough to disarm a student carrying a 357-caliber magnum pistol.

3. Agile enough to climb onto the rafters of the boys' bathroom to catch vandals, humble enough to recognize somebody else might have a better idea, and patient enough to hear out complaining parents.

4. All of the above and then some.

Vic Cottrell, president of Ventures for Excellence in Lincoln, Nebraska, who has helped hundreds of school districts around the country find principals for their schools, stated that "All we are looking for is God."

The search for the "perfect" principal begins every time a new school

1

opens or an experienced principal moves on or retires. No one questions the importance of finding the right replacements; educators know a principal can make or break a school. Timothy Dyer, Former Executive Director of the National Association of Secondary School Principals says selecting a schools' principal "is the most important thing a superintendent does" (Jones, 1995, p. 17)

Jones (1995) offers the following advice for selecting principals:.

1. Look for principals who know the territory. Someone outside the district may not understand the politics of the district.

2. Look for somebody sparkling with goodness, old-fashioned standards must be adhered to.

3. Look for signs of intelligence. Intelligence should show in candidates' management skills.

4. Look at credentials, where the candidate attended college and what types of internships were available are crucial.

5. Find a Horace Mann - someone who is fascinated by learning.

6. Try growing your own Horace Mann (or Hortense). Nurture your best teachers and begin to develop your own intern program.

The late Ron Edmonds (1978) described this characteristic of effective schools as follows:

> Principals of effective schools behave in ways that are observably, demonstrably and sometimes dramatically different from the way that principals behave in ineffective schools. The main difference is that principals of effective schools are the instructional leaders in their buildings, while those in the ineffective schools are not.

Edmonds also provided the following information:

- There are some bad schools with good principals, but there are not good schools with bad principals.

- The principal is active and involved with all aspects of the school. They are resourceful, bold supportive and dedicated to the mission of the school.

- The instructional leaders conveys high expectations for student, staff and principal performance.

- The principal inspires others in the school to attain the mission of the school.

- The principal interacts regularly with each teacher and keeps informed regarding the instructional program and progress.

- Teachers reduce the number of digressions and focus instruction on the objective to be learned.

- Students are monitored frequently to determine if they understand the current lesson. Errors and misunderstandings are corrected as they occur.

- The time allocated for instruction in content areas is specified. The amount of time allocated to instruction in a particular content area is positively associated with student learning in that content area.

- Teachers spend more time actively teaching and generating learning-related activities for their students. The proportion of time that students are engaged is positively associated with learning.

- The student success rate is 80-85% to insure productive learning. This is accomplished by teachers monitoring the quality of their student interactions and differentiating student assignments for the same objective.

Accreditation Process

Public Act 25 was passed in 1990 as a mandate for school reform. As a result of PA 25, school districts were expected to show improvement through the accreditation process. The act had the following four provisions:

1. School Improvement. - Individual schools through the community and the employees were to develop a mission statement, goals, curriculum evaluation, staff development and decision making at the building level

with the principal as the moderator/facilitator.

2. <u>Core Curriculum</u> - District develop and control local core curriculum. Outcomes for all students.

3. <u>Accreditation</u> Certified by the State Board of Education as having met or exceeded State Board of Education approved standards which have been established for six areas of school operation.

   (a) Administration and school organization

   (b) Curricula

   (c) Staff

   (d) School plant and facilities

   (e) School and community relations

   (f) School improvement plans and student outcomes

The building level evaluation used in the accreditation process shall include:

1. School data collection

2. Self study

3. Visitation and validation

4. Determination of outcomes data to be used;

5. The development of a school improvement plan

Based on the criteria listed in PA 25 schools could achieve the following accreditation status:

<u>Summary Accredited (S)</u> -   Indicates that the building is in full compliance with PA 335 and PA 339 of 1993 and PA 25 of 1990 and has 66% or more students scoring at or above satisfactory for three consecutive years on the MEAP tests.

Interim Status (I) -   Indicates that the building may or may not be in compliance with PA 335 and 339 of 1993 and PA 25 of 1990 and has 51% - 65% of their students scoring at or above satisfactory for three consecutive years on the MEAP tests.

Unaccredited (U) -   Indicates that the building may or may not be in compliance with PA 25 of 1990, PA 335 and 339 of 1993, PA 289 of 1995 and has 50% or less of their students scoring at the highest level of achievement in all of the four MEAP test areas in all of the last three consecutive years.

No Status (NS) -   Several factors contribute to a building with this status: (1) it could be a new building and not have three consecutive years of MEAP scores; (2) the building does not house grades tested by MEAP and a feeder sheet indicating which school their students continue on to was not received; (3) further Departmental input is required.

Incomplete (IC) -   Indicates the Department has not received the Accreditation Standards Report or some other data is incomplete and a status could not be assigned to the building. The department will require the building to submit the mandated report or missing data.

The fourth section of PA 25 was the Annual Educational Report. This report was completed by the principal in each building, with a public report presented on a yearly basis to the people in the area served by that building. The report must include the following: (a) The specific school improvement plan, (b) Student Achievement, (c) Retention and Dropout Rates, (d) Specialized Schools, (e) Parent participation in P.T.O. meetings and parent teacher conferences, (f) What accreditation status did the building achieve, (g) List in detail the items contained in the core curriculum.

After a school has failed to achieve at least interim status in a three year period it would be subject to sanctions in the fourth year. These sanctions could

include:

- state appointment of a new principal at the local districts expense of a new principal)

- opportunity for parents to send their child to another (accredited) school within the district.

- the school shall be closed.

As the research has shown, the principal is the key ingredient to successful, accredited schools. Principals, as instructional leader have found themselves facing challenges in working to achieve summary accreditation for their schools. The complexity of the challenge involves the need for the elementary principal to become knowledgeable about state requirements for full accreditation. Principals must lead their teachers in translating curriculum into practice.

This challenge includes working with classroom teachers and parents to provide opportunities for them to become knowledgeable to a point where implementation is possible. The challenge also includes dealing with the process of change among staff members, some of who may find change threatening. If the challenge is met, growth of student performance can reflect proportionately on efforts of the principal as the instructional leader.

Of Michigan's 3,331 schools, 145 met the criteria on the Michigan Department of Education's first accreditation report issued April 19, 1995. Of the 145 summary accredited schools, 112 were elementary schools. Additionally, 89 elementary schools in the state failed to meet the minimum criteria as set out in the new measure of school quality, indicating these schools did not meet the

state standards for excellence. Forty-five of the 89 schools that failed to meet minimum accreditation standards were elementary schools. According to former State Superintendent, Dr. Robert Schiller, ". . . the principal was the key to the success of the accredited school."

With the release of this accreditation data, a perfect opportunity is provided to study the leadership styles of the fully accredited elementary schools to determine common traits possessed by the leaders of these schools, and other characteristics that differ from principals of the unaccredited schools.

The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI), which was used for this study, was designed so that one could test Jung's personality theory and utilize the types in a practical manner. The authors, Myers and Briggs, constructed their instrument using Jung's personality theory. Their model included a Judging (J) or Perceiving (P) scale.

The MBTI contains four indices: Extrovert (E)/Introvert (I), Sensing (S)/Intuitive (N), Thinking (T)/Feeling (F), and Judging (J)/ Perceiving (P) which reflect the basic attitudes, functions and orientations which a person chooses

> in the road of human development, offering different paths that lead
> toward different kinds of excellence. . . the kind of excellence
> toward which they are headed is determined, according to type
> theory, by the inborn preferences that direct them at each fork of
> the road. (Myers, 1981)

Fiedler (cited in Hoy & Miskel, 1988) distinguished between leadership behavior and leadership style. Leadership behavior was defined as the specific tasks of leaders in directing and coordinating the work of their subordinates For example, leaders can suggest, make decisions, develop schedules, and promote their subordinates as part of their leadership behavior. In contrast, leadership

style is a personality characteristic and does not describe leadership behaviors that are consistent. Fiedler identified two basic leadership types, task-oriented and relationship-oriented.

The inventory measuring leadership types were the Least Preferred Co-worker Scale (LPC). The LPC score is obtained by first asking the 95 principals, (50 accredited, 45 unaccredited) to think of all the people with whom they have ever worked — these may be members of the present work group or those with whom they worked many years ago. The principals then rate a Bi-polar list of adjectives according to their perceptions of the type of person with whom they least preferred working.

Profiles from the results of the two scores were studied to find common characteristics in the principals of the accredited schools and the unaccredited schools.

The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) also provides clues to the personality style of individuals completing the inventory. By comparing the outcomes on the LPC and the MBTI, information regarding the relationship of general personality styles can be related to leadership styles that are reflective of leaders' personalities.

<u>The Purpose of the Study</u>

This study examined the relationships between personality characteristics as measured by the MBTI and leadership styles as measured by the LPC of elementary principals in accredited and unaccredited schools. A secondary purpose of this study is to determine if specific personality profiles differentiate

elementary school principals in educational settings that are considered successful from those in settings that are not successful.

Research Questions

The following research questions were addressed in this study:

1. Is there a difference in the personality characteristics of principals in accredited elementary schools and principals in elementary schools that are unaccredited?

2. Is there a difference in the leadership style of principals in accredited elementary schools and principals in elementary schools that are unaccredited?

3. Is there a relationship between leadership styles and personality types of elementary school principals?

Significance of the Study

This study is concerned with the relationship between the leadership styles of elementary school principals and the accreditation/nonaccreditation of their building as determined by the State Accreditation Process delineated in Public Act 25. The significance of the study lies in the implications for hiring and placement of elementary principals.

Many segments of the school population benefitted from this study; students, parents, teachers, boards of education, and the community at large. These groups benefit because principals, who have the traits of effective leadership, should do a better job as an instructional leader. This study can assist boards of education and superintendents in making logical choices for positive leadership in the elementary schools.

The long-term implications of the study are the potential for hiring

principals for unaccredited elementary schools. Understanding the relationship

between personality traits and leadership styles of successful elementary

principals could provide superintendents and boards of education with another

strategy when considering potential candidates for principalships.

Definitions

<u>Elementary Principals</u>	The school principal is the administrative head and educational leader of the school. In this position the principal is responsible for the total educational program and physical plant in compliance with policies, rules and procedures set forth in the Michigan School Code and by the local school board. Working with their staffs, school principals, exercise the primary leadership responsibility for improvement of instruction, development of curriculum, and the supervision of personnel and facilities assigned to them.
<u>Leadership</u>	A dynamic process of influencing people with a few toward leaders using their energies to release their potential of attaining the mission and goals of a given instruction.
<u>Curriculum</u>	Curriculum is a particular course of study, all such courses of study, collectively; the content of a subject area and how it is organized.
<u>Instructional Leader</u>	Assertive in their instructional role, assessment of programs, selection and evaluation of teaching staff using program needs as guidelines.
Instructional Leadership	A principal's actions or those s/he delegates to others, that promote growth in student learning. Generally these actions center on establishing schoolwide goals, defining the role of the school, providing needed resources needed to facilitate learning, providing supervision and evaluation for teachers, leading in staff development, and enabling and encouraging collaborative relationships with and among teachers. (DeBevoise, 1984).
<u>Elementary School</u>	An elementary school is a teaching institution that is

responsible for the educational needs of children from kindergarten through the fifth or sixth grade depending on the grade configurations of the school district.

Assumptions of the Study

The following assumptions were made for this study:

1. Elementary schools that are listed as accredited by the Michigan Department of Education have met all criteria required for this type of accreditation.

2. Elementary schools that are listed as failing to meet minimum standards for summary accreditation by the Michigan Department of Education have not met any of the criteria required for accreditation and are considered as unaccredited.

3. The principals' leadership styles can be effectively measured on a continuum from relationship-oriented to task-oriented.

4. The relationship between personality type and leadership style is not the sole predictor of the success or failure of students in either accredited or unaccredited elementary schools.

Limitations of the Study

Only accredited and unaccredited elementary school principals assigned to buildings in the State of Michigan were included in the study. While the results of this study cannot be generalized beyond Michigan, administrators in other states may be interested in the relationship between personality type and leadership style.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

This chapter presents a review of relevant literature on educational

leadership and personality theory associated with leadership. Researchers and

theorists; such as Jung, Deal, Hogan, Sergiovanni, Myers, and others; have

investigated perspectives and practices of effective and ineffective school

administrators. The effects of personality characteristics on leadership practices

are also included to show how these types of characteristics can affect the

school climate and school outcomes.

Leadership

Hesburgh (1988) suggested that a leader needs a clear and challenging

vision, a magic with words, the ability to motivate others, the courage to stay on

course, and the persistence not to lose hope. One of the most tangible and

indispensable characteristics of effective schools is strong administrative

leadership, without which the elements of good schooling can neither be brought

nor kept together. Being an effective school leader is both an art and science.

Effective school leaders work long and hard to develop their leadership skills.

Guild (1987) found no single image or simple formula for successful instructional

leadership, which caused her to conclude that self-awareness was important in

the development of leadership abilities. Leaders should also learn to work

effectively with people that have different cognitive characteristics. They are

constantly practicing and refining their skills. Effective school leaders have

developed the essence of leadership, which is to influence others toward

accomplishing the organizational goals. Effective school leaders get others

"turned on" about their work and keep them that way. Effective school leaders

work hard at understanding and motivating people. Hersey (1984) indicated

there were three keys to long range effectiveness as a leader:

1. Understanding people's past behavior. What evoked the behavior? What helped or hindered them in accomplishing the task?

2. Predicting future behavior. How will a person behave in the future under the same conditions, but in the rapidly changing environment of today's world?

3. Directing, changing and controlling behavior. You must take the responsibility for influencing the behavior of others. This is the key to getting results. The crucial factor in getting results is the relationship between the leader and the followers. Effectiveness is determined by the interactions between the patterns of behavior and values of both the leader and followers (p. 96).

Clark (1995) discussed leadership skills needed by effective principals.

Some of the skills listed in her article include:

- Principals must be team builders.

- A good leader knows the community and what resources are available.

- Principals must understand human nature.

- Have a vision for their school vision is a dream put into action.

- Principals need to know how to plan. (p. 35)

Lesourd, Tracz, and Grady (1992) studied attitudes toward visionary

leadership. A total of 387 principals were used to determine if there were

differences between the conceptualization of visionary attributes and managerial

qualities of principals. In addition, the study also verified the existence of five

components of vision. The five types of vision attributes included:

1. Visionary principals have strong personal convictions to which they are enthusiastically committed.

2. Visionary principals work toward realizing goals that are consistent with their personal convictions.

3. Visionary principals treat the school organization as a culture with traits and processes that are to be skillfully employed in efforts to effect change.

4. Visionary principals gain reputations as innovators because they assertively initiate new actions and new directions for their schools.

5. Visionary principals have a personal image of their school in the fixture. The imagined school of the future is better in some ways than the school of the present. Tenacious pursuit of a better future drives the leadership actions of visionary principals. (p. 35)

The researchers determined that effective leaders have both visionary attributes as well as management qualities. Leaders who are inclined to precipitate change are considered to be visionary.

According to Guttmann (1994), leadership is expressed in a variety of ways. While common traits of an effective leader may not be obvious, they may be enhanced through training, learning, experience, and by the employment of others. Guttmann stated:

Many debates have centered around whether leadership can be developed or is innate, whether a person can be simultaneously a leader and a manager, and whether or not there is really a significant difference between the two. (p. 135)

Guttmann studied personality traits of 48 principals through handwriting analysis and their responses to a survey that asked the respondent to define the importance of interpersonal relationships in leadership, relate strategies they used to motivate other people, and describe major catalysts for gain or change. The purpose of the research was to provide insight into leadership and management.

The principals were asked to prioritize traits that a leader, manager, or a leader/manager should possess. Composites of leaders, managers, and leader/managers were developed through content analysis of their responses. A leader was described as a risk taker, a visionary, an enabler, a planner/director and a booster. A manager may be somewhat of a risk taker, a director/planner, and a booster, but his/her role is not that of a visionary or enabler particularly in being able to empower others. Five characteristics that were common to the 25 principals who were considered leader/managers included:

- risk taker,

- visionary,

- enabler,

- planner/director,

- booster.

The differences between leaders and managers were defined by the respondents. Their responses included:

- A *leader* has vision and the ability to empower. The *manager* facilitates the creation and the decision of the leader.

- A *leader* is a change agent. A *manager* guides an organization toward established goals and objectives.

- A *leader* scans, plans, develops personnel, delegates, works with more intangibles, and evaluates progress. A *manager* maintains the present and can do this by working with tangible items.

- A *leader* initiates, sets the tone, charts new directions, inspires people, and creates excitement. A *manager* ensures that things are moving along in an orderly, present direction.

- A *leader* develops new initiatives, sets directions, and reaches beyond expectations. A *manager* simply directs the course of an organization according to a predetermined set of parameters.

- A *leader* guides and develops people. A *manager* oversees tasks and programs.

- A *leader* is an intrinsic part of the mission and gives a sense of direction. A *manager* controls and manipulates resources to achieve a specific task.

- A *leader* has vision and knows how to move the organization "strategically" to new and higher levels. A *manager* does just that – s/he maintains the status quo and makes organizations work well.

- A *leader* sees an unmet and compelling need and believes that s/he has the ability and/or position to arouse, to encircle, and to direct others in reading targeted outcomes.

- A *leader* creates energy and accomplishments in an organization by being "visible" and by providing an environment where others are encouraged to take risks and excel. A *manager* makes sure things get done.

- A *leader* must have a vision or understandable goals and must be able to communicate these goals. A *manager* may have goals also but would be more likely to facilitate the arrival at goals; to help others produce the work effort; to set the schedule; and to revise, to re-evaluate, or to do what is necessary. (Guttman, 1994, pp 138-139)

This study showed that leadership was composed of many facets and that it required all kinds of leaders who work together with others to produce the "best" for everyone. Guttmann concluded that the most effective leader is one who can adjust and be productive in all types of situations.

Scarnati (1994), a junior-senior high school principal, detailed nine rules for administrators. These rules are basic in the principalship, as well as in life, but are often neglected. These rules reflect professional ethics and standards of behaviors that transcend the various theories of management. The nine rules include:

1. Practice honesty and integrity. A successful leader (human being) continually demonstrates honesty and integrity as an essential element of his/her professional fabric.

2. <u>Work to eliminate fear</u>. Fear hinders communication, inhibits professional growth, and destroys confidence in the administration, eventually resulting in administrator's hearing only "good" news.

3. <u>Demonstrate care and understanding</u>. In the business of managing people, attention to detain is important. Little things matter, with positive human interaction, being an important component in successful leadership practices.

4. <u>Accept responsibility</u> - Principals need to learn to share the credit when things go right and acknowledge responsibility when things go wrong. Administrators delegate tasks to others in the organization, but retain the responsibility for the success or failure of all projects. While it is easy to accept credit for successful ventures, some administrators have difficulty in acknowledging responsibility for failures.

5. <u>Develop a service mentality</u>, The primary function of an administrator is to initiate, serve, facilitate, manage, orchestrate. Successful administrators have a service mentality that was developed early in their careers and continue to treat all others as valued customers.

6. <u>Develop loyalty</u>. Loyalty; defined as an unwavering commitment to colleagues, the organization, and oneself; is an undervalued characteristic of an effective leader. A loyal administrator provides accurate and timely input to superiors during the decision making process, and then supports all courses of action that are moral and legal once the decision has been made.

7. <u>Be flexible and adaptable</u> - Flexibility helps people respond to change, be influenced, make appropriate modifications and accept variations. The dynamic discipline of educational management requires administrators to be flexible and adaptable.

8. <u>Develop listening skills</u>. Listening skills are one of the most important skills an effective leader can exhibit. Covey (in Scarnati, 1994) stated a simple principle for listening: "Seek first to understand, then to be understood" (p. 81).

9. <u>Practice humility</u>. An effective principal never lets his/her education get in the way of learning. Without humility and recognition of personal limitations, principals cannot become lifelong learners.

For a principal to be effective, they need to be able to deal with people at all points along a continuum, educationally, economically, and socially. The educational administrator should not allow him/herself to be considered

pompous, isolated, or aloof, talking down to their constituencies. Using the nine rules for success can provide a strong ethical and professional approach to becoming an effective leader in an educational setting (Scarnati, 1994).

Leadership Weaknesses

McKenzie (1992) discussed the leadership style practiced by Odysseus the bold, courageous, resourceful hero of the Greeks. Despite the positive leadership qualities exhibited by Odysseus, he was also arrogant, impulsive, self guided, and reckless. His leadership styles weaknesses should be used as a warning for school leaders on how not to lead. Odysseus never took time to assess potential dangers, never consulted members of his team, and he depended on inspiration along with impulsive responses, based on instinct, to management problems rather than develop carefully planned problem-solving strategies. Leaders must be flexible and alert, seek wise counsel, and study history to determine the best ways to become and maintain effectiveness as leaders.

Effects of Leadership Styles

The leadership style of a principal could have a positive effect on promoting teacher skills, abilities and attitudes or it could stifle motivation and lead to teacher disenchantment and discouragement. According to Norris (1991), effective leaders should be able to appreciate the diversity of teachers and use that diversity to enhance student learning. To be considered effective, leaders need to understand their own cognitive styles and strive to enhance their capacity for more holistic thinking. Norris concluded "only as we free our own thinking can we help others become all they are capable of being" (p. 133).

Leadership as a Change Agent

Champlain (1987) identified seven critical factors that are necessary in reorganizing a school.

- The creation of a supporting enabling environment.

- The presence of clear, attainable goals that are publicized and constantly in use.

- The presence of a change agent who can effectively break the equilibrium holding an organization in place.

- The use of a systemic, planned process that is open and subject to alteration.

- The involvement of the community as an active partner and participant in any major change.

- The presence of effective leadership with vision, a sense of mission, a good measure of courage, and a sense of the importance of followers.
- A commitment to renewal that disallows compromising for lesser attainments and always aspires to higher levels of sophistication.

In the same article, Champlain listed ten critical areas of importance for effective leaders acting as change agents in a school district:

- Establish expectations

- Influence the community

- Ensure readiness

- Restructure the role of the teacher

- Reshape the role of the principal

- Articulate the vision

- Develop a state of continuing renewal

- Create an opportunity for self-esteem

- Control change

- Insist on organizational excellence.

Using these critical areas in a leadership plan can help principals become better

leaders and facilitate change.

The Core Task of Leadership: Reforming or Recharging

Managers solve problems, leaders confront dilemmas (Deal, 1987).

Leaders in all types of organizations are confronted with many of the same

issues that educators now face:

1. How do we encourage meaning and commitment,

2. How do we deal with loss and change and;

3. How can we shape symbols that convey the essence of the enterprise to insiders and outsiders.

Leaders should be able to move from the metaphoric to a literal course of action.

Some means for reforming, while revitalizing, the culture of public schools

include:

1. Recreate the history of a school with community and teachers studying the history. By seeing the Past and Present a new sense of direction was shared.

2. Articulate shared values - let all stakeholders in the educational process know the mission of the school.

3. Anoint and celebrate heros. Invite successful alumnus back as they can best tell students about their success and the role of the school in contributing to this success.

4. Reinvigorate rituals and ceremonies. Have a dinner for the teachers. Honor the profession.

5. Tell Good Stories - During faculty meetings share good stories about exemplary students.

6. Work with the informal network of cultural players. Make sure all district employees are part of the educational process. ie. Have custodial recognition days, etc. Celebrate visions and educational dreams.

In a qualitative study of administrative success; Wendel, Hoke and Jackel

(1993) asked officials from educational institutions, professional organizations,

and universities to nominate outstanding educational administrators. They

received over 1,000 names of principals who were considered to be outstanding.

The researchers contacted all nominees and explained the purpose of Project

Success. Of the 1,000 administrators, 491 submitted usable responses to

requests for information regarding their perceptions of what made them

successful administrators. Eighty-nine of the responding principals were from

senior high school principals. Eleven factors were identified that contributed to

their professional success:

1. Hard Work Successful administrators worked hard, took time for family and self, and reveled in the challenges of the principalship. They were willing to work the long hours required of a high school principal and maintained a balanced perspective of whatever it took to cope with their heavy demands.

2. Put students first - The first priority for successful principals was the best interests of their students. Effective principals believed in the potential of all students to learn and be successful.

3. High expectations - Outstanding administrators encouraged students and staff members to reach their potential. Excellence was expected, but never achieved as further improvements were always possible.

4. Community outreach - Secondary school principals must work will all stakeholders of education; students, faculty, staff, parents, patrons, taxpayers, senior citizens, adult learners, and members of special interest groups; to have success. There is a need to know and involve these stakeholders in developing a positive relationship between a school and its community. Striving to link the school and the community marks outstanding principals.

5. Positive staff relations - Principals often attribute a school's success to their staff and not to themselves. They have the insight to recognize that the ability to identify and select superior people for their staffs will contribute to the overall success of the school, reflecting on the success of the principal.

6. <u>Professional Growth</u> - Success is not possible unless the principal values personal growth and recognizes the need to continue to grow in his/her position. Of the principals in the study, one attributed professional growth as the first among several reasons for success, while another principal indicated it was the final factor for success.

7. <u>Clear Personal Philosophy</u> - Outstanding principals held strong beliefs and expressed deep commitment to them. One principal was quoted as writing "I believe in leading [by] using principles to guide decision making, such as integrity, fairness, humility, crediting others for good work, and service" (p. 53).

8. <u>Risk Taking</u> - Successful principals indicated personal responsibility for beliefs and actions. Some principals integrated risk taking with comments regarding change, innovation, staying fresh, and excellence. While risk taking was considered to have liabilities for the principal, it was considered a necessary component of the job and a fundamental factor in effecting change in their schools.

9. <u>Effective Communications</u> - A successful principal must have effective communication skills. Communication skills were often paired with sensitivity and listening, with good communication considered more interactive in nature, rather than two-way as it was usually conceptualized.

10. <u>Vision Setting</u> - Successful principals planned for the future and had a vision of what their schools should be like. Successful principals saw challenges instead of problems. They looked for the best in people and situations and viewed their teachers and students as the best in education.

11. <u>Collaborative leadership</u> - Successful principals used leadership skills that were collaborative and collegial, multidimensional in nature, and provide training programs that developed leadership skills in others.

The outstanding principals participating in this study indicated that the best way to be successful was to have definite ideas about what factors contributed to effectiveness as a leader and capitalize on these personal strengths. The participants in this study understood the need to be a role model and for staff and students and to strive to be better in all things (Wendel, et al. 1993).

Clio (1994) studied how principals get their job done in situations for which

conventional administrative authority and methods were ineffective. He

interviewed 30 high school principals in Pennsylvania using the critical incident

technique and a set of general interview questions. This study was intended to

identify micropolitical strategies that effective principals used to get their jobs

done. The principals included in this study were considered effective and were

selected from recommendations received from Intermediate Units and the

Pennsylvania Association of Secondary School Principals. Each of the principals

had at least five years experience as a principal. The findings of this study

indicated that the combination of scarce resources, human nature, and the need

to do the job contributed to the use of micropolitical strategies. The six

micropolitical strategies developed by Hoyle (cited in Clio, 1994) and Crowson

and Porter-Gehrie's (cited in Clio, 1994) seven strategies were:

1. Dividing and ruling - Avoid full faculty meetings or treat them purely as informational and then make deals with individual teachers or departments about specific matters.

2. Coopation - Take in your competition rather than isolate them.

3. Displacement - disguise the real issue, which is often personal, with a legitimate, professional one.

4. Controlling information - The strategic acquisition, distribution, presentation, doctoring, and withholding of information.

5. Controlling meetings: This involves selection of agenda items, interpreting "consensus," pressuring committee members, and massaging the minutes.

6. Exchanges: Both teachers and principals have "goods" which they exchange with each other (Hoyle, cited in Clio, 1994, p. 92).

7. Discretionary behavior: Scarce resources sometimes make the principal bend the rules to fit the situation (Crowson & Porter-Gehrie in Clio, 1994, p. 93).

Thirty Pennsylvania high school principals were interviewed, with each

interview lasting at least one hour. The researchers' intention was to find out how these principals were able to meet the daily challenges in their schools. Eighty percent of the 30 principals in the study indicated they used at least one micropolitical strategy (Clio, 1994). The most prevalent strategy used by the principals was some form of exchange theory. This strategy was mutually beneficial because both the principal and teacher get what they want. The strategy of divide and conquer was employed when the principal considered a situation too formidable to take on the entire faculty or event a department, such as a program or policy change. The findings of the study further supported the view that micropolitical techniques could be an important part of tactics employed by principals to get the job done.

The Roots of School Leadership

Sergiovanni suggested three theories of leadership for educators:

- The Pyramid Theory - one person assumes the responsibility by providing directions, supervision, and inspection. The theory works well for organizations that produce standardized products in uniform ways, it becomes a bureaucratic right move when applied in the wrong setting. When applied to schools, for example, it simplifies and standardizes the work of principals and teachers.

- The Railroad Theory - assumes the way to control the work of people in different jobs is to standardize the work process. Everyone is put on the same track, all tasks become basically the same. Just follow the tracks. With this theory principals and teachers use fewer skills, and student work becomes increasingly the same.

- The High Performance Theory - decentralization is key, workers are empowered to make decisions on how to best accomplish a given task. Connect workers tightly to ends, but only loosely to means.

Sergiovanni (1994) inferred that these three theories did not provide the best leadership approach for school leaders. He proposed an alternative

approach that viewed the school as a moral community to provide moral connections among teachers, principals, parents, and students. Moral connections would promote stronger bonds than extrinsic or intrinsic reward connections because they are derived from commitments to shared values.

Effective executive leadership is action applied to a specific occasion or situation, not part of a broad legal mandate defining the executives power, or at least not specifically cited in it (English, 1992). According to English, Machiavelli understood that boldness meant becoming a momentary tyrant because it involved acting suddenly, and sometimes in secret. The speed with which some members of the educational community may leave the effective executive with no alternatives. To act decisively, an executive must often exceed his or her base of authority. Taking the initiative can be crucial to strong leadership, leaving the executive open to criticism from other stakeholders in education.

All principals must understand basic principles if they want to be effective in their positions. These principles, discussed by Luce (1994) included:

- *Keep kids first in every decision that is made.* Educators need to provide quality service to all students. They need to ask the question: "Would I want my own child assigned to that class?"

- *Seek advice from veteran principals that you know.* Classes, seminars, tapes, can never replace advice from a respected colleague. Through experience, other principals have faced similar situations and it helps to see how they handled the problem and outcomes from their actions. Build a network of principal friends.

- Practice lead management (managing by being a leader) not boss management (managing by being a boss). Work with teachers and staff in collegial relationships. There are times when boss management is still needed, but is much more effective when used sparingly.

- *Hire good people, give them direction, support them, then get out of their way.* Never establish so many rules and regulations that the

ingenuity of teachers are hampered. Let them teach.

- *Support the superintendent and the board.* If the philosophy of the superintendent, board and principal are not in concordance, it may be time to leave the district. If you disagree with a decision, make sure it is done behind closed doors.

- *Understand that the blob runs in all directions.* No matter what you do, nor how hard you try, things over which you have no control will go crazy all at the same time. Stay cool!

- *Try not to take things personally.* It is impossible to make everyone happy. Do your best and learn to develop a thick skin. Let the criticism be considered worthwhile and do not worry about it.

- *Become an expert in school law.* Always give everyone their due process when matters that deal with legal issues, and follow the direction of your school attorney. Understand the nature of your position. You may feel torn in several directions, just continue to make decisions that are in the best interest of students and parents.

Principals of dynamic schools often perceive their work as complex, consisting of several interdependent roles that require them to interact with different internal and external constituencies (Goldring & Raillis,). Principals are not simply leaders; rather, they are leaders because they are facilitators, balancers, flag bearers, bridgers, and inquirers. According to the authors, these roles include:

- As a facilitator, the principal motivates and coordinates in a variety of ways. Symbolic acts, such as finding a small reward for a successful task force; political acts, such as asking the union president to speak at a meeting; structural acts, like providing substitutes to cover classes for teachers who are on a faculty-hiring committee are examples. These acts can serve to encourage a collaborative and professional atmosphere, keeping the school moving forward.

- As a balancer, the principal must be responsive to those above and below in the hierarchy, as well as other constituencies. As balancers, they walk a line between independence and dependence, between autonomy and external influence. Principals of dynamic schools succeeded as balancers by defining and establishing strong and mutually beneficial relationships with their superintendent and central offices. These principals also maintain appropriate relationships with

their teachers, support staff, parents, and students to provide effective leadership.

- When principals act as flagbearers, they represent the school in positive ways to enhance the reputation of the school and students. The flagbearer is a leader, especially in acting as a change agent to provide educational innovations within their schools.

- Principals are required to perform as bridgers to complete the gaps between external and internal constituencies. For example, when parents and teachers are having problems regarding a student, the principal must often mediate and provide closure with both factions feeling their needs have been met optimally. Principals often bridge the gap between their staff and central office by providing them with information on district policies and procedures that are being initiated and sharing district results on standardized testing.

- Principals who act as inquirers are able to move beyond the obvious facts in a situation that involves other stakeholders in education to ask the next question that can provide additional information to solve a problem and determine reasons for teachers reluctance to accept change.

In summary principals of dynamic schools know themselves and are aware of their strengths and limitations, passions and indifferences. These principals embrace forces in their environment and interpret voices within their communities.

According to Niece (1993) instructional leaders shared certain characteristics. He identified three objectives for this study:

- To generate categories of instructional leadership descriptors.

- To identify sources that previously influenced selected secondary principal as they were emerging into instructional leaders.

- To determine sources that principals currently seek out for instructional leadership advice and information.

Niece listed the findings of three major objectives of the study:

1. Effective instructional leaders were generally people oriented and interactional.

2. Effective instructional leaders functioned within a network of other principals.

3. Administrative practitioners were listed as a major influence on developing secondary principals.

Proficiencies for Principals

Principal proficiencies were a topic of examination by the National Association of Elementary School Principals (NAESP). This area was considered important as the role of the principal continues to change from manager to facilitator. Four prerequisites for principals to function successfully as school leaders include:

1. *Advanced skills in the teaching and learning process.* Principals should be solidly grounded in contemporary and traditional instructional techniques and strategies from both a theoretical and practical perspective. They should be able to recognize effective teaching practices and evaluate progress in learning appropriately.

2. Principals should develop a thorough understanding of practical applications of child growth and development. They should be experienced in teaching children; and capable of ensuring that the curriculum is both challenging and developmentally appropriate.

3. Principals need a solid background in the liberal arts. Principals should have a firm grasp of basic curriculum content, as well as an understanding of the relationship between that body of knowledge and the elementary/middle level curriculum.

4. A sincere commitment to children's welfare and progress is needed by elementary school principals. Principals should be caring people who understand the importance of creating a learning climate based on mutual trust and respect, that produces high morale, and places strong emphasis on the fact that all children can succeed as students.

Part of the responsibilities of an effective principals as an instructional leader includes motivating others to produce in the classroom. Krupp (1994) discussed six essential characteristics that principals need if they expect to

motivate their staff to help students learn optimally. These characteristics

include:

1. *Know yourself.* A principal cannot know his/her staff and what motivates them unless the principal knows him/herself. The principal should develop self confidence as low self confidence could result in low staff moral.

2. *Like yourself.* Effective principals focus on their strengths not their weaknesses. They set high standards for themselves. Principals who feel good about themselves can establish high standards for the building.

3. *Take control.* Self confidence allows people to take charge, make decisions and take responsibility for their actions.

4. *Be flexible.* Principals should recognize that every problem may have several solutions, with no single approach applicable to all situations. Flexible principals have more room to grow and have a positive influence on others. Flexible principals also act as positive role models for teachers on the staff. They provide encouragement for participation in staff development to help their staff grow and develop in their positions.

5. *Accept reality.* Realistic principals accept things for what they are, accept the fact that children have changed and work hard to over come mistakes. Realistic principals communicate honestly with the faculty. Realists also provide the kind of support that is needed to encourage staff members.

6. *Live fully.* The best educators have other interests, such as travel, write, read, sew, bake, bike. These individuals enrich their school with their interests in other areas.

Effective Leaders" cannot model qualities unless they also possess those

qualities. To be able to provide motivation for their staff, they must motivate

themselves to become up-beat and growth-oriented.

A study by Blase and Kirby (1992) investigated teachers' perceptions of

the strategies used by principals to influence them. A total of 836 teachers

participated in this study and provided detailed descriptions of 1,323 strategies

that were used by effective principals. Among the strategies cited most

frequently by teachers included: praising, setting high expectations, involving teachers in school-wide decisions, expanding teachers' autonomy in the areas of curriculum and instruction, increasing teachers' opportunities for professional development, providing adequate resources, and offering advice or suggestions.

Of all the strategies that were used to influence teachers' work, praise was the one most frequently reported in the study. Use of this strategy was perceived by the responding teachers as one of the most effective strategies for motivating teachers. While they indicated that praise did not need to be formal or lengthy, Blase and Kirby (1992) offered a number of suggestions for using praise effectively:

- *Praise sincerely.* Effective principals express praise in a comfortable and natural way; it is congruent with their other behaviors and personal characteristics.

- *Maximize the use of nonverbal communications.* Effective principals use nonverbal gestures such as smiles, and nods to communicate approval — especially during classroom observations.

- *Schedule time for teacher recognition.* Some principals give regular praise at the beginning or end of faculty meetings or at student assemblies to recognize teachers for excellence in teaching and working with students.

- *Write brief personal notes to compliment individuals.* While verbal praise is a good way to motivate teachers, putting the praise in writing and including a copy in their personnel file shows the teacher that the professional accomplishment was worthwhile.

- *Show pride in teachers by boasting.* Effective principals praise their teachers to parents, colleagues, and others in the community.

- *Target praise to teachers' work.* Because of the isolation and uncertainty characteristic of the profession, teachers are most responsive to praise bestowed for school-related success. Whenever possible, principals should commend specific professional accomplishments of individual teachers.

Principals and School Reorganization

Dubin (19XX) conducted a review of literature on the role of principals in school reogranization. He integrated the findings from several researchers in the area of effective schools and school organization drawing the following conclusions from his review:

- While most authors identified the need for technology to amass and analyze information essential to proactive decision making, most principals practiced a hands-on, people-generated information approach. This method allowed them to be able to both collect the requisite information and interpret, extrapolate and sift through it on a personal level. This active involvement in the data was missing from the hard, tangible summarized data that was reflected in charts, tables and numbers crunching.

- Most authors indicated a need for dramatic change in the overriding organizational structure of education. Accountability was needed at all levels to help identify areas of weakness that could be more readily remediated. For this to identification and remediation to occur, Dubin suggested greater collaboration among schools, districts, communities, businesses, government, and colleges and universities.

- Dubin identified the many roles that are played by successful principals:

  - as *facilitator/CEOs* whose roles must be elastic to meet changing needs of a complex school system and society;

  - *politician/CEOs*, who need to politic more to have various groups of his community "buy into" his decisions; and

  - entrepreneur/CEOs, who are always aware of additional funding sources available to support school programs and activities.

Teacher Empowerment Depends on Needs, Expectations of Principals, Schools, Districts

Principals' varying leadership styles, ideologies, and contextual constraints can affect their success in implementing school improvement projects based upon faculty empowerment (Kirby, Wimpelberg, & Keaster, 1992).

Principals need to be able to anticipate and manage conflicts emanating from

differences in needs and expectations of the principal participants, their individual faculties, and the employing school district.

Two characteristics with specific consequences for programs that emphasize teacher empowerment are the principal's degree of experience and comfort with participative decision making. The principal's experience with conceptualizing a structured approach to problem solving can be an important element in developing methods to implement participative decision making as part of teacher empowerment. Principals must be aware of conflicts they are likely to face when attempting to encourage teachers to provide input into decision making as part of their improvement efforts.

Regardless of the sources of conflict created by any change model, the conflicts must be anticipated where possible, or confronted as they emerge. The success of the school improvement program may depend on careful selection of participants, monitoring progress, and negotiation of expectations. The number of adaptations allowed that conflict with the philosophical intent of the program will have direct impact on the chances of success.

Leadership Styles

Bolman and Deal (1991) studied an international sample of principals and other administrators. Based on the results of this study, he developed four frameworks for organizations that corresponds to skills shown by leaders:

- *Structural* - School leaders in this category are goal setters. They value efficiency, analysis, and data, while keeping a close eye on the bottom line. These leaders are good at giving clear directions and holding people accountable. Organizations led by these leaders tend to have a "factory" culture. (Task Oriented Leaders)

- *Human resource* - To the human resource leader, people come first. Their feelings, needs, and values take precedence over day-to-day problems. Leaders in this category believe that if the people within the school "family" are taken care of, the organization will run smoothly as a result. School leaders in this mode support, empower, and facilitate the work of others. (Relationship Oriented Leaders)

- *Political* - Leaders in this category see the systems in which they work as "jungles" fraught with competition for scarce resources. These leaders make good advocates and negotiators. They are skilled at networking, creating coalitions, and working out compromises.

- *Symbolic* - To these leaders, facts are only as true as they are perceived by individuals. Cultural symbols provide a shared sense of mission and identity. Leaders in this category often are charismatic and inspiring, and act as both prophets and poets.

Bolman and Deal (1991) inferred that most administrative educational programs emphasize structural skills, with a focus on managing rather than inspiring. Although this style can produce effective managers, administrators also need to have access to other leadership styles and develop an ability to adjust their styles to the specific tasks at hand.

Instructional Leadership: How Principals Make a Difference

A 1986 study by the Smith and Andrews examined principals who were identified by their superintendents and peers as instructional leaders. As defined by Smith and Andrews, the principal as an instructional leader is able to:

1. Provide necessary resources to achieve the school's academic goals;

2. Possess adequate knowledge and skill in curriculum and instructional matters so that teachers perceive that their interaction with the principal leads to improved instructional practice;

3. Be a skilled communicator in one-on-one, small-group, and large-group settings; and

4. Be a visionary who creates an image of what the school is all about for the staff, students, and parents.

These principals were perceived by their staffs as spending their time quite differently than average principals. Based on their findings, principals, who were perceived to be instructional leaders, believed they should spend most of their time and energy on educational program improvement. Average principals did not implement their values on a day-to-day basis as they allocated their time among tasks to be performed. Average principals in the study spent more time on management (39%) and student services (28%) than they did on educational improvement (27%). The strong instructional leaders in the study spent more of their time on educational program improvement (41%). While they spent substantially more time on educational program improvement, they did not divert time away from building management functions, spending almost the same amount of time on management (34%) as average principals. Strong instructional leaders spent less time on student-related services and activities (18%) and other areas.

Smith and Andrews (1986) concluded:

Our attempts to understand what the average principal does every day and what principals who are considered to be instructional leaders do every day suggest that principals who re instructional leaders are able to organize their day so they focus their time and attention on instructional matters rather than the routine matters of running the school. Thus, the issue for the average principal is not misplaced values but a poor allocation of discretionary time, or simply poor behavioral patterns. (p.   )

Lind and Otte (1994) examined management styles with a survey sent to 1,000 human resource professionals. Of this number, 355 valid responses were returned. According to the data analysis, specific mediating variables; including self-esteem, locus of control, and Type A behavior; could predict stress relative to the leadership style (authoritative, benevolent, consultative, participative) of

respondents' managers.

Krupp (1994), in her article, "Motivation Begins With You" discussed motivation as a part of leadership. According to the article, both children and adults attempted to avoid depressed or stubborn people, while gravitating to enthusiastic, growth-oriented individuals when looking for leadership. These natural leaders have several characteristics. They know and like themselves, take control, demonstrate flexibility, accept responsibility, and live fully. Principals, as leaders, must motivate themselves to become upbeat and growth oriented if they expect to find these traits in others.

Leadership: Effectiveness and Personality

Hogan, Curphy, and Hogan (1994) answered nine questions about leadership. According to the authors, many studies, books, articles, and presentations are completed each year on leadership, but most focus on research on narrowly defined issues, rather than applications of leadership factors for the lay public. To narrow the gap between research and practical knowledge needed by practitioner and the public, the authors posed and answered nine questions relating to leadership.

What is leadership? Hogan, et al. (1994) defined leadership as a method of persuading other people to forego their personal concerns for a length of time and pursue common goals that are important for responsibilities and welfare of a group.

Does leadership matter? According to Hogan, et al. (1994), the base rate for managerial incompetence is between 60% and 75% in the United States, with

DeVries (in Hogan, et al., 1994) reporting that approximately 50% of senior executives in corporate American have failed. The problems associated with these failures include an unwillingness to exercise authority and management tyranny of subordinates. Associated with the failure of managers is the effectiveness of the organization. Studies by Chidester, Helmreich, Gregorich and Geis; Curphy, 1991, 1993; House, Spangler, and Woycke, 1991; and Smith, Carson, and Alexander, 1984 (In Hogan, et al. 1994) noted that specific leader characteristics were associated with enhanced team performance.

How are leaders chosen? Several methods have been found that can predict leadership success reasonably well. Some of these methods include tests of cognitive ability, personality tests, structured interviews, simulations, and assessment centers (Hogan, et al. 1994). Many organizations are either unaware of these methods or prefer to use their own system of choosing administrative personnel. Technical skill may be used as a predictor of leadership skills in some organizations, especially in schools, the military services, or in technology-intensive corporations. Basing a decision on administrative competency using technical skill proficiencies rather than psychological factors makes little sense as organizational structures continue to evolve.

How should leaders be evaluated? According to Hogan, et al. (1994), the team, group, and/or organizational effectiveness should provide the basis for measure the leadership skills of managers. Leaders are often evaluated in terms of:

- actual performance of the units for which they are responsible, subordinates',

- peers' or supervisors' ratings of leadership competency,

- performance in interviews, simulations, assessment centers, or leaderless group discussions.

- self-ratings of leadership competency

- perceptions of the effectiveness of leaders by personals whose careers are in jeopardy or are being eliminated from promotion.

Why do we choose so many flawed leaders? Because few organizations choose to use psychological and personality factors in choosing leaders, the failure rate of managers continues to be approximately 50%. Choosing flawed leaders is often a result of trying to evaluate leadership potentials of strangers using interviews and simulations.

Studies on emergent leadership and implicit leadership theory have determined that specific characteristics of persons who appear to be capable of being leades. Stodgill (in Hogan, et al., 1994) in a review of literature on emergent leadership found that measures of dominance, extraversion, sociability, ambition or achievement, responsibility, integrity, self-confidence, mood and emotional control, diplomacy, and cooperativeness appeared to be related to emergent leadership. These measures are inherent in the personality profiles of leaders. Kenny and Zaccaro (in Hogan, et al., 1994) found that 48% and 82% of the variance in leadership emergence rankings resulted from personality characteristics. Use of leaderless discussion groups provides a forum for determining the emergent leadership potential of strangers seeking administrative positions.

Hollander and Julian (in Hogan, et al., 1994) referred to implicit leadership theory as reflecting the degree to which people appear to be leaderlike based on characteristics (i.e., intelligence, personality, or values) which match others

preconceived notions of what leaders should be like. Many researchers (i.e.,

Eden & Leviathan, 1975; Lord, Foti, & DeVader, 1984; Rush, Thomas, & Lord,

1977; Weiss & Adler, 1981) referenced by Hogan, et al, (1994) found that

individuals have generalized ideas about leadership and use these ideas to

evaluate leadership potential of strangers.

Hogan, et al (1994) asserted that flawed leaders are chosen because

search committees choose candidates on the basis of principles that guide

leadership emergence and not using established principles of personnel

selection. Candidates that appear to be leaderlike will probably be selected,

although these people may lack necessary skills that are required to build and

guide an effective system.

How to forecast leadership? Using a combination of cognitive ability,

personality, simulation, role pallay, and multirater assessment instruments and

techniques, leadership abilities can be predicted. Specific personality dimensions

have been found to be related consistently to leadership effectiveness. For

example, Stogdill (in Hogan, et al., 1994) suggested that surgency (i.e.,

dominance, assertiveness, energy, oral communications, sociability, and social

participation) emotional stability (i.e., adjustment, emotional balance,

independence, and self-confidence), conscientiousness (i.e., responsibility,

achievement, initiative, personal integrity, and ethnical conduct), and

agreeableness (i.e., friendliness, social nearness, and support) were positively

related to leadership effectiveness. His findings were supported through

subsequent research by Bentz (in Hogan, 1994) and Bray and Howard (1993)

who found that personality traits were the best predictors of management

effectiveness.

Why do leaders fail? While some leaders fail through no fault of their own, many leaders fail because of personal reasons rather than structural or economic reasons. While these leaders may be successful in working alone (i.e., accounting, teaching, etc.), when they move into positions that require them to work through others to attain successful outcomes, they fail because they are unable to build the team concept. This phenomenon is universal, occurring in business, education, and service organizations. A large body of research is concerned with management incompetence. As detailed by Hogan, et al. (1994), managers, who are hard-working, ambitious, smart, and technically competent, fail because they are perceived as arrogant, vindictive, untrustworthy, selfish, abrasive, emotional, compulsive, overcontrolling, insensitive, abrasive, aloof, too ambitious, or unable to delegate or make decisions.

How do leaders build teams? The effectiveness of a leader is often determined by his/her ability to build a team within his/her organization. Hallam and Campbell (in Hogan, et al., 1994) identified eight leadership problems that affect team performance. The six task-related problems include: communication of a clear mission, identifying available resources and talent, developing talent, planning and organizing, coordinating work activities, and acquiring needed resources. Maintenance-related problems require leaders to minimize conflicts among group members and facilitate team members understanding of team goals, constraints, resources, and problems. The leader's personality has predictable effects on team performance, with leaders who achieve higher surgency scores more able to communicate with their teams. This ability can

increase the probability that the team understands its goal and performance standards required for achievement of this goal. Conscientiousness, agreeableness, emotional stability, are personality factors that affect the leader's ability to work and motivate teams to their highest performance levels.

What about leadership in Workforce 2000? As organizations downsize, fewer managerial positions will be needed and responsibilities of first-line managers and supervisors will expand (Hogan, et al., 1994). This same situation will exist for school districts, with central office positions being reorganized into smaller, more cohesive units and principals assuming more authority as part of the move towards site-based management. This trend has five implications for administrators:

1. Due to competition for talented employees and expansion of managerial responsibilities, overall quality of management needs to improve.

2. As the emphasis on productivity increases, the performance of senior managers are going to more closely examined.

3. Students and parents are becoming more customer focused and the workforce is changing to be more diverse in terms of female and minority employees, management practices will have to change.

4. Organizations are being forced into being more innovative, especially related to development of new products, programs, and services, which require the use of creative talent. Management of creative talent teams whose major tasks are problem solving and provision of knowledge, methods, and products present an important dilemma that needs to be examined by psychologists and researchers in organizational development.

5. The reliability of personality measures to predict leadership effectiveness has been supported by research. Selecting the appropriate personality predicts depends on the results of job analysis because selected measures are significantly correlated with performance (Tett, Jackson, & Rothstein in Hogan, et al., 1994).

Candidates for leadership positions need to be screened for both positive

and negative personality traits, with observations used to determine administrative potential. As leadership becomes more complex and managerial roles continue to evolve, organizations must consider using external specialists, such as psychologists, to determine the best "fit" between the person and the job.

Supportive Leadership

Goeres discussed supportive leadership in Opinion Papers. This discussion of college administrative staff in leadership support roles examined qualities, attitudes, and skills that managers should have to be effective and successful. These qualities, attitudes, and skills included: personal and professional abilities; relationships with subordinates, peers, and superordinates; organizational communication; flexibility; and empathy.

Drawing on extensive staff interviews, Liontos (1993) profiled a high school principal in Eugene, Oregon, who exhibited many aspects of transformational leadership. Transformational leadership is improvement oriented and comprises three elements:

- collaborative, shared decision making approach;
- emphasis on teacher professionalism and empowerment; and
- understanding of change, including how to encourage change in others.

Bob Anderson is principal at North Eugene High School, which has evolved into an outstanding, innovative school under his leadership.

Personality Theory

Jung (1971) was one of the first psychologists to address the question of

personality topology. According to Jung:

> From ancient times there have been numerous attempts to reduce
> the manifold differences between human individuals to definite
> categories, and on the other hand to break down the apparent
> uniformity of mankind by a sharper characterization of certain
> typical differences. (p. 510)

In 450 B.C., Hippocrates described four temperaments in the human

body. He named these four temperaments sanguine (passionate), choleric (bad

tempered), phlegmatic (calm), and melancholic (mood). Galen expanded on

Hippocrates' theory, indicating that positive characteristics and negative

imbalances existed in the human body. Galen theorized that human beings could

be classified according to their feelings, with his judgments based on an

individual's external world, rather than his/her internal dynamics. Paracelsus, a

Swiss physician in the 16th century, further elaborated on Galen's theory by

adding the four dimensions of nature: water, earth, air, and fire. These elements

were used to distinguish personality temperaments. After Jung completed an

exhaustive research on personality type through literature, history, mythology,

aesthetics, philosophy, and psychopathology. From this research, Jung

developed his theory of personality types. Jung recognized eight different

psychological types. These types included two attitudes toward life (extroversion

and introversion), and four operating functions (sensing, intuition, thinking, and

feeling).

While these personality types were recognized, they were not measurable

until Katharine C. Briggs and her daughter, Isabel Briggs Myers developed an

instrument based on the work of Jung. In 1962, they published the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator. This instrument measured 16 unique personality types (Myers & Myers, 1962).

In 1976, Kiersey, used Jungian theory in his work, Please Understand Me, He further refined the work of Jung and developed an instrument to measure personality types. He organized his findings into temperaments and pairs of preferences (Kiersey & Bates, 1976).

According to Kiersey and Bates (1976) and Myers & Myers (1962), the pairs of opposites are extroversion/introversion (E/I), sensing/intuition (S/N), thinking/feeling (T/F), and judging/perceiving (J/P). These pairs of oppositive were further classified into four attitudes (E/I and J/P) and four functions (S/N and T/F). By pairing attitudes and functions, the personality types were assigned. The combinations of letters for each preference provided names for each personality type (e.g., ENFP, INFP, ISTJ, ESTJ, etc.).

Type was defined by Jung (1971) ". . . as a specimen or example which which reproduces in a characteristic way the character of a species or class" (p. 482). According to Jung, personality type is an attitude a means of being ready for something definite, even though this can be unconscious. Earlier descriptions of type were based on observations of temperament or emotional behavior patterns. Jung based his model on direct movement of psychic energy and its functions in the world. According to Jung, there were two personality attitudes, introversion and extraversion, and four functions: thinking, sensing, intuition, and feeling. According to Jung, the four functions operate both in introversion and extroversion.

Jung (1971) defined introversion as a inward-turning of libido, with a

negative relationship between the subject and the object. People who are

introverted think, feel, and act in ways that demonstrate the subject is primary

and the object is secondary. His definition of extroversion is an outward-turning

of libido. People who are extroverted think, feel, and act relative to the object.

Extroversion is active when it is intentional and passive when compelled by the

object. Introverted individuals are hesitant, reflective, retiring, while extroverts are

outgoing, candid, and accommodating. Extroverts are confident and try new

things, and introverts are happy to keep to themselves and are generally

unwilling to try new things. Introversion/extroversion is an attitude, with the

degree of dominance for introversion or extroversion apparent through its

association with one of the functions: thinking, feeling, sensation, intuition.

Jung (1971) defined function as a manifestation of libido that remains

constant in principle. Four basic functions have been delineated by Jung,

including two irrational (thinking and feeling) and two rational (sensation and

intuition). The definitions of these functions are as follows:

> *Thinking* . . . the psychological function which following its own
> laws, brings the contents of ideation into conceptual connection
> with one another . . . should be confined to the linking up of ideas
> by means of a concept, in other words, to an act of judgment, no
> matter whether this act is intentional or not. (p. 481)

> *Feeling* . . . Primary a process that takes place between the ego
> and a given content, a process, moreover, that imparts to the
> content a definite value in the sense of acceptance or rejection . . .
> an entirely subjective process, which may be in every respect
> independent of external stimuli, though it allies itself with every
> sensation . . . [it is] distinguished from affect by the fact that it
> produces no perceptible physical innervations . . . in the same way
> that thinking organizes the contents of consciousness under
> concepts, feeling arranges them according to their value. The more
> concrete it is, the more subjective and personal is the value

conferred upon them; but the more abstract it is, the more universal and objective the value will be. (pp. 433-436)

Sensation . . . is the psychological function that mediates the perception of a physical stimulus. It is therefore, identical with perception . . . sensation is related not only to external stimuli but to inner ones, (i.e., to changes in the internal organic processes). . . it is a sense perceptions -perception mediated by the sense organs and "body-senses" (kinesthetic, vasomotor, sensation, etc.). . . [it is] conscious. (pp. 461-463)

Intuition . . . mediates perceptions in an unconscious way. Every thing, whether outer or inner objects or their relationships, can be the focus of this perception. The peculiarity of intuition is that it is neither sense perception, nor feeling, nor intellectual inference, although it may also appear in these forms. In intuition a content presents itself whole and complete, without our being able to explain or discover how this content came into existence . . . a kind of instinctive apprehension, no matter of what contents . . . may be subjective or objective. (pp 452-454)

In describing the four functions as either rational or irrational, Jung (1971) was referring to the type of process that each requires. Rational functions are functions of logical discrimination and are based on reflective processes. Thinking and feeling are the rational functions because they are reflective processes. Conversely, sensing and intuition are irrational functions because they are based on perceptions. These functions are not illogical or unreasonable, but exists in the present. These irrational functions may be independent of reason or the rational process.

According to Jung (1971), personality types are randomly distributed among society, rather than organized by social class. Determining a person's personality type is not a well-defined process. The actions of an individual are not the determining factor in personality type, rather motivating energy determines the type (i.e., direction in which one's energy naturally, and usually, flows).

Jung (1971) asserted that determining an individual's personality type is the basic principle that the individual's dominant function and conscious attitude is at one and the same time counterbalanced by its opposite attitude. Balancing the extrovert's (introvert's) dominant, conscious attitude is an unconscious introverted (extroverted) attitude.

At any time, only one of the four functions can be differentiated sufficiently so that it can be manipulated by the conscious will, with the others at various degrees of unconscious. According to Jung (1971), an additional problem in determining a person's type is based on unconscious and undifferentiated functions that can obscure a personality to the extent that an external observer may mistakenly identify one type for another.

People with extroverted personality types are characterized by:

- one's conscious orientation is determined by objective reality

- one trusts what is received from the outside world

- one is not inclined to submit personal motives to and for critical examination and observation

- one lines 'in and through' others

- one's thoughts, decisions, and behavior patterns are in fact determined which are outside of oneself

- one's inclination and ability to adjust are based on facts external to onself, that is, if conditions (mores) change, the extrovert adjusts his/her behaviors to adjust to this change (Jung, 1971).

Administrators who are extraverted thinking are good at establishing order, have a good sense of facts, bring clarity into situations which are filled with emotions. Their benchmarks are justice and truth based on formulations of objective reality, finding comfort and strength in the "oughts" and "musts" of life.

The extroverted feeling type of administrator seeks harmony in all conditions that surround its environment. These administrators are social, start the fund at a party, attend funerals and weddings, and are very amicable and make friends easily. Extroverted feeling types are generally well adjusted, capable of evaluating their positive and negative sides, and friendly.

Extroverted sensing individuals are grounded in reality, with his/her sense for objective facts well developed. This type of administrator is concrete and enjoys life with moderation and lawfulness, and is unselfish and willing to make sacrifices. This personality type perceives sensation as a concrete expression of life.

Extroverted intuitive types try to comprehend a wide range of possibilities which the objective situation may provide. According to Jung (1971), extroverted intuitive types are stifled in stable conditions, constantly seeking new situations, new environments, and new horizons. This personality type experiences a lack of judgement, as judgement develops from a well-developed thinking or feeling function.

Introverted people will generally exhibit the following characteristics:

- subjectivity dominates and is the primary motivating energy
- relate mainly to impressions aroused by the object in the subject or the inner reality
- characterized by thoughtful manners, reflective, marked shyness, and a fear of unknown objects
- subjectivity is traditional and experiential, more conservative.

The introverted thinking personality type is influenced by ideas, with these ideas developed in the person's subjective foundation. These types of people

tend to develop theory and not practice their findings. They are logical and straightforward, and are often good editors. They may not be good at original writing, but rather they find their logical interpretation their best characteristic. The introverted thinking individual are generally indifferent to the ideas of others. While they listen, they are usually not influenced by these ideas, because they present their views as they perceive them and are not concerned with the manner in which it is received. People with these personality types are often the "absent minded professor" or the "forgetful Jones" type of person (Jung, 1971).

People who exhibit introverted feeling personality types do not speak out and may be considered almost mystical. This type is silent, inaccessible, and hard to understand. They exhibit a neutral stance, that is associated with an air of superiority. This personality type possesses a quiet sense of loyalty and a sense of group morality/ethics. Introverted feelers are interested in outer facts, retaining and maintaining these facts, although they do not move around. Jung (1971) referred to this group using the phrase, "still waters run deep."

The introverted sensing type integrates and processes internally, although s/he may appear to be slow at perceiving. A person with this personality type may require a longer response time and has been described as the person who hears a joke at 8:00 am and laughs at 12:00 midnight. Individuals who are introverted sensing personality type are generally detailed in their thinking process and prophetic because of the intricacy with which they worked with their senses.

The introverted intuitive personality type is similar to the extroverted intuitive type, having a similar capacity for looking at the future. This type is often

viewed as a mystical day dreamer because s/he cannot communicate the processes of the collective unconscious to society as large. These people are often misunderstood. Introverted intuitive personality types tend to lose their possessions, work in chaotic conditions, procrastinate, arrive late, and pay little attention to detail either personally or within their environment. While they may be accused of lying, they are usually aloof and their memory of an event may not agree with what actually happened. Jung (1971) viewed people with these personality types as useless.

Myers-Briggs Type Indicator

While Jung theorized about the personality types, he did not expect his theory could provide the basis for personality type testing. Type testing has been found helpful in determining the way in which individuals perceive themselves relative to the world. Isabel Myers Briggs (1989) developed the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) to test for personality types. This instrument has been used for both individuals and groups to test for the four dimensions presented by Jung (1971). The MBTI Manual (1989) details the four characteristics as dichotomies:

Extroversion	(E)	Introversion	(I)
Sensing	(S)	Intuition	(N)
Thinking	(T)	Feeling	(F)
Judgment	(J)	Perception	(P)

These type characteristics distinguish different personality types, with each characteristic delineating specific energy patterns, processes for gathering information and decision making, and selecting life styles. Figure 1 presents the definitions according to the "Manual" (1989).

Figure 1

Definitions of Myers-Briggs Personality Types

Characteristic	Definition	Characteristic	Definition
Extrovert	Energized objectively and directed toward the outer world of reflection and contemplation	Introvert	Energized subjectively and directed toward the inner world of reflection and contemplation
Sensing	Collects data from observable facts and details	Intuitive	Collects data from insight of relationships and meaning of things
Thinking	Makes decisions based on logic, analysis, and objective reasoning	Feeling	Makes decisions based on subjective motivations, human values, and what is personally important to the individual
Judgment	Is concerned with organization, planning, control, and closure	Perception	Is concerned with being curious, open, receptive, flexible, and adaptive

Note: Funaro. 1992

From the four sets of personality characteristics, 16 personality types can

be determined. According to the Manual (1989, pp. 32-38), including:

ISTJ	ISFJ	INFJ	INTJ
ISTP	ISFP	INFP	INTP
ESTP	ESFP	ENFP	ENTP
ESTJ	ESPJ	ENFJ	ENTJ

Organizational patterns have been found in the combinations of the

characteristics. for Example, the rows of the table provide four combinations of

extroversion/introversion and judging/perception that have implications for

administrators. These types have been defined as:

- I – J   Decisive introverts

- I – P   Adaptable introverts

- E – P   Adaptable extroverts

- E – J   Decisive extroverts.

Combining perception and judgment, provides four types that have relevance for administrators. These types include:

- - ST -   Practical and matter of fact

- - SF -   Sympathetic and friendly

- - NF -   Enthusiastic and insightful type

- - NT -   Logical and ingenious.

Sensing and intuitive combinations provide information about personality characteristics of administrators. These types include:

- - S - J   Realistic decision makers

- - S - P   Adaptable realists

- - N - P   Adaptable innovators

- - N - J   Visionary decision makers

Thinker-feelers form four groups that may provide insight into the personality characteristics of school administrators, including:

- – TJ   Logical decision makers

- – TF   Adaptable thinkers

- – FP   Gentle types

- – FJ   Benevolent administrators

Four quadrants are developed by combining extroversion/introversion and intuition/sensing. These quadrants may provide useful information regarding the personality types of administrators. The four quadrants include:

- IN –   Thoughtful innovators

- EN –   Action-oriented innovators

- IS –   Thoughtful realists

- ES –   Action-oriented realists.

While more patterns exist among the 16 personality types, the listed ones are

most relevant to administrators. Keirsey (1984) wrote <u>Please Understand Me</u>, a

book that extends and integrates topology and temperament. According to

Keirsey, through understanding temperament, the basic motivations of

individuals can be interpreted. He stated: ". . .temperament determines behavior

because behavior is the instrument for getting us what we must have" (p. 30).

His temperaments are described in Figure 2.

Figure 2

Temperaments as Defined by Keirsey

Temperament	Characteristics
Dionysian (SP)	• motivates people to express freedom in action • negotiates oneself out of a crisis • fights using cleverness and agility not force • demands truth and represents strength, beauty, action, and love of freedom • enjoys a spontaneous, energetic lifestyle • realists • needs to be where the action is • operates well in high-risk situations
Epimethean (SJ)	• long for belonging • strong sense of responsibility to social units (e.g., church, family, organization) • fail satisfied only when they are being useful • motivated to work, earn their place in society, and cary on traditional values • establish law and order • believe in the work ethic and are seen as pillars of society • conservative, overly serious, and have much self-chosen responsibility
Promethean (NT)	• desire knowledge, competence, and power • make possible many experiences • seek to control, predict, understand, and explaint he universe (the aims of science) • seek to know everything and add to their storehouse of knowledge • critical of themselves and tend to be perfectionists, demand high standards from themselves and others • rarely satisfied, critical, and oblivious to the emotional responses of the people around them • least understood because they shield themselves so well
Apollonian (NP)	• drive for self-actualization, search for personal identity • need for unity with all creation and establishment of harmony, meaning, and a spiritual purpose in life • live lives of significance • seek to understand deep meanings, truths of life • assist other temperaments unravel inner motivations, communicate authentically, and become aware of a heightened sense of meaning in relationship • expires their belief in possibilities to people • contribute a sense of inspiration, idealism, and direction.

The MBTI is a useful tool in assessing personality types of administrators.

This type of information is beneficial in providing explanations for leadership

behaviors of educational administrators who are faced with refining and defining

goals, objectives, and processes of the institution within the framework of their

vision. According to Barr and Barr (1989), strong leadership potential is

associated with the NFJ personality type. According tothe authors, a balanced

personality type is the basis for a solid foundation for long-term leadership, with the full potential of the leader never fully realized. The need for the leader's ongoing, assessment of motives and actions, together with continual development of potential is an on-going challenge for administrators. Barr and Barr (1989) have recommended that the leadership equation requires balancing style to promote leadership improvement.

Measurements of Personality and Leadership: Some Relationships

The relationship between measurements of personality and leadership characteristics was the focus of research by Wendel, Kilgore, and Spurzem (1991). The study included 88 people who were either in administration or were working toward attainment of administrative certification. These participants formed a heterogeneous group in terms of position held, years of experience, gender, and career aspirations. They were homogeneous in personality preferences as measured by the MBTI: ESTJ (19%), ENTJ (15%), ENFP (12%) were the primary patterns within the group, accounting for approximately 50% of the participants. Myers (1962) had indicated that people with these types of personality types would make good administrators. When the personality preferences were taken in pairs, the following results were obtained:

Extroversion	E=72%	Introversion	I=28%
Intuition	N=57%	Sensation	S=43%
Thinking	T=65%	Feeling	F=38%
Judging	J=66%	Perceiving	P=34%

The participants had participated in training using individual and group exercises at NASSP Assessment Centers. A behavioral profile was obtained for the participants using standardized procedures, simulation exercises, and samples of behaviors related to on-the-job duties. The assessors observed, recorded, and prepared written reports regarding the participants' behaviors in exercises; such as leaderless group, in-basket, fact-finding, and structured interviews. Using a consensus discussion approach, the assessors pooled their observations developing a score for the administrators and potential administrators.

The results of the analyses showed that there were no relationships between each personality preference pair and scores on the dimensions for Assessment Center scores. This finding indicated that school boards and other hiring officials were unable to determine the effectiveness of a potential administrator a candidate would be from his/her personality type, nor can the assessment center data be used to make predictions about personality types. Wendel et al. (1991) concluded that information on personality types could be useful in selecting administrators with specific personality types for certain jobs. A school district needing a trouble shooter might look for an administrator with an SP personality type, because this type of person is good at clearing up messes and handling crises. A school that is having problems moving forward could use the services of an NT who could provide vision and designs for the future. Selecting the right individual for a position requires more than personality type and assessment center scores.

In a study by Walters and Wilmoth (1989), the Leadership Opinion

Questionnaire, Myers-Briggs Type Indicator, and a demographic questionnaire were administered to 115 student organization officers to examine the relationships between leadership attributes and personality preferences as well as differential leadership attributes and/or personality preference patterns were investigated. Strong relationships were found that linked leadership attributes to personality preferences were found.

Relationship between Personality Types and Leadership

In a study of 86 elementary school principals, Lueder (1983) compared perceived problem-solving strategies by psychological type. The Myers-Briggs was completed by the principals to determine their psychological type in terms of perceiving (sensing or intuitive) and judging (thinking or feeling). The principals also completed the Principal Problem Strategy Questionnaire. This instrument included 12 vignettes of problems often faced by principals in their schools. Their responses were open-ended. Lueder found that principals made judgments about a problem situation according to their psychological type characteristics. He indicated that sensing type principals generally limit their perceptions of a problem to the immediate situation using the facts that were given. They follow policy or guidelines if they exist and develop them if they do not. Intuitive principals generally perceive the same problem in borader terms. Their concerns may be school or district-wide and future oriented. They use the facts related to the situation to seek possibilities, interconnections, and implications and typically use outside sources, research, and experts to solve problems.

Feeling and thinking type principals also were considered to be either

sensing or intuitive. Their responses to situations could reflect both of their functional characteristics. The SF type appeared to limit their perceptions to the immediate situation, but used different decision making approaches. The SF was concerned about the feelings of their subordinates, while the principals whose had an ST personality type were generally impersonal.

Summary

The review of literature has presented characteristics of effective and ineffective leaders. In investigating the commonalities among leaders, effective leaders were found to be have the following characteristics:

- understanding
- motivating,
- being a visionary
- putting students first,
- acting as a facilitator,
- being people orientated,
- managing conflict,
- being a skilled communicator,
- innovating,
- adapting, and
- accepting basic core values.

The manner in which leaders are chosen was also reviewed, with personality characteristics shown to be an important part of the process. Specific personality characteristics have been shown to be typical of effective leaders. When chosing

and evaluating possible candidates for leadership positions, their personality characteristics should be considered.

Carl Jung's personality theory was included in the review of literature, showing the transition of this theory into the Myers-Briggs personality traits. The definitions of each of the 16 personality types and four personality traits were presented along with their integration into leadership theory.

By understanding how personality affects leadership styles and roles, schools can begin to include personality testing in their administrative selection process. The present study is intending to investigate personality types and leadership styles between effective schools (schools with Michigan Summary Certification) and ineffective schools (schools that are unaccredited).

Chapter III

Methodology

This chapter presents the methodology that was used to collect and

analyze the data needed to answer the research questions posed for this study.

The sections included in this chapter are: research design, variables in the study,

research questions, population, sample, instrumentation, data collection

procedures, and data analysis. Each of these sections is presented separately.

Research Design

A nonexperimental, correlational research design was used in this study.

This type of design was appropriate as the independent variable was not

manipulated and no treatment was provided to the participants. Two instruments,

the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) and the Least Preferred Co-Worker

Scale were completed by the principals in schools that have been awarded

accreditation by the Michigan Department of Education and principals in schools

that failed to meet the criteria for summary accreditation.

Variables in the Study

The dependent variables that were used in this study are:

- Personality type of the principal as measured by the MBTI

- Leadership style of the principal as measured by the Least Preferred

  Co-Worker Scale.

The independent variable was the type of school the principal was

administering: accredited or nonaccredited. The determination of accreditation

status had been made by the Michigan Department of Education.

Organismic variables were collected to provide additional information regarding the individual principals and their schools. These variables included personal and professional characteristics, as well as characteristics of the schools that may influence their accreditation status.

Accredited and Unaccredited Elementary Schools

According to the Michigan Department of Education (MDOE), 112 elementary schools were awarded summary accreditation during the 1994-95 school year. These schools had met the criteria developed by the MDOE under Public Act 25 and Public Act 362. These schools ranged in size from 12 students to 804 students. The summary accredited schools were located in all geographic regions including the Upper and Lower Peninsula.

Forty-five elementary schools were unaccredited by the MDOE during the 1994-95 school year. These schools ranged in size from 188 to 1,082 and were all located in urban areas in the Lower Peninsula of Michigan. A complete list of both the accredited and unaccredited elementary schools can be found in Appendix A.

Population

The principals of the two types of elementary schools, accredited and nonaccredited, comprised the sample for this study. There were 112 principals in accredited elementary schools and 45 principals in nonaccredited elementary schools at the time of the study.

Sample

The sample included a random sample of 50 principals from summary accredited schools and all 45 principals in nonaccredited schools. To provide comparable data from the principals from both types of schools, it was decided to use all of the unaccredited schools and an equal number of principals in summary accredited elementary schools. To assure that selection of these principals was random, a random number table was used to select 50 from the 112 summary accredited schools.

Instrumentation

Three instruments were used for this study: Myers Briggs Type Indicator, Least Preferred Co-Worker Scale, and a short demographic survey developed by the researcher. These instruments were completed by principals in accredited and nonaccredited schools.

The Myers Briggs Type Indicator

The Myers Briggs Type Indicator is an instrument developed by Myers and Briggs in the 1940s as an aid in applying Jungian theory. The essence of the Jungian theory is that seemingly random variations in behavior are actually consistent and orderly when one considers the different methods in which people prefer to take in information and the ways in which they choose to make decisions. This instrument has been used extensively in counseling, education and business.

Personality Typing

Personality typing is not a new process. The oldest form of typology was

devised by oriental astrologers (cosmological typology) who classified character in terms of four trigona, which corresponded t the four elements: water, air, earth and fire. As early as 400 B.C., Hyppocrates who may have been the first type theorist suggested there were four basic personality types (physiological typology): choleric, melancholic, sanguine and phlegmatic. These temperaments were related to a specific body humor or mood and were related to body fluids, namely yellow bile, black bile, blood, and phlegm.

Jung, in 1923, used the physical traits based on Hyppocrates types ,as well as his extensive review of typologies in literature, mythology, aesthetics, philosophy and psychopathology, to reconstruct these traits into psychological classifications. The reconstruction led to modern processes of developmental personality typing. The individual psyche cannot be understood simply by a system of classifications, rather an understanding of psychological types can expand the understanding of human behavior in general ways.

In Jung's theory, there are two pairs of mental functions or four individual modes of orientation (sensing, intuition, thinking, feeling) and two basic personality attitudes (extroversion and introversion). These functions act as a framework for classifying personality types and suggest what characteristics represent similar and different personality types.

The MBTI consists of four dichotomous scales; Extraversion versus Introversion (E-I), Sensing versus Intuition (S-N), Thinking versus Feeling (T-F), and Judging versus Perception (J-P). On the E-I scale, a person's preference for the direction of his/her energy and interest is either toward the outer world of persons, actions, and objects (E) or toward the inner world of ideas and concepts

(I). On the S-N scale, a person's preference is either for perceiving the world through the realities of experience taken in by his/her five senses (S) or for perceiving the world by paying more attention to inferred meanings and possibilities (I). On the T-F scale, a person's preferences are determined by relying more on logical order in making judgements (T) or more on personal values and importance (F). On the J-P scale, preferences are characterized by planning and controlling events (J) or by being flexible, waiting to see what happens, and reacting to events with spontaneity (P).

A substantial body of empirical data has been collected on the use of the MBTI. Data have been obtained from a variety of occupational and academic groups. The scores on the MBTI have been related to creativity, academic achievement, vocational preferences, aesthetic preferences, values, needs, aptitudes, and work habits. Group differences and correlations are broadly supportive of the construct validity of the scales.

Least Preferred Co-Worker Survey

The Least Preferred Co-Worker (LPC) Survey (Fiedler, 1980) was developed to determine leadership styles through problem-solving, decision-making, and management styles. According to Fiedler, leadership styles can be classified into the traditional task-oriented and relationship-oriented categories with one important difference: these two styles of leadership are considered to be opposite ends of a single continuum rather than independent dimensions. Leadership style generally reflects an individual's behavior in various situations and consequently, one's leadership style may depend on his/her personality and cannot be readily changed.

Leadership style, as measured by the Least Preferred Co-Worker Scale, uses the principals' responses to a series of bi-polar adjectives that reflect characteristics of a leader. The respondent is asked to reflect on one person at his job with whom s/he can work least well and to describe this person using the bi-polar adjectives. Relationship-oriented leadership styles are used by individuals who describe their least-preferred coworker in relatively favorable terms; such as pleasant, supportive, etc. Those who give their least-preferred co-workers relatively unfavorable descriptions have task-oriented leadership styles obtain more satisfaction from completing tasks successfully (Schriesheim & Bannister, 1979).

The internal consistency on the LPC scale had a median split-half reliability of .89 for the scale indicating good internal consistency. The factor analyses on this scale yielded one major factor that described task-relevant behavior. Rice (cited in Fiedler & Garcia, 1987) reported on test-retest reliability in 23 studies, with stability estimates varying relative to the length of time between test and retest. The median correlation reported by Rice was .67 with a mean correlation .64. These correlations reflect a moderate amount of test stability with the LPC which is adequate for a study that is using a single measurement period. According to Rice, the LPC is a valid instrument with good stability that measures leadership styles that range from relationship oriented to task oriented.

Demographic Survey

The researcher developed a demographic instrument to collect information on the personal and professional characteristics of the principals in

the study. The questionnaire included items such as age, gender, educational level, length of time in education, length of time as an administrator, and length of time in current position. These items were measured using a forced-choice categorical format to provide consistency in responses among the principals.

Data on the individual schools were also collected on this survey to determine if summary accredited schools differed from unaccredited schools in terms of technology, teacher innovativeness, and parent involvement. These questions included items such as: number of computers, principals' perceptions of their teachers' willingness to use innovative instructional strategies, parental participation in the schools, school climate, etc. These questions used a combination of forced-choice categorical and open-ended responses to provide opportunities for explanations of instructional strategies and examples of parental involvement.

In addition, information on demographic statistics about the school districts were obtained from the Michigan Department of Education web site on the Internet. The information that downloaded included the percentage of students receiving free or reduced lunches as a measure of the socioeconomic status of the families in the school district. Previous research has shown that school districts with high percentages of students receiving free and reduced lunch tended to score lower on standardized or criterion-referenced tests.

Data Collection

Following approval by the Behavioral Investigation Committee (BIC) at Wayne State University to conduct the study, the researcher sent survey packets

to selected principals of the accredited and unaccredited elementary schools. The survey packets included a cover letter, copies of the surveys, and a stamped self-addressed envelope for returning the completed survey. The cover letter included the purpose and importance of the study, assurances of confidentiality of the responses, explanation of the voluntary nature of participation, and directions for returning the completed instruments.

The surveys were distributed to the principals in all schools at the beginning of August when they are required to be available at their schools. The instruments were mailed to the schools by the researcher. Each survey packet was coded to provide control over the outstanding survey packets. Approximately two weeks following initial distribution of the survey packets, postcard follow-ups were sent to the nonresponders to remind them to complete and return their survey packets. The postcard provided a telephone number where the principal obtained an additional survey packet in the case where the first packet was either lost or destroyed. Four weeks following initial distribution of the packets, data collection was considered complete.

In addition to the data provided from the principals, additional information on the schools was obtained on the Michigan Department of Education web site on the Internet. This information included socioeconomic data on the number of free and/or reduced lunches for a three-year period, as students in schools located in low socioeconomic areas tend to have lower standardized test scores than students in higher socioeconomic areas. This information was obtained for each of the schools in the district.

Data Analysis

The statistical analysis was divided into descriptive and inferential

statistics. The descriptive statistical procedures provided a profile of the

principals and their schools. Crosstabulations, frequency distributions, and

measures of central tendency and dispersion were used for the profiles. The

inferential statistical procedures included chi-square tests for independence, t-

tests for two independent samples and Pearson product moment correlations. All

decisions on the significance of the statistical procedures were made using an

alpha level of .05. Figure 3 presents the statistical analysis by research question.

Figure 3

Statistical Analysis

Research Question	Variables	Statistical Analysis

1. Is there a difference in the personality characteristics of principals in accredited elementary schools and principals in elementary schools that are unaccredited?	Independent Variable
	    Type of school of principal
	        Accredited
	        Unaccredited
	
	Dependent Variable
	    Personality characteristics of the principals as determined by the MBTI
		Crosstabulations of the personality characteristics by the type of principal was used with chi-square analysis to determine if specific personality types are more prevalent in principals of accredited and unaccredited schools

2. Is there a difference in the leadership style of principals in accredited elementary schools and principals in elementary schools that are unaccredited?	Independent Variable
	    Type of school of principal
	        Accredited
	        Unaccredited
	
	Dependent Variable
	    Leadership style of the principal as determined by the Least Preferred Co-worker Scale
		t-Test for two independent samples was used to determine if there are differences in the leadership styles of principals in accredited and unaccredited schools.

3. Is there a relationship between leadership styles and personality types of elementary school principals?	Leadership styles of the principal as determined by the Least Preferred Co-worker Scale Personality type as determined by the MBTI	Pearson's product moment correlations was used to determine the strength and direction of the relationships between personality styles and leadership styles of the principals in accredited and unaccredited schools.

Chapter IV

Results of Data Analysis

This chapter presents the results of the data analyses that were used to describe the sample and address each of the research questions posed for this study. This study examined the relationships between personality characteristics as measured by the MBTI and leadership styles as measured by the LPC of elementary principals in accredited and unaccredited schools. A secondary purpose of this study is to determine if specific personality profiles differentiate elementary school principals in educational settings that are considered successful from those in settings that are not successful.

A total of 95 principals, including 50 accredited schools selected at random from a population of 112 accredited schools and all 45 unaccredited schools, were asked to complete the survey and the MBTI. Of this number, 18 principals from accredited schools and 19 principals from unaccredited schools returned their completed surveys for a total response rate of 38.9%. The response rates by type of school are presented in Table 1.

Table 1

Response Rate by Type of School

Type of School	Distributed		Returned	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Accredited	50	52.6	18	36.0
Nonaccredited	45	47.4	19	42.2
Total	95	100.0	37	38.9

<u>Characteristics of the Principals</u>

The respondents were asked to provide personal and professional

characteristics, as well as characteristics of their schools. Each of these sections

is presented separately.

<u>Personal Characteristics</u>

The principals were asked to provide their age on the survey. Their

responses were crosstabulated by the type of school, accredited or

nonaccredited. The majority of the respondents (n=25, 69.4%) reported their

ages as between 46 and 55 years of age. Of this number, 13 (72.2%) were in the

accredited school group and 12 (66.7%) were in the nonaccredited schools. Five

(13.9%) principals, including 4 (22.2%) in accredited schools and 1 (5.6%) were

in the nonaccredited schools. One (5.6%) principal in the accredited school

group and 5 (27.8%) principals in the nonaccredited school group. One principal

in a nonaccredited school did not provide his/her age on the survey. The

principals were homogeneous in respect to their ages, as approximately 70%

were between 46 and 55 years of age. The results of these analyses are

presented in Table 2.

The respondents were asked to provide their gender on the survey. The

responses were summarized using crosstabulations. An equal number of male

(n=9, 50.0%) and female (n=9, 50.0%) principals were among the accredited

school principals. In nonaccredited schools, 11 (61.1%) of the principals were

male and 7 (38.9%) were female. One principal in the nonaccredited group did

not provide their gender on the survey. The results of this analysis are presented

in Table 3.

Table 2

Age of Principal by Type of School

| Age of Principal | Type of School | | | | Total | |
| | Accredited | | Nonaccredited | | | |
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
36 to 45	4	22.2	1	5.6	5	13.9
46 to 55	13	72.2	12	66.7	25	69.4
Over 55	1	5.6	5	27.8	6	16.7
Total	18	100.0	18	100.0	36	100.0

Missing   Nonaccredited Schools 1

Table 3

Gender of Principal by Type of School

| Gender of Principal | Type of School | | | | Total | |
| | Accredited | | Nonaccredited | | | |
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Male	9	50.0	11	61.1	20	55.6
Female	9	50.0	7	38.9	16	44.4
Total	18	100.0	18	100.0	36	100.0

Missing   Nonaccredited Schools 1

The principals provided their educational level on the survey. Their responses were crosstabulated by the type of school, accredited or nonaccredited. Nineteen (54.3%) of the principals, including 9 (50.0%) in accredited schools and 10 (58.8%) in nonaccredited schools, had master's degrees as their highest level of education. Of the 11 (31.4%) principals who had obtained educational specialist certificates, 6 (33.3%) were in the accredited schools and 5 (29.4%) were in nonaccredited schools. Three (16.7%) principals

in accredited schools and 2 (11.8%) principals in nonaccredited schools had

completed either an Doctor of Education or Doctor of Philosophy degree. Two

principals in nonaccredited schools did not respond to this question. Based on

thee findings, most of the principals appeared to have obtained master's

degrees. The results of this analysis are presented in Table 4.

Table 4

Educational Level by Type of School

Educational Level of Principal	Type of School				Total	
	Accredited		Nonaccredited			
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Master's Degree	9	50.0	10	58.8	19	54.3
Educational Specialist	6	33.3	5	29.4	11	31.4
Ed.D./Ph.D.	3	16.7	2	11.8	5	14.3
Total	18	100.0	17	100.0	36	100.0

Missing   Nonaccredited Schools   2

The principals were asked to report their experiences in education in

terms of the length of time they had been in education, the length of time they

had been a principal, and the length of time they had been in their present

position. Descriptive statistics were used to compare the principals in accredited

and nonaccredited schools. The principals in accredited schools had been in

education for an average of 26.67 (sd=4.34) years, with a median of 26.50 years.

The range of experience for principals in accredited schools was from a

minimum of 19 years to a maximum of 34 years. The mean length of time in

education for principals in nonaccredited schools was 29.28 (sd=7.09) years.

The range of experience was from 20 to 46 years, with a median of 26.50 years. The principals in both schools appeared to have substantial experience in education.

The participants from accredited schools had been principals for an average of 12.33 (sd=6.02) years. The range of experience as a principal was from 2 to 23 years, with a median of 11.50 years. Participants from nonaccredited schools had been principals for an average of 12.00 (sd=7.44) years, with a median of 10.00 years. The range of experience as a principal was from 4 to 29 years. Experiences as a principal were widely varied, with principals in nonaccredited schools having slightly less time in this position.

Principals in accredited schools had been in their present positions for a mean of 7.00 (sd=5.10) years. The median length of time in their present positions was 6.00 years, with actual experience ranging from 2 to 18 years. The principals in nonaccredited school had been in their present positions for a mean of 8.67 (sd=4.51) years. The range of experience was from 2 to 17 years, with a median of 8.50 years. Principals in nonaccredited schools had been in their present positions longer than principals in accredited schools. Table 5 presents the results of this analysis.

Characteristics of the Schools

The principals were asked to provide information about their schools. The first set of items included number of students, administrators (other than principals), teachers, paraprofessionals/teaching aides, and other support staff (counselors, social workes, etc).

The mean number of students in the accredited schools was 497.39

Table 5

Experiences in Education

Type of Experience	Mean	SD	Median	Range	
				Minimum	Maximum
Time in Education					
Accredited Schools	26.67	4.34	26.50	19	34
Nonaccredited Schools	29.28	7.09	26.50	20	46
Time as a Principal					
Accredited Schools	12.33	6.02	11.50	2	23
Nonaccredited Schools	12.00	7.44	10.00	4	29
Time in Present Position					
Accredited Schools	7.00	5.10	6.00	2	18
Nonaccredited Schools	8.67	4.51	8.00	2	17

(sd=116.32), with a median of 489 students. The range of student enrollment

was from a minimum of 342 to a maximum of 800 students. The average number

of students in nonaccredited schools was 508.88 (sd=246.78) with a median of

384 students. The range of student enrollment was from 200 to 1,060.

The average number of other administrators (other than the principals)

was .17 (sd=.38) in accredited schools. The median number was 0 with a range

from 0 to 1. In nonaccredited schools, the number of administrators ranged from

0 to 2, with a median of 0. The mean number of other administrators in

nonaccredited schools was .37 (sd=.60).

The mean number of teachers in accredited schools was 25.00 (sd=5.74),

with a median of 22.50 teachers. The range of teachers in these schools was

from 15 to 35. The number of teachers in nonaccredited schools ranged from 2

to 45, with a median of 22. The mean number of teachers in nonaccredited

schools was 22.53 (sd=.61).

The range of paraprofessionals/teacher aides in accredited schools was

from 1 to 20, with a median of 4.50. The mean number of paraprofessional/

teacher aides was 5.24 (sd=4.50). Nonaccredited schools had a mean of 7.84

(sd=5.06) paraprofessionals/teacher aides. The median number of

paraprofessionals/teacher aides was 8.00, with a range from 0 to 20.

The mean number of other support staff (counselors, social workers, etc.)

in accredited schools was 4.17 (sd=2.83), with a median of 3. The range of other

support staff was from 1 to 12. The range of other support staff in nonaccredited

schools was from 0 to 30, with a median of 6. The mean number of other support

staff was 4.17 (sd=2.83).

Accredited schools appeared to have smaller populations, fewer

administrators, more teachers, less paraprofessionals/teaching aides and

support staff than their nonaccredited counterparts. Their responses were

summarized using descriptive statistics for presentation in Table 6.

The principals were asked to indicate the number of computers they had

in their schools, and in specific locations. Their responses were summarized

using descriptive statistics.

The mean number of computers in accredited schools was 55.06

(sd=27.79) with a median of 45.50. The range of computers in accredited

schools was from 25 to 128. In nonaccredited schools, the number of computers

ranged from 0 to 45, with a median of 28. The mean number of computers was

25.47 (sd=13.70.

The accredited schools had a mean of 26.44 (sd=30.10) computers in

classrooms, with a median of 22 computers located in classrooms. The range of

computers in classrooms was from 0 to 115 for accredited schools. The mean

Table 6

Descriptive Statistics
School Populations

Type of School Population	Mean	SD	Median	Range	
				Minimum	Maximum
Students					
Accredited Schools	497.39	116.32	489.00	342	800
Nonaccredited Schools	508.88	246.78	384.00	200	1,060
Other administrators					
Accredited Schools	.17	.38	0	0	1
Nonaccredited Schools	.37	.60	0	0	2
Teachers					
Accredited Schools	25.00	5.74	22.50	15	35
Nonaccredited Schools	22.53	9.61	22.00	2	45
Paraprofessionals/Teaching Aides					
Accredited Schools	6.72	5.24	4.50	1	20
Nonaccredited Schools	7.84	5.06	8.00	0	20
Other Support Staff (Counselors, social workers, etc.)					
Accredited Schools	4.17	2.83	3.00	1	12
Nonaccredited Schools	8.11	7.45	6.00	0	30

number of computers in nonaccredited school classrooms was 11.37 (sd=11.35),

with a median of 8.00. The range of computers in nonaccredited school

classrooms was from 0 to 30.

The number of computers located in accredited school computer labs was

8.89 (sd=11.31), with a median of 4.00. The range of computers in accredited

school computer labs was from 0 to 35. The number of computers in

nonaccredited school computer labs ranged from 0 to 35, with a median of 0.

The average number of computers in computer labs was 5.42 (sd=9.55).

The mean number of computers in the accredited schools media centers

was 2.89 (sd=3.34), with a median of 3.00. The range of computers in accredited

schools media centers was from 0 to 13. In nonaccredited schools, the media

centers had an average of 1.42 (sd=2.09) computers, with a median of 0

computers. The range of computers in nonaccredited schools media centers was

from 0 to 6.

It appears that accredited schools use computers more than unaccredited

schools as evidenced by the greater number of computers in the schools,

classrooms, number of labs, and in the media centers. The results of this

analysis are presented in Table 7.

Table 7

Descriptive Statistics
Computers in School

Computers	Mean	SD	Median	Range	
				Minimum	Maximum

School
   Accredited Schools
   Nonaccredited Schools
	55.06
	25.47
		27.79
		13.70
			45.50
			28.00
				25
				0
					128
					45

Classrooms
   Accredited Schools
   Nonaccredited Schools
	26.44
	11.37
		30.10
		11.35
			22.00
			8.00
				0
				0
					115
					30

Computer Labs
   Accredited Schools
   Nonaccredited Schools
	8.89
	5.42
		11.31
		9.55
			4.00
			0.00
				0
				0
					35
					35

Media Center
   Accredited Schools
   Nonaccredited Schools
	2.89
	1.42
		3.34
		2.09
			3.00
			0.00
				0
				0
					13
					6

The principals were asked to indicate how parents participate in their

schools. As the principals were asked to select all that apply, the number of

responses exceeded the number of respondents. Their responses were

crosstabulated by the type of school, accredited or nonaccredited.

Eighteen (100.0%) accredited and 17 (89.5%) nonaccredited schools had

parent/teacher conferences. Room parents as a means of parent involvement were reported by 17 (94.4%) of the accredited schools and 14 (73.7%) of the nonaccredited schools. Eighteen (100.0%) of the principals in accredited schools and 17 (8.5%) of the principals in nonaccredited schools indicated they had parent/teacher groups. All principals in accredited schools (n=18, 100.0%) and 16 (84.2%) principals in nonaccredited schools indicated they had open house meetings. Eighteen (100.0%) of the accredited schools and 17 (89.5%) of the nonaccredited schools used parents as field trip chaperones. In 16 (88.9%) accredited schools and 16 (84.2%) nonaccredited schools parents were used as tutors. Nine (50.0%) accredited schools and 5 (26.3%) nonaccredited schools had parents sponsor clubs in the school. Ten (55.6%) accredited schools and 5 (26.3%) nonaccredited schools indicated "other", but did not provide specific ways that parents were involved in their schools.

While parent involvement appeared to be high in both types of schools, principals in accredited schools reported greater levels of participation in all areas of parent involvement. The results of this analysis are presented in Table 8.

The principals were asked to indicate the percentage of parents who attended parent/teacher conferences. Their responses were summarized using descriptive statistics.

The mean percentage of parents attending parent/teacher conferences in accredited schools was 91.47% (sd=23.53%), with a median of 98%. The percentage of parents who attended parent/teacher conferences was from 3% to 100%. In nonaccredited schools, an average of 75.62% (sd=27.46%) of the

Table 8

Parent Involvement by Type of School

Parent Involvement	Type of School				Total	
	Accredited		Nonaccredited			
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Parent/Teacher Conferences	18	100.0	17	89.5	35	94.6
Room Parent	17	94.4	14	73.7	31	83.8
Parent/Teacher Group	18	100.0	17	89.5	35	94.6
Open House	18	100.0	16	84.2	34	91.9
Field Trip Chaperone	18	100.0	17	89.5	35	94.6
Parent Tutors	16	88.9	16	84.2	32	86.5
Club Sponsors	9	50.0	5	26.3	14	37.8
Other	10	55.6	5	26.3	15	40.5

parents attended parent/teacher conferences. The median percent of parents

who attended parent/teacher conferences was 91%, with percentages ranging

from 5 to 99%. Principals in schools that were accredited had a greater

percentage of parents attending parent/teacher conferences that principals in

nonaccredited schools. The results of this analysis are presented in Table 9.

The principals were asked if they had parents sit on committees, such as

curriculum planning or school improvement. Their responses were

crosstabulated by type of school, accredited or nonaccredited.

The majority of the principals (n=34, 91.8%) indicated they had parents on

school committees. Of this number, 18 (100.0%) of the principals in accredited

Table 9

Descriptive Statistics
Percentage of Parents who Attend Parent/Teacher Conferences

Type of school	Mean	SD	Median	Range	
				Minimum	Maximum
Accredited	91.47	23.53	98	3	100
Nonaccredited	75.62	27.46	91	5	99

schools had parents on school committees, with 16 (84.2%) of principals in

nonaccredited schools had parents on these types of committees. Table 10

presents the results of this analysis.

Table 10

Parent Involvement on Committees by Type of School

Parent Involvement on Committees	Type of School				Total	
	Accredited		Nonaccredited			
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Yes	18	100.0	16	84.2	34	91.9
No	0	0.0	3	15.8	3	8.1
Total	18	100.0	19	100.0	37	100.0

The principals were asked if they encouraged their teachers to use

innovative strategies to help children learn. They were asked if they felt the use

of these innovative strategies have had an effect on standardized test scores.

All 18 (100.0%) of the principals in accredited schools indicated that their

teachers indicated their teachers used innovative instructional strategies in their

schools. In comparison, 17 (89.5%) of the principals in nonaccredited schools

indicated their teachers used innovative instructional strategies, with 2 (10.5%)

reporting their teachers did not use these types of strategies.

Twelve (66.7%) of the principals in accredited schools indicated they encouraged their teachers to use innovative instructional strategies. In nonaccredited schools 11 (57.9%) of the principals reported they encouraged their teachers to use innovative instructional strategies.

When asked how the use of innovative instructional strategies effected outcomes on standardized tests, 17 (50.0%) of the principals indicated they had good effects on standardized tests from the use of innovative instructional strategies. Nine (26.5%) of the principals reported excellent effects, with 8 (23.5%) indicating some effects. None of the principals indicated the use of innovative strategies did not effect outcomes on standardized testing.

In accredited schools, 5 (29.4%) principals reported excellent effects from the use of innovative strategies, with a similar number reporting some effects. Seven of the respondents reported good effects from the use of innovative instructional strategies. One principal did not respond to this question.

Ten (58.8%) of the principals in nonaccredited schools reported good effects from the use of innovative instructional strategies, with 4 (23.5%) indicating excellent effects from this testing. Three (17.6%) of the principals reported the use of innovative instructional strategies had some effect on the outcomes of standardized testing.

Principals in accredited schools were more likely to encourage their teachers to use innovative instructional strategies. Principals in accredited schools were also more likely to report excellent effects, while principals in nonaccredited schools reported good effects with the use of innovative

instructional strategies. The responses to these questions are presented in Table 11.

Table 11

Teachers' Use of Innovative Instructional Strategies and
Their Effects on Standardized Testing

Teachers Use Innovative Instructional Strategies and Their Effects on Standardized Testing	Type of School				Total	
	Accredited		Nonaccredited			
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Teachers employ innovative instructional strategies						
Yes	18	100.0	17	89.5	35	94.6
No	0	0.0	2	10.5	2	5.4
Total	18	100.0	19	100.0	37	100.0
Administrator encouraged teachers to use innovative instructional strategies						
Yes	12	66.7	11	57.9	23	62.2
No	6	33.3	8	42.1	14	37.8
Total	18	100.0	19	100.0	37	100.0
Use of innovative instructional strategies have had an effect on standardized testing						
Some effects	5	29.4	3	17.6	8	23.5
Good effects	7	41.2	10	58.8	17	50.0
Excellent effects	5	29.4	4	23.5	9	26.5
Total	17	100.0	17	100.0	34	100.0

Research Questions

Three research questions were developed for this study. Each of these questions were answered using inferential statistical analyses. All decisions on the statistical significance of the findings were made using an alpha level of. 05.

Research question 1. Is there a difference in the personality characteristics of principals in accredited elementary schools and principals in elementary schools that are unaccredited?

The personality types of the principals were obtained from the Myers

Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) that each principal completed. The MBTI instruments were scored by an individual who has been trained and certified by the Myers-Briggs Institute. The outcomes were crosstabulated by type of school. Due to the small number of respondents in each group, statistical testing of this data was not appropriate.

The largest group of principals (n=8, 21.6%) were classified as ESTJ personality types, with 6 (16.2%) categorized as ISTJs. Four (10.8%) participants had personality types that were scored as ESFJ and 3 (8.1%) were classified as ENTP. Two (5.4%) principals were each categories as having ESTP, INP, INTP, ENFP, and ENFJ personality types. One (2.7%) principal each had an ISFJ personality type, INFJ personality type, and 1 (2.7%) and ENTJ personality type. One principal in an accredited school did not complete the MBTI.

Among the accredited principals, three (16.7%) had ESTJ personality types and a similar number had ESFJ personality types. Two (11.1%) principals each had ISTJ personality types and ESTP personality types. One (5.6%) principal were each categorized as ISFJ, INFJ, INTP, ENFP, ENTP, ENFJ, and ENTJ personalities. Two principals in nonaccredited schools did not complete the MBTI.

An examination of the personality types shows that there is a larger number of principals in nonaccredited schools that are classified as either ISTJs or ESTJs. Principals who are ISTJs and ESTJs have personality characteristics that are associated with leaders and administrators. The primary difference between these two types of personalities is that ISTJs are considered to be introverts and ESTJs are extroverts. The personality types of principals in

accredited schools appear to be diffuse with no particular personality type appearing more often. The majority of principals in accredited (n=12, 70.6%) and nonaccredited (n=10, 58.8%) schools were extroverts, although there were more introverts among the principals of nonaccredited (n=7, 41.2%) schools as compared to accredited schools (=5, 29.4%). Table 12 presents the results of this analysis.

Table 12

Personality Typed by Type of School

Personality Types**	Type of School				Total	
	Accredited		Nonaccredited			
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
ISTJ	2	11.1	4	21.1	6	16.2
ISFJ	1	5.6	0	0.0	1	2.7
ESTP	2	11.1	0	0.0	2	5.4
ESTJ	3	16.7	5	26.3	8	21.6
ESFJ	3	16.7	1	5.3	4	10.8
INFJ	1	5.6	0	0.0	1	2.7
INFP	0	0.0	2	10.5	2	5.4
INTP	1	5.6	1	5.3	2	5.4
ENFP	1	5.6	1	5.3	2	5.4
ENTP	1	5.6	2	10.5	3	8.1
ENFJ	1	5.6	1	5.3	2	5.4
ENTJ	1	5.6	0	0.0	1	2.7
Total	17	100.0	17	100.0	34	100.0

Missing Accredited 1
          Nonaccredited 2

** E – I   Extrovert – Introvert
   S – N   Sensing – Intuititve
   T– F   Thinking – Feeling
   J – P   Judging – Perceiving

Research question 2. Is there a difference in the leadership style of principals in accredited elementary schools and principals in elementary schools that are unaccredited?

Principals in the two types of schools were compared on leadership style using t-tests for two independent samples. Principals were asked to rate 16 pairs of adjectives and indicate how each related to the co-worker s/he least preferred using a 5-point Likert scale. Items that were negative were reversed scored to obtain measurements in the same direction. Scores were obtained for each principal by summing the responses. Scores on this scale could range from 16 to 80, with higher scores indicating leadership styles that were relationship-oriented and lower scores indicating more task-oriented leadership styles. The dependent variable in this analysis was the continuous scores on Fiedler's (1980) Least Preferred Co-Worker Scale. The independent variable in this analysis was type of school, accredited or nonaccredited.

The t-value of .26 obtained on the comparison of leadership styles by type of school was not statistically significant at an alpha level of .05 with 34 degrees of freedom. This result indicated that principals in accredited schools (m=74.72, sd=2.52) did not differ significantly from principals in nonaccredited schools (m=74.28, sd=6.91). This finding indicated that leadership styles of principals in both the accredited and nonaccredited schools were more likely to reflect a relationship orientation. The two groups had similar scores on leadership styles Results of this analysis are presented in Table 13.

Research question 3. Is there a relationship between leadership styles and personality types of elementary school principals?

Because of the lack of variability in leadership styles of the elementary

Table 13

t-Test for Two Independent Samples
Leadership Style by Type of School

Type of School	Number	Mean	SD	DF	t-Value
Accredited	18	74.72	2.52	34	.26 (NS)
Nonaccredited	18	74.28	6.91		

school principals in the two types of schools, accredited (m=74.72, sd=2.52) and

nonaccredited (m=74.28, sd=6.91), personality types could not be compared by

the leadership styles of the principals.

Personality temperaments were developed from the principals' personality

characteristics, that included sensing/intuitive, thinking/feeling, and

judging/perceiving. Four personality temperaments were obtained that included

sensing/judging, sensing/perceiving, intuitive/thinking, and intuitive/feeling.

Sensing/judging principals are those who collect data from observable facts and

details and are concerned with organization, planning, control, and closure.

Sensing/perceiving principals also collect data and are curious, open, receptive,

flexible, and adaptive. Principals who are intuitive/thinking display personality

characteristics that include collection of data from insight of relationships and

meaning of things. Intuitive/feeling principals have personality characteristics that

include collecting data from insight of relationships and meaning of things

Personality temperaments are considered to be indicative of the principals were

crosstabulated with the type of school to determine if there was an association

between these two constructs. The personality styles were collapsed to reflect

the four temperaments: sensing/judging, sensing/perceiving, intuitive/thinking,

and intuitive/feeling and makes decisions based on subjective motivations,

human values, and personal importance of the situation to the principal.

Most of the principals were sensing/judging (n=19, 55.9%), with 7

(20.6%) having intuitive/feeling personality temperaments. Six (17.6%) principals

had intuitive/thinking personality temperaments and 2 (5.9%) had

sensing/perceiving personality temperaments. The majority of the principals in

both accredited (n=9, 52.9%) and nonaccredited (n=10, 58.9%) schools had

sensing/judging personality temperaments. Three (17.6%) of accredited school

principals and 4 (23.5%) of nonaccredited school principals had intuitive/feeling

personality temperaments. Table 14 presents the temperaments of the principals

in the study.

Table 14

Frequency Distributions
Personality Temperaments

| Personality Temperaments | Type of School | | | | Total | |
| | Accredited | | Nonaccredited | | | |
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Sensing/Judging	9	52.9	10	58.9	19	55.9
Sensing/Perceiving	2	11.9	0	0.0	2	5.9
Intuitive/Thinking	3	17.6	3	17.6	6	17.6
Intuitive/Feeling	3	17.6	4	23.5	7	20.6
Total	17	100.0	17	100.0	34	100.0

The original research question was developed to determine if leadership

styles (relationship oriented or task oriented) of the principals and personality

temperaments were associated. Although a chi-square analysis was planned, all

of the principals scored above the scale's midpoint, indicating they had

relationship-oriented leadership styles. As a result, the planned analysis was not appropriate.

Ancillary Findings

As there are differences in academic achievement between accredited and nonaccredited schools, the percent of students receiving free and reduced lunch funding were compared to determine the effect of socioeconomic status on accreditation status. The data for free and reduced lunches was obtained from the Michigan Department of Education Web Site on the Internet for each of the school districts included in this study. The dependent variable in this analysis was the mean percentage of students in the two types of schools who were receiving free or reduced lunches. The type of school used as the independent variable.

The results of the three t-tests comparing the three years of data were statistically significant at an alpha level of .05. These results indicated that accredited schools had significantly lower percentages of students who qualified for free or reduced lunches than nonaccredited schools. These findings provide support that schools in low socioeconomic areas are more likely to have students who are not achieving academically, especially when compared to students in higher socioeconomic areas. The results of these analyses are presented in Table 15.

Summary

Results of the statistical analysis used to describe the sample and answer the research questions have been presented in this chapter. Findings and conclusions associated with these findings are presented in Chapter V.

Table 15

t-Tests for Two Independent Samples
Free and Reduced Lunch Percentages by Type of School

Year	Number	Mean	SD	t-Value
1994				
Accredited	18	9.69	11.03	8.98*
Nonaccredited	19	33.24	24.44	
1995				
Accredited	18	10.68	10.38	7.76*
Nonaccredited	19	61.68	26.09	
1996				
Accredited	18	8.67	8.01	9.32*
Nonaccredited	19	65.95	24.89	

*$p \leq .05$

Chapter V

Summary, Conclusions, and Recommendations

Summary

An examination of relationships between personality characteristics as measured by the MBTI and leadership styles as measured by the LPC of elementary principals in accredited and unaccredited schools to determine if specific personality profiles emerge that differentiate elementary school principals in educational settings that are considered successful from those in settings that are not successful were the focus of this study. The defining characteristic used in this study to delineate successful and unsuccessful schools was receiving interim accreditation from the State of Michigan.

The role of the elementary school principal needs to carry with it the responsibility of being an effective educational leader. As Jones (1995) suggested, a leader is someone who is ". . . wise enough to mentor a young faculty and intellectual enough to sit on the school roof if kids read 500 books" (p. 17). In essence, it takes all kinds of strategies to help children learn.

Edmonds, at a seminar in 1978, described effective schools as follows:

> Principals of effective schools behave in ways that are observably, demonstrably, and sometime dramatically different from the way that principals behave in ineffective schools. The primary difference is that principals of effective schools are the instructional leaders in their buildings, while those in ineffective schools are not.

Principals have to exhibit effective leadership styles to be in charge of effective schools. Their leadership styles may be tempered by their personality traits, although little research has examined the relationship between personality and leadership style. Care must be taken not to confuse leadership tasks with

leadership style. Leadership tasks are specific tasks that leaders perform in directing and coordinating the work of their subordinates. These tasks include suggesting, making decisions, developing schedules, and promoting their subordinates. In contrast leadership style is a personality characteristic and does not describe leadership behaviors that are consistent (Fiedler in Hoy & Miskel, 1988).

The most commonly used measure of personality is the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) which is based on Jung's theory of personality. According to Jung, there are two pairs of mental functions, or four individual modes of orientation (sensing, intuition, thinking, and feeling) and two basic personality attitudes (extroversion and introversion). These functions act as a framework for classifying personality types and can suggest what characteristics represent similar and different personality types.

By associating different leadership styles (relationship oriented and task oriented) with personality traits, a pattern may be discerned that differentiates principals of effective schools from principals of ineffective schools.

An abundance of literature, both anecdotal and research-based, exists on leadership. Most of this literature provides the types of tasks and traits of good leaders. Major differences have been found in the types of skills a leader must exhibit to be considered effective among researchers. For example, most researchers believe a good leader must be a team builder, must know and understand the community and available resources, understand human nature, have a vision for their school vision, and know how to plan (Clark, 1995). Hersey indicated three keys for an effective leader, understanding past behavior, being

able to predict future behavior, and directing, changing, and controlling behavior.

A debate is also continuing as to whether leadership is innate or can be learned. According to Guttmann (1994), a leader was described as a risk taker, a visionary, an enabler, a planner/director, and a booster. A manager may be somewhat of a risk taker, a director/planner, and a booster, but may not be a visionary or enabler, specifically in being able to empower others.

The on-going need to understand leadership is a result of trying to understand the effects of leadership on outcomes, especially in an educational setting. According to Norris (1991), the leadership style of a principal cold have a positive effect on promoting teacher skills, abilities, and attitudes, or it could stifle motivation and lead to teacher disenchantment and discouragement. To be considered effective, leaders need to understand their own cognitive styles and strive to enhance their capacity or more holistic thinking.

Sergiovanni (1994) proposed an approach to school leadership. This approach viewed the school as a moral community to provide moral connections among the major stakeholders. According to Sergiovanni, moral connections could promote stronger bonds than extrinsic or intrinsic reward connections because they are derived from commitments to shared values.

Leadership effectiveness and personality have been linked by Hogan, Curphy, and Hogan (1994). Stodgill (in Hogan, et al., 1994) found that measures of dominance, extraversion, sociability, ambition or achievement, responsibility, integrity, self-confidence, mood and emotional control, diplomacy, and cooperativeness were characteristics found in the personality profiles of leaders. Kenny and Zaccaro (in Hogan, et al., 1994) found that 48% and 82% of the

variance in leadership emergence rankings resulted from personality characteristics. According to Hogan, et al. (1994), flawed leaders are chosen because search committees choose candidates on the basis of principals that guide leadership emergence and do not use established principles of personnel selection.

Wendel, Kilgore, and Spurzem (1991) studied the relationship between personality and leadership characteristics using the MBTI. The participants were either in administrative positions or were working toward attainment of administrative certification. Specific patterns emerged within the group, with ESTJ, ENTJ, and ENFP the primary personalty type patterns, accounting for approximately 50% of the participants. Extroversion was the most commonly found trait among administrators. The other traits that were found among more than 50% of the participants included intuition, thinking, and judging. A study by Walters and Wilmoth (1989) found strong relationships between leadership attributes and personality preferences.

Methods

A nonexperimental, correlational research design was used in this study. The primary data collection instruments were the MBTI and the Least Preferred Co-Worker Scale (Fiedler, 1980). Both of these instruments were considered to be valid and reliable for use with adults. The MBTI is the most widely used personality type indicator. The Least Preferred Co-Worker Scale measures leadership style and not leadership skills.

The participants in this study were principals in accredited schools n=112) and principals in nonaccredited (n=44) schools. To provide a sample that

included a similar number of both types of respondents, a random sample of 50

principals in the accredited schools and all of the principals of the unaccredited

schools. Of this number, 18 principals from accredited schools and 19 principals

from unaccredited schools returned their completed surveys for an overall

response rate of 38.9%.

Research questions.

Three research questions were posed for this study. Each of these

questions were answered using a combination of inferential statistical tests and

descriptive analyses. All decisions on the statistical significance of the findings

were made using an alpha level of .05.

> *Research question 1.* Is there a difference in the personality
> characteristics of principals in accredited elementary schools and
> principals in elementary schools that are unaccredited?

Crosstabulations of the personality characteristics of the principals in

accredited and nonaccredited by type of school were obtained to determine if

there was a preponderance of personalty types in accredited and nonaccredited

schools. Due to the small sample size, the number of principals with each unique

personality type was not sufficient to determine if there were differences between

the two types of schools in terms of personality of the principals.

> *Research question 2.* Is there a difference in the leadership style of
> principals in accredited elementary schools and principals in
> elementary schools that are unaccredited?

The mean scores for leadership styles of the principals in accredited and

nonaccredited schools were compared using t-tests for two independent

samples. The results of these analyses provided no evidence of significant

differences in leadership styles between principals in the two types of schools.

Research question 3. Is there a relationship between leadership styles and personality types of elementary school principals?

The leadership styles of the principals were all above the midpoint of the scale indicating the principals were all exhibiting relationship-oriented leadership styles. Because of this lack of variability, the personality temperaments of the principals could not be tested.

Ancillary Findings

Information on the percentage of students qualifying for free or reduced lunch programs in the two schools was downloaded from the Internet Web Site of the Michigan Department of Education. This data were compared between accredited schools and nonaccredited schools to determine if socioeconomic status was a determinant of academic achievement. Accredited schools had significantly fewer students who qualified for free or reduced lunch programs than nonaccredited schools over a three year program. Based on this finding, there appears to be a significant difference in academic achievement between schools with a low percentage of students qualifying for free or reduced lunch and students in schools with a high percentage of students in these types of programs.

Conclusions

Factors that contribute to student success in schools have been the focus of research for many years. This study attempted to determine if a principals' personality and/or his/her leadership style could be a determinant in student success. The results of this study have shown that personality types of principals are diverse in both accredited and nonaccredited schools. There was no clear

pattern of personality types that could be responsible for principals being in schools where students perform well and in school where students are having problems in attaining standards established by the state for academic performance.

The principals in this study all scored high on the Least Preferred Co-Worker Scale indicating they all had relationship-oriented leadership styles, regardless of the type of school in which they were acting as the instructional leader. Previous literature has linked leadership style with high performing schools. This study can neither refute or support these studies as the principals were homogeneous in terms of leadership style.

The ancillary findings of this study have supported contentions that socioeconomic status of the school is a predictor of academic success among the students. Over a three-year period, accredited schools had significantly lower percentages of students qualifying for free or reduce lunches.

The sample size in this study may be too small to draw any general conclusions, but it should be considered as exploratory in ruling out personality styles as a precursor of student success in academic achievement. Other factors should be examined to help schools that are unaccredited become high performing.

Recommendations for Further Research

The results of this study have given rise to additional questions regarding differences in school performance. Research needs to be continued to determine why a school consistently produces high-performing students and another has

low test scores over long periods of time. The following suggestions are made for

further research in this area:

- Replicate this study with a larger sample to determine if personality types and personality temperaments differ among principals in high and low performing schools.

- Study factors outside of school that can influence student achievement. Some of these factors could include: socioeconomic status of families, family composition within the school district, commitment to education of the families, parent involvement in the schools, etc.

- Investigate personality types of teachers to determine if teachers with certain types of personalities influence student achievement.

- Examine the role of the principal in student achievement, including visibility in classrooms, relationships with parents, participating in school activities, etc.

- Compare personality types of principals at different grade levels (e.g., elementary, middle, and high school) to determine if certain personality types are more prevalent at specific grade levels.

Appendix A

Instruments

.

Least Preferred Co-Worker

Directions: Think of a teacher in your building when you are completing this scale. Describe this person as s/he appears to you based on each set of adjectives. Select the adjective from each pair that describes this teacher and then indicate your level of agreement with the adjective. Numbers closer to the adjective reflect higher agreement that the adjective is an accurate description of the teacher. Please be honest. All responses will be confidential with all responses reported in aggregate.

	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	
Pleasant									Unpleasant
Friendly									Unfriendly
Rejecting									Accepting
Helpful									Frustrating
Unenthusiastic									Enthusiastic
Tense									Relaxed
Distant									Close
Cold									Warm
Cooperative									Uncooperative
Supportive									Hostile
Boring									Interesting
Quarrelsome									Harmonious
Self-assured									Hesitant
Efficient									Inefficient
Gloomy									Cheerful
Open									Guarded

DEMOGRAPHIC SURVEY

Please answer the following questions as they relate to you and your school. There are no right or wrong answers. All responses will be confidential and no individual or school will be identifiable from the reported findings.

Age
❑ Under 35
❑ 36 to 45
❑ 46 to 55
❑ More than 55

Gender
❑ Male
❑ Female

Educational Level
❑ Bachelor's Degree
❑ Master's Degree
❑ Educational Specialist
❑ Ed.D./Ph.D.

Length of Time in Education   _____ Years

☞ **Please complete other side**

Length of Time as a Principal _____ Years

Length of Time in Current Position _____ Years

How many of the following personnel do you have in your school?

Students	Administrators (Other than Principal)	Teachers	Paraprofessionals/ Teaching Aides	Other Support Staff (Counselors, Social Workers, etc.)

How many computers do you have in your school for instructional use? _____

How many of these computers are in the following locations? (Check all that apply):

_____ Classrooms _____ Labs _____ Media Centers

How are parents able to participate in your schools? (Check all that apply):

❏ Parent/Teacher Conferences ❏ Open House ❏ Parent tutors
❏ Room parent ❏ Field Trip Chaperone ❏ Club Sponsor
❏ Parent/Teacher Group ❏ Other _____

What percentage of parents attend Parent/Teacher Conferences? _____

Are parents asked to sit on committees (Curriculum planning, school improvement, etc)
❏ No ❏ Yes If yes, please list the types of committees where parents are involved:

_____

Do you feel your teachers employ innovative strategies to help children learn?

❏ No ❏ Yes If yes, please list the types of strategies that your teachers use

_____

What innovative strategies have you encouraged your teachers to use to help children learn?

❏ No ❏ Yes

Do you feel the use of these innovative strategies have had an effect on standardized test scores?

❏ No Effects ❏ Some Effects ❏ Good Effects ❏ Excellent Effects

Use the following space to provide comments regarding the State of Michigan Accreditation Process.

_____

_____

_____

THANK YOU FOR TAKING TIME TO COMPLETE THIS QUESTIONNAIRE

Appendix B

Correspondence

To: Elementary School Principals

I am a doctoral student at Wayne State University in curriculum. I am working on my dissertation that examines and compares the personality types and leadership styles of principals in elementary schools. Principals are considered the instructional leaders of the school, especially at the elementary level. This study is intended to determine if there are personality characteristics and leadership styles that are specific to elementary school principals.

Three instruments are included in this study. They are the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator, the Least Preferred Co-Worker Scale, and a short demographic survey. These instruments should take no longer than 20 to 25 minutes to complete.

Please be advised that all responses will be confidential and that no individual will be identifiable from the analysis that will be provided on the final report. The surveys are coded, but the purpose of this coding is to allow the researcher to maintain control over outstanding surveys during data collection. The code book with the names of the participants will be destroyed after all data collection has been completed. No risks or additional effects are likely to result from your participation in this study. In the unlikely event of an injury arising from participation in this study, no reimbursement, compensation, or free medical treatment is offered by Wayne State University or the researcher.

Your participation in this study is voluntary, with the return of your completed survey evidence of your willingness to participate in the study. Once you have returned your completed survey, you can withdraw until the end of the data collection period. Following this period, your survey will not be identifiable, preventing your withdrawal.

Please complete the survey and Myers-Briggs Personality Type Inventory, Form G within five working days. Return the survey, along with the Myers-Briggs booklet and finished answer sheets in the enclosed self-addressed, stamped envelope and return it to the researcher by United States mail. If you have any questions regarding the items on the survey or the purpose of the study, please feel free to contact me at your earliest convenience. I can be reached at (313) 654-9112. This number is to my home where I have an answering machine. I will return your call within 24 hours. If you would like information regarding your rights regarding participation in this study, please contact Dr. Peter Lichtenberg, Wayne State University Behavioral Investigation Committee at (313) 577-1628.

I appreciate your help with this project.

James F. Orwin   Ronald V. Urick, Ph.D.
Doctoral Candidate   Advisor

Enclosures

References

Barr, L., & Barr, N. (1989). The leadership equation: Leadership, management, and the Myers-Briggs. Austin: Eakin Press.

Bennis, W., & Nanus, B. (1989). Leadership for Excellence. In S. C. Smith & P. K. Piele (Eds.), School Leadership: Handbook for Excellence . Eugene, OR: ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management, College of Education, University of Oregon.

Bensimon, E. M. (1989). Making sense of administrative leadership. The "L" word in higher education (ERIC Clearing House on Higher Education ED 317 099). Washington, DC.

Blase, J., & Kirby, P. C. (1992). Bringing out the best in teachers: What effective principals do. Newbury Park, CA: Corwin Press, Inc.

Bolman, L., & Deal, T. (1991). Images of leadership (Occasional Paper 7). Nashville, TN: National Center for Educational Leadership.

Bothwell, L. (1983). The Art of Leadership: Skill-building techniques that produce results. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Champlain, J. (1987). Leadership: A change agents view. In L. T. Scheive & M. B. Schoenheit (Eds.), Leadership: Examining the elusive. 1987 ASCD Yearbook (pp. 49-63). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Clark, S. (1995, May,). What leadership skills do principals really need? The School Administrator, 52, 35.

Clio, D. C. (1994). Micropolitics: Empowering Principals to Accomplish Goals. NASSP Bulletin, 79(564), 89-96.

Deal, T. E. (1987). The core task of leadership: Reforming or recharging. In L. T. Scheive & M. B. Schoenheit (Eds.), Leadership: Examining the Elusive (pp. 12-14). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Dubin, A. E. The principal as chief executive officer. Bristol, PA: Taylor and Francis.

Dye, A. (1994). The supervisory relationship (ERIC Clearinghouse on Counseling and Student Services ED 372 343).

English, F. (1992). The principal and the Prince: Machiavelli and school leadership. NASSP Bulletin, 76(540), 10-16.

Goldring, E. B., & Raillis, S. F. (1993). The principals of dynamic schools: Taking charge of change. Newbury Park, CA: The National Association of Secondary School Principals and Corwin Press, Inc.

Guttmann, R. C. (1994). Leaders and mangers: Dimensions and differences. People and Education, 2(2), 135-147.

Hadderman, M. (1984). What is team management (ERIC Digest EA 25 ED). Washington, DC.

Hogan, R., Curphy, G. J., & Hogan, J. (1994). What we know about leadership: Effectiveness and personality. American Psychologist, 49(6), 493-504.

Hurley, J. C. (1994). Becoming a principal? You must be kidding! International Journal of Educational Reform, 3(2), 165-173.

Joekel, R. G., Wendel, G. C., & Hoke, F. A. (1994). Principals can make a difference. Principal, 73(4), 34-35.

Jung, C. G. (1971 (original work 1921)). Psychological Types (H. G. Baynes, Rev. by R. F. C. Hull, Trans.). (Vol. 6). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Keirsey, D., & Bates, M. (1984). Please Understand Me. Del Mar, CA: Prometheus Nemesis Book Company.

Kirby, P., Wimpelberg, R., & Keaster, R. (1992). Teacher empowerment depends on needs, exceptions of principals, schools, and districts. NASSP Bulletin, 76(545), 89-95.

Klauke, A. (1988). Recruiting and selecting principals (ERIC Clearing House on Educational Management ED 297 481). Alexandria, VA: NASSP Taskforce.

Knoop, R. (1994). A model of universal leadership based on psychological type. Journal of Social Behavior and Personality, 9(1), 43-62.

Konnert, W. (1990). The superintendency in the nineties: What superintendents and board members need to know. Lancaster, PA: Technomic Publishing Co.

Liontos, L. B. (1992). Transformational Leadership: Profile of a High School Principal (ERIC Digest No. 72 ED 347 636). Portland: Oregon School Study Council.

Luce, W. (1994). Principles for Principals. Executive Educator, 16(8), 23-25.

Lueder, D. C. (1989). One hundred top small district executive educators: Their personalities and leadership styles. Journal of Rural and Small Schools, 4(1), 36-43.

McDade, S. A. (1988). Leadership in Higher Education (ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education ED 301 144).

McKenzie, J. (1992). Sail beyond your Odysseus complex. The Executive Educator, 14(7), 22.

Myers, I. B., & Myers, P. B. (1980). Gifts Differing. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press, Inc.

Myers-Briggs, I., & McCaulley, M. (1989). Manual: A guide to the development and use of the Myers-Briggs type indicator. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.

Niece, R. (1993). The principal as instructional leader: Past influence and current resources. NASSP Bulletin,77(553), 13-18.

Norris, C. J. (1991). Supervising with style. Theory Into Practice, XXX(2), 128-133.

Pankake, A. M., & Burnett Jr., I. E. (1990). The effective school principal. Palm Springs, CA: ETC Publications.

Scarnati, J. (1994). Beyond technical competence: Nine rules for administrators. NASSP Bulletin, 78(561), 76-83.

Serafin, A. G. (1992). Charismatic behaviors and traits of future educational leaders. Paper presented at the Midwest Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL.

Sergiovanni, T. J. (1994). The roots of school leadership. Principal, 74(2), 6-8.

Walters, N. J., & Wilmoth, J. N. (1989). Leadership attributes and personality preferences of high school student leaders in health occupations. Journal of Vocational Education Research.

Wendel, F. C., Hoke, F. A., & Joekel, R. G. (1991). Project success: Outstanding principals speak out. The Clearing House, 67(1), 52-54.

Wendel, F. C., Kilgore, A. M., & Spurzem, C. W. (1991). Are administrators' personalities related to their job skills. NASSP Bulletin, 76(530), 14-20.

Abstract

PERSONALITY TYPES AND LEADERSHIP STYLES OF PRINCIPALS IN
ACCREDITED AND UNACCREDITED ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

by

JAMES F. ORWIN

May, 1999

Advisor: Dr. Burnis Hall

Major: Curriculum and Instruction

Degree: Doctor of Education

The purpose of this study was to determine if leadership styles and

personality types differed among elementary school principals in schools that

were accredited by the State of Michigan and those that were nonaccredited.

Accreditation from the State of Michigan indicated that students have attained a

level of mastery, while nonaccreditation meant the students were not performing

academically. The role of the principal needed to be investigate to determine if

specific leadership styles could be linked to academic performance and if

principals in high achieving schools had different types of leadership. A total of

18 principals in accredited schools and 19 principals in nonaccredited schools

completed three instruments, Least Preferred Co-Worker Scale to measure

leadership style, Myers-Briggs Type Indicator to determine personality styles,

and a short demographic survey to obtain information regarding the personal

and professional characteristics of the principals and collect data about the

parents and the schools. In addition, information on the percentage of free and

reduced lunch program qualifiers was obtained from the Michigan Department of

Education via the Internet.

The results of the analysis provided no evidence of differences between principals in accredited and nonaccredited schools in regards to personality types or leadership styles. As all of the principals were found to exhibit relationship-oriented leadership styles, a comparison of personalty type by type of leadership style was not completed. Ancillary analysis compared the percentage of students qualifying for free or reduced lunch over a three-year program between the accredited and nonaccredited schools. The results of these analyses were statistically significant indicating that accredited schools had significantly fewer students qualifying for free or reduced lunch programs than schools that were not accredited.

Autobiographical Statement

James F. Orwin

Education	1998 – Doctor of Education – Curriculum and Instruction Wayne State University. Detroit, Michigan
	1984 – Education Specialist – Educational Administration Wayne State University, Detroit, Michigan
	1975 – Master of Arts – Secondary School Administration Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan
	1967 – Bachelor of Science – Physical Education Northern Michigan University, Marquette, Michigan

Certifications State of Michigan – Superintendent Certification
State of Michigan Teaching Certificate – Permanent

Professional Experiences	1986 to 1998 Carleton Airport Community Schools – Superintendent
	1981 to 1986 Richmond Community Schools – Superintendent
	1967 to 1981 Croswell-Lexington Community Schools – Assistant Superintendent, Elementary Principal, Assistant Middle School Principal, Teacher, Coach
Professional Organizations	Association of School and Curriculum Development Michigan Association of School and Curriculum Development American Association of School Administrators Michigan Association of School Administrators Michigan Negotiators Association
Community Organizations	United Way Allocation Board Salvation Army Board of Directors Ash Township Building Authority