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The study examined educational leadership behaviors among elementary school principals in Qasim region of Saudi Arabia. Seven independent variables using a survey questionnaire among a randomly selected sample from the identified population. Self-reporting elicited, first, critical background information and, second, data concerning 60 specific leadership behavior items important to work issues, critical areas of educational administration, professional relationship situations, and leadership problems ordinarily confronted. Items were grouped according to five categories of twelve items each.

Ninety-six principals or 80% of the survey sample of 120 responded. Focus of the study derived importantly from an extensive and complex review of literature incorporating six sections of inquiry. These were: Principal Behavior and School Effectiveness, Organizational Leadership Behavior, Educational Leadership Behavior, Principal Organizational Leadership Behavior, Principal Length of Experience and Effectiveness, and Education and School Administration in Saudi Arabia. Preliminary
research assumptions indicated that principals' length of administrative experience was importantly related to leadership behavior.

Twelve research null hypotheses were tested using one-way analysis of variance ANOVA with alpha level at .05 of significance. Relationships between principal organizational leadership behavior and three independent variables included academic degree, length of additional administrative training, and school district were confirmed. Length of administrative experience was determined to be related to leadership behavior within only one of the five subcategories. This was principals' relationship with students. Four independent variables determined to not be related to leadership behavior included principal length of classroom teaching experience, length of assistant principal experience, length of administrative experience, and age.

Principal leadership behavior was discussed as a function of transformational leadership considered in its macro (Burns, 1978) sense. Conflict between organizational socialization experienced by school principals within the administrative capacity and the professional socialization school principals experience primarily as part of academic education and through subsequent additional administrative training was examined. Principals' assertion of transformational leadership intervention was discussed in term of leadership behavior and educational improvement. Organizational socialization process was presented as characteristically submerging principal transformational potential within organizational transactional routine. Organizational process and socialization were proposed as limiting professional educational experience.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

Education in Saudi Arabia until well into the 20th Century had not been formally organized according to any publicly governed system. Male children, usually beginning around age six, and generally continuing no further than age fifteen, were taught basic literacy and Islamic law in the masques by the Imams, the religious leaders. A small number of children, still mostly male, but including also a very few females, from privileged families, were taught individually in their family homes by private teachers, some of whom were Imams, and some of whom were simply teachers or tutors. More commonly for female students, however, daughters were sent by their parents, again from age six through fifteen, to study with small groups of female students, only, in the homes of women teachers (Muslah, 1982; Al Salloom, 1987).

These female teachers were recognized for religious qualities, and they were considered well educated among women, having been fortunate enough to have received tutoring from their father, or from a private teacher he provided, more than likely a male. For the women teachers themselves, instructing young women was taken as a profession. They continued in teaching throughout their lifetimes. At retirement they passed the teaching role onto a personally selected student. Passing on of the teaching role to selected students was also a tradition of those Imams who taught male students. This
traditional teaching of the young under one teacher, either male or female, with students of all ages and levels grouped together, was called "Katateeb" (Al Salloom, 1987).

The Two Holy Mosques in Mecca and Medina became the centers of learning for all parts of the Islamic world, but especially the Arabian Peninsula. A very select group of male children were sent by their parents to one or the other of these Mosques to continue their education after age fifteen or after finishing Katateeb. Selection of these special students was made on the recommendation of the Imam (Al Salloom, 1987; Hay Gazzaz, 1992).

By the late 19th Century, in Mecca, four private schools had provided classes for students who studied together in a composite group, covering many subjects from beginning level through higher level, corresponding roughly to kindergarten through high school. The first of these schools had been organized in 1872 by Mohammed Othmani, a Muslim businessman, who had migrated from India to avoid troubles with the British government, which had confiscated all of his wealth and property. A wealthy lady friend, back home in India, had sent Othmani money to develop this first school. The school, and, thus, the beginning of formally organized education in Saudi Arabia was named, Alsolatihe, in the lady's honor. Seven years later, still in Mecca, a second school, Alfakherieh, was opened by one of the original school's teachers, indicating formal education growing success. In 1905 another businessman, Mohammed Ali Zinal, opened a school in Jeddah, and also a third school in Mecca, in 1912, and one other school in Medina. Together these three schools are called "Alfalih." The fourth of the original
schools in Mecca was opened in 1916, by Sherif Husein. The above schools remain in
operation to this day (Muslah, 1982).

The four successful schools in Mecca were reorganized by King Abdul Aziz into
public schools in 1924, after his liberation of Mecca from Sherif Hussein's rule in 1923.
In order to establish public education in 1924 throughout the country, firmly based on
sound principle, King Abdul Ariz assembled a group of scholars to develop guidelines for
schools to be created according to a uniform system. One of the goals was to create
equal instruction and educational opportunity at no cost for anyone throughout Saudi
Arabia. Thus, public education was founded in the city of Mecca and for all Saudi Arabia.

In conjunction with this founding, public education began formally with
establishment of the Directorate General of Education in 1926. The office of Directorate
General was charged with two main functions: first, the construction of numerous
elementary and secondary schools; and second, to proceed with recruitment of teachers
to implement educational programs as designated for the schools (Al-Alsheikh, 1992; Hay

From this point of officially establishing formal education, until 1960, all formal
education was for males only. By 1952, from the original four schools in Mecca,
designated by King Abdul Ariz for the initiation of public education, the number of public
elementary schools had grown to 226 throughout Saudi Arabia. In 1953, Saudi Arabia's
government replaced the Directorate General of Education with the Ministry of
Education. The present ruler of Saudi Arabia, King Fahad, the Custodian of the Two
Holy Mosques, was the first Minister of Education, accomplishing many things for Saudi Arabian education during his relatively short tenure. Educational opportunity was greatly expanded under his administration, with public schools created literally in every village throughout the country (Dar Al Shorouq, 1979).

The Ministry of Education today is responsible for all male public education grades K-12, including special education, and also junior colleges for training teachers of the male population throughout the whole country. At present, the number of public elementary schools has increased to 5,307, all under the supervision of the Ministry, and all still entirely comprised of male students only. Female Education, Higher Education, and Technical Education programs are each administered through three other distinct government agencies (Al Salloom, 1987).

Saudi Arabia, located on the Arabian Peninsula, has an area of about 900,000 square miles with a population of 12 million. Riyadh is the capital city. The Constitution and the Laws are based on Islamic Religion. The government and people of Saudi Arabia view Islamic Religion as inclusive of a way of life which preaches the ideas of equality among people, tolerance of other religions, and submission to the will of God. Islam encompasses a legal system that lays down precise rules for behavior in private and social life, as well as in business and the educational system. The presence and influence of Islam are pervasive in Saudi Education. Learning for Muslim people is a duty dictated by God in order to create a good society. The first word revealed to Prophet Mohammed (Peace be Upon Him) was "Iqrea," which means "read." Many instances of praise for
knowledge occur in the Quran and the Sunnah (the Prophet's tradition, or life story). Islam continues to provide the basis of all learning in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, through its emphatic directive to seek knowledge throughout life. The study of Islam is at the core of modern education in Saudi Arabia, providing the necessary foundation to prepare new generations for challenges of the future. Islam does not discriminate concerning equality between men and women, but ascribes rights and duties for each group towards the other. For this reason, male and female education are separated in Saudi Arabia (Dar Al Shorouq, 1979; Al-Mubtaath, 1989).

The Kingdom of Saudi Arabia Ministry of Higher Education has established that the purpose of education is to have the student understand Islam in a correct, comprehensive manner; to plant and spread the Islamic creed, to furnish the student with the values, teaching and ideals of Islam, to equip him with the various skills and knowledge, to develop his conduct in constructive directions, to develop the society economically, socially and culturally, and to prepare the individual to become a useful member in the building of his community (Ministry of Higher Education, 1978, p. 10).

At initiation of formal education in 1924, with government establishment of the Directorate General Of Education, several elementary schools were then opened in the large cities of Riyadh, Medina, Jeddah, and Dammam, while one more school was added in Mecca. These schools were divided into six levels, for students ages six through twelve. During the 1960s and 1970s, elementary education developed very rapidly due to large increases in pupil enrollment. Educational needs were served by forty school districts. Although Saudi Arabia is a developing country, and still in the process of creating its infrastructure, including that for education, by 1993 the number of boy's
elementary schools had reached 5,307, with a separate principal for each school (Ministry of Education, 1994).

Statement of the Problem

Education in Saudi Arabia is formally viewed as a process which develops, controls, and guides the life of a community towards its ideal, and awakens individual students to an awareness of their responsibilities towards their country (Ministry of Information, 1986). The education decision-making function which determines this developmental and controlling process is highly bureaucratized and centralized. All planning of curriculum, budget, hiring practices, course implementation, and so forth are strictly, rigidly, and comprehensively controlled by the Ministry of Education (Al Salloom, 1988). The main goal of education in Saudi Arabia has been to create good students who will be the future citizens of the state, and upon whose shoulders the nation will be built (Al-Zaid, 1982).

To effectively achieve this goal, the education system of Saudi Arabia should concern itself with getting the best principals, teachers, curriculum, and so on, in order to help produce well educated citizens. Teachers' training, formerly conducted at secondary level institutes, has over the past twenty years been considerably expanded, in particular through the establishment of a junior college system for teacher training. At present, all teacher training is carried out in this system or in four year colleges and universities.
In order to achieve organizational goals, the schools of Saudi Arabia need effective administrative leaders to establish good relationships with staff, parents, students, and community. Administrative leaders also must work to establish and maintain productive viewpoints and policies concerning the school curriculum. Principals can be thought of as the most important element in the education system, because they head the schools and can often act as the key to schools' effectiveness or ineffectiveness. The principals' primary leadership function, in general, corresponds to transforming collective ideas and concerns into specific, achievement oriented goals. To carry out this function, principals should create collegial working relationships, exemplified by collaborative action planning (Kyte, 1952; Lipham, 1981).

In Saudi Arabia some teachers during their employment apply to be principals or assistant principals, after gaining some teaching experience. Principal selection is made by the district superintendents from the available pool of teachers and assistant principals. Assistant principals are commonly teachers who are assisting school principals on a part-time basis. In addition, selection for the principalship, from among teacher candidates, is generally related to teaching performance, which in itself may not be a good indicator of qualification for administrative duties. Sometimes principals selected are not qualified to do their jobs as well as could be reasonably expected. They may lack knowledge concerning administration. They may not understand how school principals work to create effective schools. In Saudi Arabia, the problem of insufficient administration preparation and professional training is exacerbated by the fact that principals, even with
no training, stay at the same school until retirement, at age sixty (Manuie, 1976; Abolaban, 1978).

Specific criticism related to the Saudi Arabian school administration suggests that principals cannot achieve the goals of the school because they tend to see their work as merely a series of rudimentary activities: maintaining the combined attendance records of the schools, coordinating regulations received from the school district, and informing the district superintendent of the equipment needs of the school. Moreover, given their training and background experience, these administrators may not, in general, be qualified to achieve much beyond such rudimentary functions. Deficiency in training and experience may result in a lack of qualification for attending to the deeper dimensions of school leadership. Such leadership deficiency may be the true source of relationship problems for the principal and his staff with students, teachers, and parents (Hamoooh, 1977).

The approach in this study will be to examine how elementary school principals behave in their work, in terms of school, staff, students, and school community, with emphases on school curriculum and how the principals serve as effective organization leaders for educational improvement in the schools. Interaction of principal organizational leadership behavior with individual background factors and administrative experience will be also examined.
Purpose of the Study

After first establishing some understanding as to the role school principals play in educational formation, the present study will attempt determination of organizational leadership behaviors, in theory and in practice, recognized as desirable and effective in four further dimensions, which are: as stated in general organizational theory; as specifically applied to educational settings and situations; as theory is related to elementary school principals' actual behaviors; and as tenure of administrative experience may influence principal effectiveness. In the final dimension of the study, all of the above formulation of principal effectiveness will then be cast in the light of the Saudi Arabian educational context.

From within this dimension of specific educational context, the study will then focus directly on organizational leadership behaviors among elementary school principals in three selected school districts of Qasim region in Saudi Arabia. Organizational leadership behaviors will be analyzed in terms of what principals actually do within the school environment, in serving as authority figures, educational experts, community leaders, advisors to parents and families, school managers, problem solvers, decision makers, and in carrying out the day-to-day rudimentary activities of the schools. The study will identify leadership behavior manifested in relation to specific principal decision and response situations. Additionally, length of administrative experience will be determined for individual study participants and then examined in terms of its influence on identified manifestations of principal organizational leadership behavior.
Definitions

The following terms, as they are used in the study, are defined below:

Qasim Region

Qasim region, a part of Saudi Arabia, lies approximately at the center of the Arabian Peninsula (see map, Figure 1). It is one of 14 Saudi Arabian Administrative Regions (see Figure 2). The region is famous for its agricultural resources and comprises more than 250 towns and villages, including 13 main towns, all of which are linked to Qasim region's capital city of Buraidh. The largest three cities in Qasim are Buraidh, Unaizah, and Al-Rus. Each city comprises a separate school district. The first government school was opened in Qasim in 1937 (Ministry of Information, 1993).

Figure 1. Map of The Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.
Leadership

Examination of the body of leadership theory provides numerous approaches. Leadership has been defined in terms of individual traits, behavior, influence over other people, interaction patterns, role relationship, occupation of an administrative position, and perception by others regarding legitimacy of influence (Yukl, 1989). The specific definitions chosen for study are "leadership is the behavior of the individual when he is directing the activities of a group toward a shared goal" (Hemphill & Coons, 1957, p. 7, cited in Yukl, 1989, p. 2); and leadership is "the particular acts in which a leader engages in the course of directing and coordinating the work of his group members" (Fiedler, 1967, cited in Bass, 1985, p. 10).
Elementary School

Elementary schools are the foundation on which rests the preparation of youth for all of the following stages of their lives. Elementary education is an important stage of learning which influences all the members of the nation and provides them with the fundamentals of Islamic Religion, sound ideology, important social meanings, trends, and the experience, information, and skills they will need to become functioning members of society (Ministry of Higher Education, 1978).

Principal

As the chief administrator for the individual school, the principal plays a pivotal role in the lives of students and all factors related to the school. The principal is the most important and influential individual in the school. The principal is the person responsible for all activities that occur in and around the school building. The principal is the main link between the community and school. The principal performs in this relational capacity in order to establish positive attitudes, toward the school and education, and among parents and students associated with the school. The principal is the key to a successful school (Kyte, 1952; Spain 1956; & Lipham, 1981).

Principals' Organizational Leadership Behavior

Principals' organizational leadership behavior refers to actions principals take within the scope of school activities (Davis & Newstrom, 1985). Thomas (1969) states
that the leader's organizational leadership behavior characteristically is the result of the interaction between the expectations of his role and his need-dispositions, or, more explicitly and operationally, his values and disposition as to interpersonal orientation, organizational orientation, and interpersonal values (1969).

**School Curriculum**

School curriculum includes all experiences children have under the guidance of teachers. It thus is the sum total of all student learning (Jacobson et al., 1954).

**Transformational Leadership**

As Yukl (1989) cites from Burns, that "leaders and followers raise one another to higher levels of morality and motivation" (p. 210). It is the aspect of power mobilization for social system and institutional change, as Burns emphasizes, that becomes the essential feature of leadership effectiveness and leader exercise of will in organizations and institutions of the present time. Besides accomplishing the task, transformational leadership seeks to transform the situation at hand, by raising the expectations and attitudes of both leaders and followers (Burns, 1978).

A individuals come together and form the leader-follower relationship to accomplish the task, to rise to new levels of expectations and dreams, and to work together beyond accomplishing the task. Transformational leadership involves a relationship between leader and follower in which the leader attempts to create for the
combination of both leaders and followers an outcome which was not a goal of the followers before they entered the relationship, but which meets with their approval more than all of the other goals which are open to them (Burns, 1978). Conger (1989), following Burns in pursuing the macro concept of social system change, emphasizes the manifestation of vision on the part of the transformational leader as the vital organization creative act, constructive of a state or condition that had not previously existed (1989).

Organization of the Study

This study will be organized into five chapters. Chapter I includes the introduction and background, statement of the problem, purpose of the study, definitions, and organization of the study. Chapter II will present the review of related literature, incorporating six primary research sections and chapter summer. These six sections are: the relationship between the elementary school principal and school effectiveness; organizational leadership behavior; educational leadership behavior; principal organizational leadership behavior; the relationship between work experience and effectiveness of principals; and education and school administration in Saudi Arabia. Chapter III will describe the design and method of the study, including introduction, research questions, hypotheses, null hypotheses, design of the study, operational hypotheses, method of investigation, identification of population and research sample, instrumentation, response scale, procedures, treatment of data and data analysis, and pilot test. Chapter IV will provide the analysis of findings for the study, including introduction,
data collection, individual experience and background factor characteristics of respondent as the independent variables, principal organizational leadership behavior as the dependent variable, null hypotheses testing, and chapter summary. Interpretation and recommendations of the study, included discussions and conclusions, recommendations, limitations, and future study will be in Chapter V.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Introduction

Organizational leadership behavior is a problem facing organizations everywhere, but it is particularly a problem in school systems. Schools need leaders to guide them in order to achieve their goals, and societies always look for effective school leaders. Analysis of organizational leadership behavior may provide the most useful approach for helping to select school organization leaders, and thereby helping to fulfill an important facet of social need and demand (Kyte, 1952; Lipham, 1981).

Concern for organization leadership ability, even when focusing on how that leadership is manifested in the schools, as this study attempts to do, or, more specifically, when focusing on school principle leadership behavior, has clearly become a multidisciplinary problem. The business of the schools, for which the principals are responsible, must face situations that go well beyond immediate school and academic concerns, including poverty, injustice, violence, lack of adequate health care, and related social concerns. Coordinating all of these areas into the larger school scenario will require the principal to possess massive ability to absorb, interpret, and disseminate information, while also striving to satisfy the needs of many stakeholder. Serving well the
interests of all children is rapidly becoming increasingly complex (Crowson & Boyd, 1993; in Murphy & Louis, 1994).

The above suggests critical role changes and adjustments for school principles, as they strive to lead not only from the center of the educational establishment, but also from within the mass of their society's concerns:

The principal now becomes relocated from the apex of the pyramid to the center of the network of human relationships and functions as a change agent and resource. (Wilkinson, cited in Chapman, 1990, p. 227, in Murphy & Louis, 1994, p. 25)

Chapman (1990, in Murphy & Louis, 1994) in noting that the school community, in the sense of its area of responsibility, continued to increase, suggested the added burden to the management role for the principal was primarily in terms of the greater public sector, within which the principal now had to forge new connections between school and community environments. Increasingly, the principal must take on the role of boundary spanner and community-wide action agent (1990).

This review of research related to organizational leadership, as the concept applies to school effectiveness and school principal behavior, includes examination of six areas of concern: first, the relationship between elementary school principal behavior and school effectiveness; second, organizational leadership behavior in general; third, educational organization leadership behavior; fourth, principal organizational leadership behavior; fifth, the relationship between school principal length of experience and the effectiveness of the principal; and sixth, education and school administration in Saudi Arabia. The chapter will conclude with a summary statement attempting to integrate information.
Principal Behavior and School Effectiveness

Kyte (1952) emphasized that the principal is the professional head of a school and is accountable for its success. Consequently, the principal is responsible for all individuals at work in any capacity whatsoever. They, in turn, are responsible to the principal in everything they do in the school and for the results obtained (1952).

Leadership remains in a position of restructuring organizations anew, in the face of structural dysfunction. The principal is uniquely situated within the organizational structure and within the educational value system to restore structure, especially of the elementary school. The principal's role is central to the total organization function (Blumberg & Greenfield, 1980).

Croft & Halpin (1962) established two relationship assumptions concerning principal organization influence: perception of principal behavior by participants outweighs actual behavior; and the principal's ability to foster a climate of freely expressed participant leadership behavior was critical. Aloofness and production emphasis should be replaced by thrust, or motivation of participants, and by humane consideration (1963).

Lipham (1981) noted that principals have considerable potential to improve the lives of others. They make a difference in schools. This is recognized by scholars, researchers, journalists, practitioners, parents, citizens, and even politicians. They have all found that the local school is the key to educational improvement and that the leadership of the principal is crucial to the school's success with students. The principal,
as head of the school, which is a social system, has great potential to refine or renew its educational program (1981).

Smith & Andrews (1989) suggest that school principals act as the focal points from which education succeeds or fails in fulfillment of its great "moral, ethical, and goal obligations to create good schools—places where all children can achieve their full potential and receive an equal opportunity to succeed in society" (p. v). Conrad (1989; in Smith & Andrews, 1989) supports Smith and Andrews' contention that principals live up to their potential primarily as they act as instructional leaders, a concept demanding some clarification, but clearly manifesting four key leadership qualities: provision of resources, acting as an instructional resource, acting as effective communicator, and maintaining a visible presence (1989).

During the 1980's, studies of school principals' roles and their relation to school effectiveness centered on instructional leadership. The focus of such study suggested the principal was the primary individual accountable for academic achievement of students. The principal was viewed as having the direct responsibility for improving schools in terms of learning and instruction. School effectiveness research also indicated that teaching staff professional satisfaction was most powerfully influenced by teachers' perceptions of their school principals as effective instructional leaders (Smith & Andrews, 1989).

Reading and math achievement was shown to be positively influenced by teacher perception of the principal as a strong instructional leader, especially for low-achieving
These studies suggested that measures were needed to develop more principals as instructional leaders in order to improve schools. Four steps were viewed as essential. These included first, being certain as to the intent and meaning of the term, "instructional leader;" second, creating programs of school administration which would select and educate principals according to appropriate fulfillment of the instructional role; third, improving selection processes for identification of principals with instructional capability, while assisting schools in mastering these processes; and fourth, enhancing the quality of school district officials’ designs concerning present principals’ performance levels, through implementation of supervision, evaluation, and staff development models (1989).

The importance of the relationship between school principals and school effectiveness was summarized by Smith & Andrews (1989) as follows:

Principals assume enormous obligations. The most important of these is to build a structure of relationship within the school so that all children have the opportunity to learn... [We use our professional knowledge and skills to create conditions in which each child can grow to... full potential and all children are given equal opportunity to succeed in our society. When these conditions are present, there is a measurable increase in the academic performance of children, and at the same time, over time, the differences between groups of children (low-income v. affluent, ethnic v. white students) are reduced. (p. 2)

Also important in terms of principal leadership in relation to school and educational effectiveness is public perception of low leadership ability and unauthentic commitment to the needs of students. Public confidence must be restored in schools and
their leaders. This can be best accomplished through school principals. They must demonstrate understanding of the democratic social basis of education within the schools. They must demonstrate leadership ability. They must perform school administrative functions so that the teaching staff is inspired to commit themselves to school excellence also (Smith & Andrews, 1989).

Sapone (1985) states that any school will increase in efficiency and effectiveness to the degree that the principal can act effectively as an instructional leader. Consistent application of curriculum models approved by the school staff and principal is the key factor for success. Also, Lipham (1981) maintained the essential purpose of the principal is to improve teaching and learning. Principal demonstration of instructional knowledge and strong participation in instructional activities create the finest schools. Austin (1979) reported that principal knowledge of the basics and ability to evaluate curricular innovations and teaching methods are the most important components underlying school success. Through these attributes of principal effectiveness teachers and schools improve (1979).

Effective leadership communication of vision bonds all organization elements and the community into an effective team. The school is given a new direction. Effective vision communication combined with strong instructional leadership ensures improved faculty instruction in classrooms and clarifies the bond of student achievement and school effectiveness (Andrews & Soder, 1987; Andrews, Soder, & Jacoby, 1985; in Smith & Andrews, 1989).
Vail (1982, in Smith & Andrews, 1989) maintains that high performance schools have principals who "have strong feelings about the attainment of purposes, focus on issues and variables, and put in extraordinary amounts of time to achieve their purposes" (p. 16). Effective schools are created by principals' abilities to articulate a vision of instructional goals for prioritizing classroom and school activities with coherence and integration of school staff instructional planning (Blumberg & Andrews, 1988). Principal communication through projection of goals and enthusiasm for their achievement develops a high expectation and mutual respect climate throughout the organization (Persell & Cookson, 1982).

Role theorists suggest that even with situational and environment determinants, the principal largely can shape role behavior and determine outcomes, especially over time, as the role becomes more familiar and as expectations become fairly routinized (Smith & Andrews, 1989). Expectancy Theory (Nebecker & Mitchell, 1974), on the other hand, works toward prediction of behavior of the principal based on understanding of the principal's expectations concerning consequences. From this perspective, behaviors are primarily determined from exterior expectations and outcomes preset as desirable to the organization. The viewpoint would appear to fail in acknowledging much in the way of leader transformational impetus, nor does it "explain how leaders formulate expectancies or why they value some outcomes more than others" (1989, p. 6).

Osborn & Hunt (1975) examine larger structural variables which tend to exist somewhat outside volitional attitudes and valued outcomes of people or of the
organization as a whole. Underlying factors such as community size and makeup, size of school, changes going on or predicted in the community, the administrative structure itself, and the relative centralization of the decision-making process are key elements in resolving the matter of principal behavior. Relevant work tasks and attitudes and expectations of organization associates, as well as their attitudes, help to shape principal job performance, but the larger structural factors are assumed to be better predictors. The principal, at several levels of awareness and choice, adapts to external variables and organization size and structure. Through this environmental adaptation, the principal then reacts to organizational associates' attitudes and traits (1975).

The entire concept of how students learn; the interaction of schools, teachers, and administrators, and, therefore, the definition of educational effectiveness were all placed in a new light with the Coleman Report (1966; as cited in McCurdy, 1983). The contention of that report was that effectiveness of schools resulted more from social background factors or conditions related to students, such as parents' educational levels, family incomes, and classmates associated with, and not so much with quantity and quality of learning experience and accomplishment. If these contentions had their obvious influence and impact on education and social directives, they were not wholeheartedly accepted by educational research and practice, which persevered in formulating how educational institutions and individuals and practices within those institutions might become more effective. The role of principals came to be seen as critical, especially as research continued into the 1980's (1983).
Greenfield (cited in McCurdy, 1983), noted that a new era of research concerning principals was beginning in terms of principal effectiveness or acting as an agent of positive change. Research on principal effectiveness accompanied the initial research question, critical for that time especially in education: what factors differentiate schools in terms of effectiveness? Initial conclusions had suggested that difference occurred primarily in terms of whole schools, and not simply individual teachers, classrooms, students, and so forth. Difference in school or learning effectiveness had been traced to the principal (1983).

Clark (cited in McCurdy, 1983), in a review of 97 students concerning school achievement in urban settings, determined that "Principals are crucial in determining school success" (p. 9). The review determined that principals, through their creation of an attitude of achievement, are able to instill and initiate growth, beneficial attitudes, and critical motivation. They importantly create a climate of achievement. Clear goals and successful staff development result from principal leadership (1983).

Morris (cited in McCurdy, 1983) also specified principal creation of school climate as particularly critical for effectiveness of learning. Edmonds' (1979, in McCurdy, 1983), concluded that in urban school settings principals were "a determining factor in the school's effectiveness" (p. 9). Edmonds' (in McCurdy, 1983) study suggested that the administrators' behavior, policies, and practices all impacted significantly on school effectiveness, as did having a good balance of management and instructional skills and implementing school-wide initiatives to resolve student reading problems (1983).
Brookover & Lezotte (1979) found the principal instrumental to effectiveness according to the following rationale: for successful schools, the principal acts as instructional leader, is a relatively strong disciplinarian, and is responsible for evaluation achievement; for failing schools, principals tend toward permissive behaviors, an emphasis of informal, collegial relationships with faculty, and emphasis on public relations (1979).

**Organizational Leadership Behavior**

Involving everyone in the organization as part of the shared mission may be the central facet of organization leadership (Bennis & Nanus, 1985; in Smith & Andrews, 1989), which involvement can also be variously defined as simply completing tasks through others (Thomson 1983; in Smith & Andrews, 1989), or as success in pursuing goals based on shared values of leaders and followers (Schmuck, 1985; in Smith & Andrews, 1989).

Modern theory of organization leadership has followed change in the evaluation of society from agrarian to industrial to post industrial forms over the past 100 years. Leadership theory has closely adapted a branch of sociology called sociology of knowledge, which points out that theories and explanations of world systems are importantly influenced by cultural, economic, and technological forces whose operation is worldwide. In other words, understanding of organization development can occur only as we explore changing patterns within global cultural patterns. This view of organization theory importantly emanates from the inception of scientific management theory dating
from the end of the Nineteenth Century. Since this inception, organization leadership
theory has itself evolved into a recognized system of knowledge residing in exploration
of all areas of relevant information (Bowditch & Buono, 1994).

Essentially, leadership theory progressed from ancient perspectives and acceptance
of traditional and hereditary forms of authority toward hierarchies based in competitive
commercial needs availing themselves of advantages accruing from planning,
organization, and attendance to management span of control. As practical experience
developed, the concept of universal application of management principles and technically
organized dispositions, such as specialization of function, predominated. Such attempts
at scientific formulation of desirable organization leadership had been in evidence as early
as ancient Egyptian codification of control and planning principles, and both Socrates and
Plato elaborated thinking underlying organization systemization and specialization.
Urbanization of workforces and elaboration of technical and industrial output established
a complex new and vital social order in conflict with traditional, aristocratic social forms
and hierarchies. Gradually, as traditional orderings were increasingly challenged, a new
rational legal basis of authority and organization process emerged. Position, role
responsibility, and to some extent functional capacity all served together to erode
classical, hereditary dominance. Thus, commercial expansion and innovation, together
with technological advance derived from new scientific knowledge and application, led
to reevaluation of the foundations of traditional society. This combination of
circumstances, as it recreated society, created also the manifestation of the dynamic and
power-inclusive organization which would create and evolve world revolutionizing control systems (Bowditch & Buono, 1994).

From such expansive, evolutionary, and technically innovative circumstances, a new legitimation of authority would emerge, as would concomitantly the modern manifestation of capitalism. Instrumental to both growth and refinement of organization efficiency and effectiveness would be elaboration of principles of economic theory and profitability. These provided essential inputs for management and organization enhancement. Classical organization management analysis would proceed from profit motivation for systematic study of impinging organization conditions. The stage was established for reception of the industrial revolution. Technological innovation expanded all conceivable development frontiers. As industry and production established new social infrastructure, a supportive material structure was demanded for its growth and articulation. Improvement and expansion were demanded in systems of transportation, nationwide and global; power sources and consequent exploitation of resources; technological innovation; breakthrough systems of communication; networks of financing, together with advanced systems of resources application and support; and technical and literacy training of the labor force. Influenced and in fact instigated by these vast global forces, classical organization theory would evolve in conjunction with Classical Enlightenment theory and view of humankind, characterizing humans as rational in orientation and satisfaction maximizing, responding primarily to economic needs and associated forces. Concepts soon emerged some two centuries prior to the present time,
emphasizing delegation, coordination of effort and strategy, and very importantly, motivation methods (Bowditch & Buono, 1994).

Critical to the emergence of organization leadership has been analysis of the concept of culture. Cultures which are indigenous to particular organizations evolve over time as the products of collective consciousness and interaction. The culture reflects while also containing the shared and agreed upon beliefs of organization members. Cultures provide security largely concerning matters based in uncertainty. Cultures thus can be viewed as importantly acting to reduce or rationalize uncertainty or provide a system of management for individual and group anxiety. Both the substance and form of cultures are imbued with emotion, meaning, and symbolism. Cultures are the expressive dimension of organization, at variance with the technical and pragmatic organization concerns designated in the realm of structure. Culture manifests as inherently contradictory, ambiguous, and paradoxical. As such, however, culture realistically demonstrates and correlates with human behavior and interactions within groups. Structural, rational organization patterning, while apparently necessary, cannot effectively of itself resolve the complexity and potential chaos of human interaction. Unity, belonging, and commitment emerge over time as information and group experience become internalized and accepted as proper and acceptable. As the internalized system becomes reflected back out to the group in an ordered, justified, and acceptable pattern, group belonging and commitment are established, stabilized, and comprehended in a generalizable set of configurations. Such a process and manifestation cannot, it seems
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very clear, be imposed from above upon the group through direct acts of leadership intervention for organization solidity to be established among the mass of organization as such. However, organization culture cannot be fully known, objectively, but only partially, by the interested observer, including the organization leadership. This factor alone presents powerful difficulties for leadership. Much of the nature of the culture remains subjectively manifested and in a sense only understood within itself. Of more immediate and ostensible difficulty for the leadership, however, is simply that this most powerful formulator of organization actualization is beyond leadership direct control, since it is by definition the creation of organization mass membership. Moreover, in part due to the difficult and intense formative processes necessary for culture to emerge, culture acts as a conservative force. Generally, the stronger the culture, the less likely it will be to adapt readily to innovation advancement and leader intervention (Bowditch & Buono, 1994).

Organizational cultures are for the most part viewed in terms of leadership theory as unique to specific organizations. This factor in itself is demanding for organization leadership. Theory tends to support the general concept that organizations performing similar functions, such as education, or public education, or even according to designated grade levels, can differ as markedly from one another in terms of organization culture as do organizations performing dissimilar functions. Power of the culture factor, arising primarily outside the scope of organization leadership, combined with almost infinite
cultural variation among organizations, makes important and time consuming demands on organization leadership (Bowditch & Buono, 1994).

The complexity of organization culture phenomenon is deepened by the multiplicity of culture manifestations within a single organization. Typically, a dominant culture expresses core values and norms of the organization while subcultures or contiguous cultures simultaneously are enhancing to the core or dominant culture, generally expressing strength of support for the core culture beyond the mean level of the organization as a whole. Subcultures, however, may also be orthogonal, or expressive of both the dominant core and also conflicting values specific to the subgroup. Subcultures may be more divisive from the dominant norms and values. They may create dissent and act as countercultures. Thus, though likely oriented toward the overall success of the organization, simply by acting against the dominant culture, through behaviors and expressions of beliefs and values, countercultures tend to undermine the success of the organization as a whole:

Organizational countercultures tend to emerge when individuals or groups are living under sets of conditions which they strongly feel cannot provide them with their accustomed or hoped for satisfaction...when existing cultural support systems have broken down and people are attempting to regain some sense of control in their lives (Bowditch & Buono, 1994, p. 329).

In part of cultural components outlined above, organization leadership theory contends that intra organizational conflict is inevitable. Conflict, however, need not be negative, depending on whether or not its impact on goal achievement is positive or negative (Gibson et al., 1994). Moreover, from perspective of both leader opportunity
for interaction with organization social structure to effect change and organization demand for leader intervention to achieve order and stability, as well as to restore productive capacity, intra organization conflict exists as virtually the central domain and venue of leadership action.

One consequence of organizational conflict, and the downside of leadership opportunity, is stress. Stress in itself, however creates organization dimensions which must be negotiated by organization leadership. Leaders of all organizations must be aware of the presence and effects of stress as related to themselves and to all organization members. The pervasive organizational outcomes for stress are individual defense reactions, sometimes jointly designated as the general adaptive syndrome. The syndrome or GAS, has three adaptive phases: alarm, resistance, and exhaustion. Classifications of stress consequences include designation of subjective, behavioral, cognitive, physiological, health, and organizational. When evaluating and attempting to work with organizational member behavior and performance, leadership must remain cognizant of stress emanating from the organization environment, while, simultaneously, recognizing interactions of organization stress with non organization situations and stress factors feeding back into the organization environment. Factors within the organization environment evoking stress are termed, "stressors," stressors are external to the individual and are potentially, though not necessarily, harmful to the affected individual. Stressors which are identified within the organization environment are classified according to characteristics within that environment, the level within the individuals of the organization, the level within the
associated group, and the level within the organization as a whole (Gibson et al., 1985). Stressors emanating from within organizations produce different stress levels depending upon the individual. Type A Behavior Pattern (TABP), life change events, and social support are considered important moderators of stress. Stress and stress associated factors within organizations are inevitable outcomes of organization and group behavior and interactions. Stress, as with conflict, is to some degree and in many important senses not only valuable but necessary for organization production and positive result. Generally, leadership can position itself to become more aware of and to monitor stress levels and underlying conflict situations, sometimes occurring within the leader, evoking stress and associated conflict. Conflict is viewed as either functional or dysfunctional, the one enhancing and benefiting organizational performance, the other acting as a hindrance. Leadership must interpret the optimal organization conflict level. Factors producing intergroup conflict result from the necessity of work interdependence, which in turn both produces and brings to light differences in goals, perceptions, and greater need for specialization or specialist intervention. Changes within and between groups evolve through dysfunctional conflict. Intergroup conflict may increase cohesiveness among individual group members, as well as increase the likelihood of autocratic leadership, a focus on the task, and an emphasis on loyalty; whereas, beyond the individual group, that is, in terms of how dysfunctional conflict affects intergroup association, distorted perceptions and negative stereotyping are likely to increase, while communication decreases. Intergroup conflict within the larger organizational function is difficult to
diagnose and to manage. Leadership skills in problem solving, establishing superordinate goals, expansion of resources, avoidance, smoothing, compromise, authority, and sometimes resorting to changing either the organization membership or structure are necessary. Specifications of individual situations and circumstances dictate the leadership approaches to be used. Where conflict is too low, conflict stimulation techniques should be employed, including use of communication channels, hiring or transferring in outside individuals, and changing organization structure. Effective leadership demands both resolution and stimulation (Gibson et al., 1985).

Leadership within organizations importantly depends on overall awareness of how the behavior, attitudes, and performance of group members affect one another. Ideally, leadership is proactive in terms of interventions to modify perceptions, attitudes, and motivations. Leadership identification of group characteristics and parameters begins with leadership knowledge of its own style, strong points, and virtues. These factors are suitably coordinated with task, setting, group member characteristics, and behavioral patterns. Group difference resulting in conflict can arise through differing perceptions of the role of the organization. Generally, three possibilities exist: the organization leadership's view, the view of some group or groups within the organization, and the views of individuals outside of the leadership. Facing multiple role expectations on the parts of individuals creates conflict and stress, especially when expectations are incongruent or the fulfillment of one precludes fulfillment of other. Identification of and
resolution of role conflict constitute a critical dimension of organization leadership (Gibson et al., 1985).

The model of organizational social system functioning developed by Getzels & Guba (1957-58) has been supported by Goldman, (1966), Owens (1991), Ubben & Hughes (1992), Pankake & Burnett (1994), and many others. They view the organizational process as a social system model. There are two major classes of phenomena for the model, the nomothetic and the ideographic. The model shows that observed organization behavior is a function of these two major classes of organizational process phenomena. Leader behaviors come from both needs and expectations. Needs come from the personal or ideographic perspective. Expectations arise from institutional or nomothetic requirements. Behaviors are the individual's attempts to cope with the environment, itself composed of patterns of expectation for individual behavior. Behaviors are constructed in ways consistent with the individual's independent pattern of needs. The organization will become effective when the leader understands the ideographic needs of each member, as well as their relation to the nomothetic organization demands, and is able to coordinate and harmonize these two organization aspects.

Gibson et al., (1985) suggest five underlying principles important to comprehension of organizational leadership in the modern world. First, leadership differs markedly from management. Second, leadership is conceptually complex. Third, experience, training, and analysis can effectively develop leadership attributes. Fourth, of primary importance is the fit among leader, followers, and situations. Fifth, in certain
situations other factors become predominant and leadership loses importance and influence (1985).

Organization leadership, though conceptually complex, is narrower than management. Leaders are responsible to plan, organize, and control. These factors remain consistently applicable to management. Organization leadership can function independent of them all. Leadership concerns successful creation of compliance toward goals among organization membership (Gibson, et al. 1985).

More specifically, leadership, within organizations designates employment of non coercive methods of communication process. Even though in an associated sense the concept of leadership is important in all human relationships, the specifically designated function, nevertheless, remains narrow: compliance to effect accomplishment. Although coercion is not considered demonstration of leadership, effectiveness depends importantly on role and position, either as manifested within the formal hierarchy, or informally, in terms of how the group of associated others accept or look upon the individual designated for or accepting the leadership role. The key to effective organization leadership seems to be individual leadership ability to successfully exploit given situational, as well as personally manifested instances of interpersonal power. Four dimensions are important to leadership and successful exercise of interpersonal power within organization. These dimensions include: first, leader awareness of power and the importance of perceived power; second, the necessity to go beyond and avoid relying on coercive power; third, clear identification of leadership power sources, including place, time, and information
and personality characteristics; and fourth, awareness that goal accomplishment depends not only on power source, and perceptions of power, but also on follower needs, the leadership situation, and the experience of the leader (Gibson et al., 1985).

In general, within organization structure, relationships among jobs remain relatively fixed and stable. The essential purpose of organization structure is to achieve maximum effective performance through its influence on individual and group behavior. Thus, the elemental relationship between organization as a structural system and the leadership of that organization is that they must coordinate with one another; the nature of the one must derive from the nature of the other. Organization structures themselves are determined according to four key managerial decisions. These decisions are directed toward: dividing work, delegating authority, departmentalizing jobs into groups, and determining spans of control. Each of these key managerial or leadership decisions operates in some sense independently to solve specific problem areas. Nevertheless, the most important focus of leadership decision process is the interrelationship and interdependency among all elements (Gibson et al., 1985).

Leadership within organizations includes components combining structural and functional considerations. Important among these are delegation, specialization, grouping of functions, and span of control. Delegation of authority from the leadership is always a relative matter. Every organization member carries some authority independent of leadership, including individual administrators and managers themselves. From an organizational strategic point of view, the question is whether each member has sufficient
authority to carry out the designated job. Specialization or dividing large tasks into smaller related tasks or jobs must be initiated in terms of technical and economic advantages. Grouping of related jobs must be based on commonality of function. Span of control designations should be according to frequency and intensity of relationships among potential subordinates (Gibson et al., 1985).

Specialization, grouping, delegation, and span of control decisions create outcomes which determine organization structure and distinctiveness. Structural difference is measured according to complexity, centralization, and formalization. Organizational complexity denotes the extent to which jobs are relatively specialized. The extent to which authority is retained as essentially the function of top management defines centralization. The extent to which policies, rules, and procedures are codified in written form defines formalization (Gibson et al., 1985).

The relationship of organization structure to leadership and the importantly reciprocal nature of this process underlie the more subjective, complex, behavioral, and dynamic aspects determining organization function: specifically, individual psychology and interactions of individuals with one another; organization components; and the environment. Consideration of the mass of data relating to organization leadership has led to a situational or contingency design for the total organization leadership perspective. From this perspective, motivation becomes virtually the central leadership principle. The leader focuses on five aspects: what determines behavior; what directs or channels behavior; what maintains or sustains behavior; identification of difference between
intrinsic and extrinsic rewards related to motivation; and the organizational context of motivation (Bowditch & Buono, 1994).

As organizational leadership attends to motivation of members, a central organizing or governing principle becomes leader knowledge and awareness of both individual and group perception. Leadership must become sensitive to the reality of perceptual bases of decision processes. Perception powerfully overrides reality. Understanding of scientific information concerning human cognitive process is critical. Such psychobiological process, however, is importantly influenced in everyday circumstances by the social context of judgement: reactions to political and organizational settings and pressures. Individual differences dynamically interact in various ways with such patterns of influence. Perceptual distortion and its effect on organization outcomes are ongoing concerns for leadership on a virtually day-to-day basis. Leadership must be knowledgeable in the processes of visual and auditory perception. It must be aware of human inability to respond except to what perception indicates. Through effective communication, related leadership outreach to organization membership, active problem solving, and maintenance of personal contact and relationships, leadership struggles to correct misperceptions and to inform according to reality. Leadership thus must pursue knowledge of factual and perceptual reality simultaneously, including how these realities are manifested within leadership organization concept. At the same time, leadership must engage in an outgoing struggle to discover and implement successful strategies for
resolving perceptual conflict and creating structural and behavioral harmony closely reconciled with reality as well as it can be known (Bowditch & Buono, 1994).

In addition to identifying how leadership interacts with organization structure and individual behavior to create organization effectiveness, leadership must, as has been suggested above, strive to understand the basic and projected impact of its own behavior, motivation, and perception, in terms of analysis similar to that applied to overall organization membership. Even prior to this overall, complex assessment, however, leadership must undertake to understand and resolve what it comprehends in the term, "effectiveness," itself. Two theories of effectiveness in terms of organizations are each widely accepted. The first of these is designated, "goal theory." Goal theory suggests effectiveness derives from success in meeting purposes or outcomes: the underlying assumption here, then, is that organizations exist as rational and purposive entities which pursue identified goals, objectives, and missions. The second theory is systems theory. In systems theory organizations are viewed within the social context and environment. Systems theory focuses on organization necessity of or demand for survival. Survival is contingent on organization function to satisfy environmental demand (Gibson et al., 1985).

Essential to systems theory is the dimension of time. The time factor indicates differentiation between short-term and long-term success factors. Essentially, long-term success factors are the true criteria of leadership effectiveness. As alluded to throughout this discussion of organization success, coordination of multiple work effort provides the
key, especially in light of increasing organization emphasis of specialization. In attempting to influence and coordinate behaviors of individuals and those of groups, while simultaneously attempting to account for those behavior through attending to organization structure, management engages within an extremely complex relational context. Leadership strives to understand individually the considerable interdependence among individual, group, and organization management. The interaction among all such components establishes organization culture. It is maintained for organizational effectiveness (Gibson et al., 1985).

Leadership employment of power and politics to achieve organization goals can be understood in terms of leadership action to get things done in the way the leader wants them to be done. Important to this achievement dimension is the concept of authority which is the form of power made legitimate through acceptance by followers. Organizational power bases are viewed as interpersonal and deriving from one or more sources: legitimate or based on formal organization position; reward; expert; and referent or charismatic. These interpersonal power bases emanate from formal organization prescription, or they arise through exercise and recognition of personal qualities. Legitimate, reward, and coercive power are primarily organizationally determined. Expert and charismatic power forms result from personal qualities. Patterns of communication arise from organization structures. These patterns establish structural and situational power bases. Patterns of communication and information flow importantly establish power formation and use. Leaders with a high need for power are likely also to
be committed to organization goal accomplishment and to be heavily involved in coaching subordinates. Expertise, location within the organization power structure, and access and control of information provide important power bases for lower level employees, allowing for upward, from bottom to top, power flow. Persuasion and manipulation power skills are important to lower level acquisition and exercise of power. Capacity for establishing reliable resolution of uncertainty within the organization affords power and opportunities for its exercise to organization subunits. The opportunity factor is interpreted as strategic contingency. Strategic contingency refers to events or activities which are critical for organization goal accomplishment: coping with uncertainty, centrality, and substitutability. Uncertainty and disagreement generally exist within organizations concerning options and decision processes. Power which enforces chosen decision processes can be based on creating an illusion of power and authority. Compliance and obedience to authority often derive from an illusionary process. The process for acquiring, developing, and exercising power toward organizational outcomes which underwrite one's own or one's coalition's preferences is designated as politics. Refinement of political expertise and gamesmanship tends to become the abiding preoccupation of those involved in or desirous of influencing decision process (Gibson et al., 1985).

Exercise of power from any source and level depends upon effective communication. Communication is ongoing and pervasive. However, much communication is counterproductive or simply ineffective, and thus dysfunctional. Effective communication must consider the communicator, the message, the medium, the
receiver, and feedback. Equally important is the relationship between organization design and communication process. Organization design should encourage communication in three distinct directions: vertical, horizontal, and diagonal. Ideally, the encoding and decoding processes, used by communicator and receiver respectively, should be homogeneous. Communication breaks down to the extent these processes are heterogeneous. Communication barriers underlie heterogeneous process and breakdown. Effective leadership demands constant awareness of barriers relevant to respective leadership situations (Gibson et al., 1985).

Communication received through organization structure in combination with impacts of individual and group behaviors provides the basis of organization decision process. Leader effectiveness is largely a consequence of the quality of decision process, which itself is of two kinds: programmed or nonprogrammed. First level leadership is responsible for most programmed decision, nonprogrammed are largely, if not exclusively, the province of top management. Organizational decision process is multifaceted. Choice itself is simply one phase of a complex process incorporating numerous environmental and behavioral factors. Value, perception, and personality factors create alternative decisions within apparently identical situations. Nonprogrammed decision making arises to a great extent from group situation. Evidence seems to support the contention that group decision process outperforms individual process. Leadership substantially gains effectiveness through coordination of collective decision making (Gibson et al., 1985).
Leadership in organizations, largely, as has been stated in various ways, a composite of influence ability, positional power, and facility in creating an illusion of authority likely beyond that which actually exists, rests upon a foundation of acceptance of the leader by the followers. Influence derived from acceptance is established by followers' need to gain satisfaction. Analysis of leadership potential resorts to understanding of physical, sociological, and psychological traits. Leader consideration of follower needs tends to lead to follower satisfaction. Additionally, follower expectations, skills, role clarity, and previous experiences are critical to the leader-follower relationship. Leader effectiveness derives from modifying the above factors associated with followers or modifying leadership approaches to correspond with them. Situational leadership suggests that interaction of all relevant forces to a given situation, including the leaders, the subordinates, and the organization, demands diagnosis. Contingency leadership proposes a formula of success based on leadership style and situational favorableness. Three crucial factors are leader-member relations, task structure, and position power. Subordinate participation in decision-making should be factored into the process according to the level of leader skill and knowledge, quality of decision required, extent of problem structure, and desirability of acceptance by subordinates. Debate within leadership theory importantly concerns level of subordinate decision participation. Leadership may tend increasingly at present to higher levels of subordinate participation than what are necessary or desirable. Flexible leader adjustment of related time and acceptance factors seems desirable in most organization situations.
Reasonable time expenditure, decision quality, and subordinate acceptance are the prime factors of coordination for leadership effectiveness. Increasing personal payoffs for subordinates, making provision for guidance and counseling for clarifying path-goal options, and reducing barriers to envisioned outcomes are key leadership functions and abilities. Leadership importantly functions in terms of ability to process information and diagnose probable causes of behavior within organizations. Subordinates have substantial impact and influence in terms of leader behavior. To some extent, the cause and effect relation of subordinate satisfaction and performance level arising from leader behavior and effectiveness is reversible. Important to leadership effectiveness is the influence impact of leadership. Substitutes for organization leadership include ability, experience, routineness of tasks, and group cohesiveness (Gibson et al., 1985).

For leadership, changes in the environment of organizations create a need for organization development. Such organizational development change may indicate that systematic redesign of structure, process, and behavior within the organization are necessary. Organization development may be mandated by more than simply adjustment to new environmental input. Processes and behavior within the organization may simply become dysfunctional. Awareness of the level of organization function demands diagnosis of present and potential problems. Collection of data measuring current state of production, efficiency, satisfaction, adaptiveness, and development is an ongoing leadership concern. Solution intervention should focus on distinguishing the problem from its symptoms, on identifying change that is necessary for resolving the problems, and
on expected outcomes and how these will be measured. Leadership analysis should be in terms of organization effectiveness. Outcomes that are measurable, such as production, efficiency, satisfaction, adaptiveness, and development must be linked to skill and attitudinal, behavioral, and structural changes necessitated by problem identification. Organization members should be brought into the diagnostic process and into participation with management if the organization climate is conducive to shared strategy. Shared authority strategy associates perceived problems with skill, attitude, behavior, and structural cases and the appropriate selected method of resolution. Lack of necessary preconditions may preclude employee participation, in which cases management will act unilaterally to understand and to clarify the problem and to select the appropriate resolution approach. Provision for evaluation procedure must begin as the organization development gets underway (Gibson et al., 1985).

Organization development must proceed according to problems identified and understanding of organization personnel. Organization change follows the unique adaptation each organization makes to its environment. The range of the course of organization development will be individually limited. Constraints and alternatives must be identified. Maximizing expected returns should be the guiding development principle (Gibson et al., 1985).

Organization leadership emphasis on individual behavior and traits of character as critical to total organization function suggests that individual organization member adjustment, including new tasks and new people, importantly, as well as reaction factors,
is critical to overall individual orientations. Incoming psychological makeup and background experiential factors are critical to the interaction process. Individual attitudes which are linked to behavior determine organization success. Effective leadership requires encompassing both overall and management attitudes, in terms of causal factors and not simply in terms of how attitudes create given results. Changing organization member attitudes is a complex and demanding process primarily dependent on communication strategy, importantly emphasizing strength of the message conveyed. Even with realization of individual job satisfaction, management must be aware that high organization function performance is not guaranteed. Job satisfaction is not a sure indicator of high organization or individual performance. Individual personality differences must simply be coped with and cannot be readily changed. Despite difficulty in controlling, predicting, and measuring, personality differences explain much in terms of individual behavior, and thus organizational difficulty. Coordination or harmonization among differences provides the leadership aspect for incorporating personality difference into organizational strategy. Altering personality in any sense appears not to be feasible (Gibson et al., 1985).

From the perspective of contemporary organization leadership, organizations are open systems influenced by environmental forces and changes. Contemporary leadership, as opposed to traditional, emphasizes awareness of and the effects of social and political thinking and change, organizational stakeholder and the pressure created through them for the organization, and the multifold influence of the global economic association and
impact felt throughout all world societies. Organization leadership thus becomes more immersed in the "macro respective environments" (Bowditch & Buono, 1994, p. 284), discovering in part that leadership can direct the organization, in varying degrees, to exert influence upon the environment for purposes of change and control, in many cases through organizational linking and coalitions. In general, the way the organization is structured and designed should fit the "demands constraints, and uncertainties posed by its environment" (p. 314). Comprehensive internal evaluation and restructuring of organizations by leadership, or development, attempt transformation toward the future and enhancement of organizational experience for those involved (1994). Leadership endeavor within organizations, it seems important to bear in mind that leadership involves in contemporary terms an emphasis upon thinking and both discovering and elaborating upon the right way to proceed, the most productive way for the organization to conceive of itself (Bennis & Nanus, 1985). Bowditch & Buono (1994) follow this transformational disposition of leadership function in suggesting the following character for leader interaction with organizations:

The most important point to remember is that a diagnostic approach is necessary. . . . A specific intervention that is effective in one organization will not work the same way in another firm. . . . Unless an organization's problems are sufficiently diagnosed and analyzed, and interventions are then fitted to meet those particular problems, frustration and disenchantment with organizational behavior-related concepts and theories rather than personal satisfaction and organizational improvements are likely to occur (Bowditch & Buono, 1994, p. 442).

The present overall perspective of organization leadership may not provide a comprehensive frame of reference and generalizable model. Trait theories which
originally instigated analysis of leadership behaviors and outcomes have to some extent reemerged in terms of focusing on personal characteristics and special leadership qualities. Attitude and behavior-related theories and later contingency and situational framework theory had previously displaced emphasis on special personality characteristics. Leadership in organizations theory has attempted to differentiate executive power from other forms of influence and control and to establish a differentiation between transactional and transformational leadership. Emphasis upon empowering followers has suggested the utility of disseminating leadership power among many, if not all, organization members throughout the organization, establishing a leadership function which coordinates the efforts of organization members who themselves act as the primarily self-directed leaders of the organization. Recent theory suggests a possibility for developing a multiple-theory encompassing framework. Multiple approach, as part of this effort to create an encompassing framework, suggests that the central concept of leadership itself, as presently constructed, may be inclusive of functions which are very different from one another. Production or immediate supervision leadership can readily be perceived as an order of activity which has very little in common with upper levels of leadership involved with strategic planning, future organization directions, and the position of the organization within the society and culture. Leadership performance becomes decidedly situational in contemporary theory, inclusive of path-goal theory, the life-cycle and leader-participation situational models, attribution theory, and the multi-level model (Bowditch & Buono, 1994).
Harrington (1995) suggests that the basis of organizational success is a combination of each individual's personal trust, commitment, and creativity in relation to the organization. In terms of organization leadership assisting in the development of individual excellence, risk taking must be allowed and encouraged. Failure cannot be totally condemned but should be viewed as a legitimate and necessary part of the learning experience. All organization participants should be assisted in establishing a career plan which fulfills both individual and total organization needs and expectations. Helping all organization members to establish clear and well-defined career paths is desirable when possible. Personality and background of organization members should fit with organization statements of vision and values (1995).

Harrington (1995) advocates implementation of network organization structure, focusing on management style, performance management system, education and training programs, communications processes, compensation and rewards programs, and management or leadership development. Emphasis should be upon development of organization member teams. Deemphasis of direct leader monitoring of individual performance should provide for, instead, attention to team or group progress and improvement in team decision-making ability. Leadership within organizations becomes primarily a matter of providing information and guidance as part of the decision-making process. Leadership becomes largely synonymous with team support. A given team's contribution to organizational goals comes to outweigh in importance individual performance (1995).
Network organization leadership de-emphasizes competition among organization members and stresses instead goal accomplishment and client satisfaction. With additional decision authority throughout the organization, broader task assignments, and increased demand for immediate individual responsibility, training needs increase. Open communications systems are necessary. As much as possible within the organization system all information should be available to every organization member. Communication with direct sources, whenever possible, should be available for members. Compensation systems may need preconsideration to meet the assignment restructuring of organization members. Performance review and career development should emphasize opportunity for lateral growth, formation of organization network, and service to clients rather than skill development function (Harrington, 1995).

Hersey & Blanchard (1993) suggest that organizational leadership involves three skills: first, understanding the situation, or diagnosis of the circumstances you are attempting to influence; second, having the capacity to adapt your behavior and other available resources to meeting situational contingencies; and third, communicating, or being able to communicate, in ways that other people can easily understand and accept (1993).

Rogers (1995) suggests that organizational leadership depends upon a psychological contract of trust between leaders and organization members. The aura of organization trust is perceived as having currently broken down due to international trends of the past twenty five years. Organization members tend to view organization
activity and leadership as motivated by unethical standards, greed, short-term focus, and growing cynicism. Top leaders must work hard to emphasize and establish trust and communication. Trust building strategies require considerable time and care for development. Five areas are defined as critical for trust in terms of directly impacting organization members. These are, first, establishing, clarifying, and committing to organization vision; second, establishing the organization's values; third, developing a fair, just, equitable, and satisfying compensation system; fourth, establishing trust in the work environment; and fifth creating integrity and trust in personnel decisions (1995).

Wilson (1995) has commented upon recent emphasis of power and politics in organizations and has suggested a greater need to investigate the effects of these, in terms of organization and leader commitment. Beaubien (1994) criticizes a trend of executive game playing in organizations. Gamesmanship, while perhaps viewed as effective strategy for achieving organization results, in effect is harmful to organization morale, while also lowering productivity and quality of organization output. Additionally, gamesmanship can suggest lack of commitment or inability to make specific, necessary choices. Gamesmanship may result in expenditure of too much in the way of valuable resources for more information which may be trivial in relation to the decision process. Effective leadership depends upon careful consideration of information available and decisive action. Some risk taking is necessary (1994).

Leadership cannot be overly accommodating or apologetic. Accommodating approach allows others to control or weaken the decision process. Decision-making
becomes all but impossible. The leader of the organization should be cordial and friendly, but being non-assertive and overly affable detracts from leadership (Beaubien, 1994). Myers (1994) describes how effective leaders add value to their organizations through provoking exceptional individual and team effort, going consistently beyond expectations. Four organizational dimensions appear open to leader intervention for heightened performance: first, self and other; second, awareness; third, focus and integration; and fourth, innovation and performance. From this perspective, leadership is enabled to project energy, become involved, embrace others, persuade, and persevere. Value added approach creates additional impact for modern organization leadership (1994).

Gorden (1994) examines Kerr & Jermier's concept of substitutes for leadership, which attempts to account for situations in which leader behaviors are neutralized by characteristics of subordinate, task, and organization. Subordinate characteristics include ability and experience, need for independence, professional organization, and indifference towards organizational rewards. Task characteristics serving in a similar vein include routineness; availability of feedback; and intrinsic satisfaction, organization, group cohesion, and rigid reward structure. Egan (1994) emphasizes the impact of culture for driving shared patterns of behavior within organizations. By definition, culture includes shared assumptions, beliefs, values, and norms of the organization. Behavior patterns affected include strategic behavior, operational behavior, decision-making behavior, information-flow behavior, managerial behavior, and supervision. Ideally, the culture, through the patterns of behaviors driven, serves the organization. Organizations must
emphasize the preferred culture and strive to translate this into behavior. Projected
culture change begins with adequate auditing of the organization culture to determine
what must be transformed. Culture-change strategies should be developed and
implemented according to organization deficiency (1994).

Hall & Norris (1993) studied organization employees in both public and private
sectors to determine what subordinates looked for in terms of leadership. Important
characteristics included being capable of creating and communicating a vision of the
future; communicating clearly and regularly with subordinates; being trusted; giving
recognition for good performance in a timely manner; understanding and utilizing
subordinate abilities; accepting responsibility and blame at their appropriate levels of
leadership, while not blaming those at the top; and having appropriate people, systems,
and procedures for support of leadership aims. Leadership from the subordinate
perspective discovered here tends to become adaptive and effective through organization
interaction and support. Leaders should receive positive influence from within the
organization. Systems and procedures should work to advance leadership aims.
Organization role models have the capacity to shape leadership that will identify with
organization models (1993).

Belasco (1993) notes that an earlier leadership paradigm of command and control
was more relevant to organizations when organization physical assets rather than human
skill and potential were primarily important. Leaders must realize and develop
organization intellectual capital. Five steps for organization success are given. First,
leadership behavior must be changed and directed to the paradigm change. Second, the client or customer becomes the final repository of authority. Third, organization thinking must always be strategic. Fourth, ownership of the organization must pass throughout the organization structure. Fifth, the leadership must learn continuously. Subordinates commanding the intellectual force of the organization perform managerial work of planning, organizing, commanding, coordinating, and controlling. Leaders perform leadership functions of strategy, transferring leadership function, and intellectual growth.

Scally (1992) points out that organization leadership must visibly commit to quality performance. The vision or mission formally and informally elaborated must be evidenced and results born out through leadership. To get the vision to lead to actual organization performance, vision must be translated into team and individual objectives. Important also to incorporating vision within organization membership is appropriate training input.

McAndrew (1989) suggests that successful leadership importantly involves creating an environment for all organization members to act powerfully. Organizations emphasizing outward-facing perspectives and interaction with the environment counteract organization powerlessness. Leaders should strive to eliminate their own oppressive behavior in order to base organization behavior on rational thinking while establishing leadership behavior in others (1990).

Bass (1985) emphasized inspiration through leadership within the organization. Organization members perceive effective leaders, which are leaders they will follow.
actively and willingly, as knowledgeable, sensitive, and enlightened. From these perceptions, members follow with confidence. Confidence is emplaced through meaning given to needs and actions by the leader. The leader openly and publicly articulates beliefs held in common between the leader and followers. Subordinates are influenced to exert themselves through leader inspiration, beyond their previous concepts of self-interest and expectations. A wide array of behaviors can be employed by leaders to create inspirational effects. Components of leader inspiration are overlapping and include managing meaning, managing impressions, molding follower expectations, envisioning, and intellectually stimulating.

Nicholls (1988) suggested that transforming leaders know what they want. They are proficient in wielding power within the context of organization member participation to achieve individually desired results. Effective leadership combines engaging member dispositions with a high degree of closeness and affinity within their own spectrum of control. Leadership which transforms becomes simultaneously democratic, visionary, and enabling of subordinates.

Dubinsky et al., (1988) emphasize leadership within organizations as ideally initiating organization structure while manifesting high levels of consideration for subordinates. Allcorn (1985) underlines the profound effect of leadership styles on subordinate moral and productivity. Differences in leadership styles examined include extremes of autocratic leader rule to maintenance of laissez-faire environments within which all individuals freely participate and are generally responsible for their decisions and
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positions. Organizations also importantly differ according to leader style of 
communication. Examples of communication difference include personal leadership 
within which organization interpersonal relationships develop and are promoted. In 
systems of paternalistic leadership, the leader emphasizes protection of subordinates, 
thereby encouraging their dependence upon leadership. Organization factors of 
interaction such as stress, self-esteem, and anxiety will be treated differently according to 
leadership approach.

Macmillan (1987) suggested notable differences between successful and failing 
organization leaders. The first element of success concerns leader display of commitment 
followed by ability to inspire pervasive organization commitment toward organization 
development. Leader personal commitment should be highly visible for success. The 
second element of success builds upon leadership systematic strategy to create confidence 
and demonstrate subordinate development capability to themselves. This strategy of 
organization success builds momentum and establishes freedom throughout the 
organization membership to take the initiative for improvement. Successful leaders apply 
appropriate leadership disciplines to situations within the development process. They act 
as transformational leaders orchestrating human resource development processes (1987).

Hersey & Blanchard (1993) in their revised deliberations on organization 
leadership and management develop what they believe is a holistic approach, combining 
several theories, concepts, and empirical research. In this comprehensive approach, goals 
are perceived as objects of motives. They are established to satisfy needs, as described
by Herzberg's hygiene factors and motivators. As Herzberg's conceptualization depicts goals, Maslow's hierarchy of needs serves to classify "high-strength" motives. Both systems become integral to "Situational Leadership" (p. 474). Chief concerns are readiness levels and appropriate leadership styles with high probabilities for satisfying needs and realizing goals. Organization success hinges upon integrative decision making for effective management of human resources. The correlation between leadership style or approach and maximum need satisfaction and goal achievement is never perfect. Other approaches or styles may produce desired results to some degree (1993).

Hersey & Blanchard (1993) also perceive Douglas McGregor's Theory X and Theory Y as well as Likert's Management Systems, and Agyris' Immaturity-Maturity Continuum as integrating well with Situational Leadership. The authors summarize these various styles and perceptions as follows in terms of their consistency and integration:

Likert's system describes behaviors that have often been associated with Theory X assumptions. According to these assumptions, most people prefer to be directed, are not interested in assuming responsibility, and want security above all. The assumptions and the corresponding system behaviors seem to be consistent with the immature end of Argyris' continuum. System 4 illustrates behaviors that have often been associated with Theory Y assumptions. A Theory Y manager assumes that people are not lazy and unreliable by nature, and thus can be self-directed and creative at work if properly motivated. These assumptions and the corresponding System 4 behaviors seem to relate to the mature end of Argyris' continuum. System 1 is a task-oriented, highly structured authoritarian management style. System 4 is based on teamwork, mutual trust, and confidence. Systems 2 and 3 are intermediate stages between these two extremes (p. 476).

The authors emphasize that these theories, as they are realized among organization leaders, or organization members, are not necessarily connected to leader behaviors,
which tend, no matter the theoretical belief, to be more adaptable and flexible according to the perceived nature of the situation (Hersey & Blanchard, 1993). Additionally, the complex systems of "Schein's four assumptions about human nature and their implied management styles" (p. 477), and the theory of McClelland are viewed as compatible with Situational Leadership. Four assumptions of Schein concerning types within human nature relate to leadership or administrative style: first, rational-economic; second, social; third, self-actualizing; and fourth, complex (man or individual). Situation leadership moves to greater integration with leadership theory of Argyris, Likert, and McGregor. Through incorporation of these assumptions, Schein posits an understanding of human nature which is more complex than rational-economic, social, or self-actualizing. In their native complexity, individuals challenge organization prerogatives and leadership approach. Organization members are characteristically highly viable, capable of incorporating new motives, motivated on the basis of many different kinds of needs, and potentially able to respond to numerous different leadership styles. Such complexity among organization membership virtually stipulates that organization leadership adjust style appropriately to meet contingencies. Organization members oriented toward achievement are motivated to set their own goals and strive toward personal goal achievement, rather than the typical rewards of success (1993).
Educational Leadership Behavior

Schofield (1974) maintained that organization hierarchy, or vertical organization structure, was particularly detrimental to education leadership, which should strive to involve both students and professional staff in the decision-making process. Goals were viewed as effective only to the extent that they are part of day-to-day learning and teaching. Vertical organization structures separate those with most knowledge and potential input related to the immediate point of decision from the actual decision making. Thus, the responsiveness of the organization to educational needs cannot be actualized. Creating more horizontal organization structure and decentralization provides educational leadership with access to rapid, sensitive, and organization-wide points of decision-making. Power relationships between leaders and professional staff become less formal and less rigid. Decision-making power is then accorded to those best able to define both problem and solution (1974).

Executive-style, personal, centralized leadership detracts from decision-making power and educational accomplishment. Group decisions and solutions related to mutual problems are more effective and efficient. The education leader does not possess all the know how or all the ideas. Instead, the leader's knowledge is directed to creating a climate conducive to group input, thinking, creativity, and decision responsibility. All members are increasingly oriented and integrated into the administrative process, according to a more democratic format (Schofield, 1974).
The ideal of "open" group administration (Schofield, 1974, p. 15) creates important advantages of flexibility. Group members acquire responsibility to incorporate administrative skills into their educational repertoire (1974).

Effective organizational leadership behavior is manifested through searching for profound value and significance beneath surface events and activities. Organization members and their activities rise above the mundane. Symbolically communicated vision establishes purpose and organizational ownership. Language symbolization maintains communication of vision at readily and simply understood levels. The symbolic aspects of leadership are emphasized in contemporary leadership contexts and theoretical formations directed to them (Sergiovanni, 1984).

Blount (1993; cite in Maxcy, 1994) suggests that critical reexamination of educational leadership is greatly needed and should be derived from "structuralist notions of leadership in their temporal and culturally specific frames" (p. 50). Early theorists defined effective school leadership in terms of character traits. Blount quotes one of these theorists, Raymond Frazier (1926, p. 205), as to the general characteristics of the ideal principal or educational leader:

The personification of courage, rugged honesty, sincerity... not too serious... able to play as well as work... he should heartily enter into the wholesome plans and ambitions of his workers... just as does the ideal businessman (p. 50).

Post-World-War-Two visions of education leadership moved somewhat away from such vivid character portrayals. Education leadership conceived of as value-driven actions of administrators emerged from theoretical formulations, such as Simon's
administrative behavior theory (1947), which allowed education administrative thinking
to be derived from tenets of behavioral science. Administration was resolved to a series
of rational decision processes consisting of choices among established alternatives.
Solution means could thus be objectively predetermined. Control over groups, causal
relationships, direction of tasks, accomplishment of goals, and direction of activities
joined with or supported decision-making processes (Blount 1993; in Maxcy, 1994).
More recently, a third wave of educational leadership theory has prevailed. Social and
environmental contexts are viewed as largely determining leadership behavior and
successful strategies. Environmental controlling variables are discovered and analyzed.
In a sense, from this deemphasis of both character and behavior, the individual role of the
leader, virtually the concept itself of leadership couched within personality and actions,
was diminished to the point of extinction. The path appeared to be open to outside
control of leadership itself, from whatever vantage, through determination and
manipulation of environmental factors. Blount characterizes the present situation of
external control of educational leadership and the accompanying crisis situation as
primarily a quest of interest groups for power manipulation. Persons in positions of
authority question the roles, behaviors, and perhaps underlying assumptions of
educational leadership. The process of external examination has evidenced considerable
power, socially derived, to bring about "change in the qualities, behaviors, and contexts
of school administrators" (p. 52). External authority has refined the parameters of
educational leadership discussion in terms of which leadership roles, aspects, and leaders
themselves should be examined, as well as which process of investigation should be used. The dominant overlay of such thinking moves to design how and to what ends educational leadership is to be controlled (1994).

Blount (in Maxcy, 1994) extends the notion of how educational concerns must include input from the entire community. Blount clearly perceives the matter rests in the responsibility of educational leadership. Blount notes that parents and other community members may feel excluded from entering the discussion and fray centered in issues attendant upon leadership consideration, design, and control.

Many undoubtedly have deep and passionate ideas about who educational administrators are, how they should behave, and perhaps most important, how they should interact with the people whom they are designated to lead. These people have in common only a lack of public voice, a voice denied them by the exclusionary practices of those who control the discourse, but also the fact that educational administrators are not directly accountable to them (p. 56).

A hierarchical structure encompasses contemporary educational leadership and dominates discussion of organization and leadership assumptions. Many persons and groups within the wider community affected by education have very small and limited voice as to its decisions and proceedings. The sense of accountability to underrepresented groups is very limited among educational leaders. Educational leadership, in the sense of its emanating from formal, administrative position power, operates from positions of privilege within the hierarchy. The privileged tend to define the rules by which the structures of public education operate. This arrangement is perpetuated as present leadership selects its replacements to mirror current membership. Also, the
practice of educational leadership is normalized, the patterns and parameters of acceptable discourse are pre determined, and whatever persons, voices, or practices are considered objectionable are avoided and/or eliminated. Educational leadership, as its definition is dominated by privileged discourse, has been determined to follow mainly ideal and traditional visions, rather than responding to social change and adjustment, or redefinition based on any sense of the needs of the broader society. Discovery of such ideals and construction of ways to ensure their manifestation have been the purpose of education research. Traditional views of leadership emphasize defining a leader in terms of display of leadership traits, exhibition of behavior according to how a leader is expected to behave, or operation within a preconceived context supposedly isomorphically defining leadership. The notion of leadership is thus effectively removed from the concept of the individual person who is the leader. Privileged class control successfully separates leadership concept as a class of activities from the actual individual attempting to lead. Control of the socially dominant class is thus facilitated, since practice in theory is much more amenable to control than individual leaders. Overt control of leaders, as desirable as this might be from the perspective of the privileged class, is notably a difficult matter, since mounting of resistance to control mechanisms would likely result, unless the leader, as may typically be the case, was involved with the instigation of the control attempt (Blount, 1993; in Maxcy, 1994).

Blount (1993; in Maxcy, 1994) comments upon the necessary distinction between educational administrators and educational leaders. Privileged class discourse wishes to
assume that the two concepts coincide. Blount rather views administrators as persons accountable to the privileged class, as functionaries with rigidly defined roles and fixed hierarchical position. The position requirements are structure bound. Thus those who fill them are quite expendable. Preservation of the ruling structure, thus assuring, it is hoped, administrators' own place within that structure, dominates administrators' thought and action even more than does attending to "their social and temporal context" (p. 58).

A leader who actually operates as a leader, on the other hand, is unique in approach and relationship within the context of leadership. The leader maintains mutual bonds of relationship with those who agree to follow. The action of leadership is response to particular challenges. The leader can never be viewed as simply a dispensable part within the hierarchy. Administrators, as they serve preservation of the hierarchy, act in functional isolation from others. Actual leadership function is transmitted down to the administrator from the top of the hierarchy. The actual leader, who may be serving in the administrator role, through bonds made with followers, cannot at all function or indeed exist in isolation from others. Arrangements of hierarchial isolation of power, moreover, as defined and maintained through privileged discourse, assume discreet administrator function per identified discrete group. The system of reporting and accountability assumes also a uni-directional channel of authority and communication flow. Actual leader action, contrariwise, is off centered to relationships among voluntary choosers of leadership and followership roles. The leader, in complete distinction from the administrator functionary, can only maintain his function through establishing "caring,
trusting, constant relationships with those who follow" (p. 58). Reciprocating relationships of mutual responsibility become the mainstay of leader action. Followership itself becomes a kind of leadership as the reciprocal relationship is maintained. The influence of each party, leader or follower, is within a mutual process. Traditional views and roles of leadership break down as leader and follower roles are exchanged (Blount, in Maxcy, 1994).

From Blount's point of view, the problems of educational leadership stem from leadership's accepted role within the educational hierarchy. It is the leadership position and function in fact which maintain and reify the hierarchical structures. Today the discourse of education has greatly widened, even though shift in positional education leadership power may seem remote. Diverse interest groups and individuals have opened new avenues of criticism, each espousing its own set of needs and agenda of discourse. From Blount's perspective, the critical issue has become to place disenfranchised groups at the center of discourse and as the central focus for inquiry. The issue at present seems to be that "restrictive and rule-bound layers of administration greeted constructive innovation" (p. 59). Criticism, which, while refusing to participate in structural oppression of educational needs, develops new theory in education leadership for improvement at deeper levels is much needed (1994).

Davies & Foster (in Maxcy, 1994) suggest that a new form of critical pragmatism is greatly needed in the realm of educational leadership. At present, educational
leadership operates according to foundationalist assumptions, the more predominant of which are given as follows:

1. Research will generate theory, which in turn will produce law-like generalizations. Hoy & Miskel (1982) define applying knowledge to "administrative and organizational problems" (p. 27) and then go on to observe that "the road to generalized knowledge can lie only in tough-minded scientific research" (p. 28). Knezevich (1984), while admitting the "artistic" side of administration, suggests that "the goal of the scientific approach to administration is the more precise determination and realization of institutional outcomes through reliance on theory, models, sophisticated tools in administrative planning, decision making, and leadership behavior" (p. 9). The emphasis in the teaching of educational administration is on how theory and research can guide practice, and on how increasing scientific research will yield reliable, foundational knowledge for the practice of administration.

2. There are well-established concepts that can explain administrative and organizational behavior. Hason (1979) comments that the objective of his text on educational administration is "providing decision makers with concepts and theoretical frameworks to aid them in determining what to look for in diagnosing and analyzing what they will see" (p. 17). Campbell and associates (1985), in the fifth edition of their text on administration, conclude that "behavioral scientists have developed some useful concepts about organizations and much empirical work has been done to test these concepts" (p. 17). Textual material used in administration generally accepts what it labels
"administrative science" or "management science" and assumes that their concepts are foundational for preparation of administration. These concepts include motivation of employees, effective communication strategies, authority relationships, organizational climate, and models of leadership behavior.

3. Competing perspectives and alternative frameworks are not acknowledged, or if acknowledged, done so only in passing. An examination of popular texts in administration will show little concern by such texts with Continental scholarship, neo-Marxist accounts of schooling, revisionist histories, critical theory, feminist critique, constructivism, and other nonparadigmatic deviations from orthodox, functionalist approaches to understanding human action. The outcome, of course, is to present assumptions 1 and 2 as necessary, satisfactory, and sufficient.

4. The reification of concepts is considered a normal and necessary outcome of an administrative science. The traditional approach to educational administration is to see such concepts as "organization," "leadership," "administration," and so on as things that can be researched, prodded, changed, and otherwise manipulated. They stand not as artificial creations of human minds but as concrete entities, and are presented as such to the audience of educational administration texts. This, indeed, must be the case if the model under which educational administration research operates is to justify itself, for if there were no concede, "real" organizations much of the research program would falter for lack of a subject (pp. 62-63).
Administration and leadership in education, based on the above set of assumptions, maintain a "tight circle of believers in a positivist science of educational administration" (Maxcy, 1994. p. 63). Additionally, the intellectual bases maintained within such assumptions are tied together with administrative systems, tests and other stipulated requirements for competencies, and foundations of education sustained through legal and financial systems. Even when change and improvement are strongly suggested, alteration in basic institutionalized structures is left out of the scenario. Instead, "the essential concepts of authority, competence, and performance remain as measures of a profession, whether located in bureaucracy or collegiality" (p. 63).

Educational programs in education and administration leadership are interconnected with and work to reinforce the web of education administrative interdependency and essential tendencies (Davies & Foster; in Maxcy, 1994).

Principal Organization Leadership Behavior

Leadership requires management of meaning, attention, trust, and oneself (Bennis, 1984). Principal school leadership demands comprehending the purpose of schools and managing organization symbols toward purpose fulfillment; it demands helping teachers to focus energies to teach students and fulfill school purpose; it demands helping them to establish organizational trust in themselves; and it demands knowing personal strengths and weaknesses, as well as how to bring these into harmony (1984).
Organization conditions shape principal leadership behavior in terms of the above competency areas. Three theories explain this reciprocal organization leadership process: role theory, expectancy theory, and adaptive-reactive theory. Role theory suggests how principals react to expectations of others (Kahan & Rosenthal 1964; Pfeiffer & Salancik, 1975; in Smith & Andrews, 1989). Expectations derive from principal job description, daily agenda requests, and superintendent directives. Teachers' and students' expectations are more indirectly conveyed. Expectations from varying sources create role conflicts as noted by Yukl (1981). Within boundaries of the organization mission, as this is formalized, the principal can model outside expectations according to his own vision (1989).

Kyte (1952) suggested that first, and above all else, the principal is responsible for the safety, welfare, and development of the children enrolled in the school. Second, the principal is responsible for the welfare of teachers and for their professional success. Third, the principal utilizes as much as possible service to children and to teachers rendered by other supervisory officers. Fourth, the principal should try to obtain the maximum assistance from administrative and support agents. Fifth, the principal should promote the best interests of the children in every way possible. Kyte also noted that the principal organizes the school and school employees to create efficient, democratic, and cooperative institutions of dependable, skilled workers. The principal uses organization leadership to plan, organize, and administer a sound educational program for all students. In the operation of the school, the principal should always remain the professional leader
of the teaching staff. This leadership role includes "working scientifically, considerately, and democratically" (1952, p. 12). Emphasis should be maintained on teaching improvement and learning enhancement. The principal's primary effort should be devoted to educational supervision. The principal assumes responsibility for coordinating and directing all the various specialized services provided by the school. The principal serves as a leader in the school community in order to promote children's welfare and an enlightened public consensus. The principal must evaluate all administrative work, the achievements of all school administration and staff, the development of the students in the school, and the attitudes of the community toward the educational program (1952).

Ramseyer et al., (1955) developed nine areas of behaviors or responsibilities which they had observed and identified as important to educational administration within the community setting. The nine include: goal setting; policy making; role determination; effectiveness appraisal; administrative function and structure coordination; promotion of educational improvement through working relationships with community leadership; effective use of community resources; involvement of people; and effective communication (1955). The authors suggested that among school systems, the quality of behavior in each of the above areas is likely to vary. Within each school system, moreover, the importance given to each area of behavior fluctuates. Critical to assessment of the administrator's attendance to duty and responsibility will be evaluation of the roles each of the above behaviors plays in the administrator's daily carrying out of
the organization leadership function (Ramseyer et al., 1955). Elaboration concerning the nine behavioral roles are as follows:

In goal setting, all relevant concepts should be established by participants to achieving the goal, who will in turn understand and accept the goals. Participants should not be concerned that goals other than the stated ones may be operative in the situation, nor should they be concerned about incongruities arising in terms of methods for achievement not carrying forth the spirit of the goal. Precision in statement of goals, openness and fullness of participation, and clarity of relationship between objective and method help the administrator to overcome widespread divergence of opinion and absence of true community of action (1955).

For making policy, participant initiation is stressed. Administrator communication of participant policy involvement is important. Widening the participant base in policy making locates points of decision authority for later implementation when policy is established. The administrator must correctly ascertain and balance rights, privileges, and responsibilities among participants in policy making and policy implementation (1955).

In determining roles, the administrator is expected by participants to clarify their roles, assignments, and levels of success. The administrator is valued in the supporting role. As democratic processing, committee decision making, and structural change increase, determination and administrator acceptance of role or roles become increasingly complex. Particularly with participant interaction in decision roles and committee democratically constituted initiatives and decision processes, participant role acceptance
is critical. For coordinating administrative functions and structure, the central administrative challenge relates to ultimate objective accomplishment through maintaining the proper perspective concerning each activity chartered as composite of the goal. The elements of accomplishment must be harnessed together through the administrator maintaining appropriate relationships and proper emphasis (1955).

In appraising effectiveness, administrators must address the community shared expectations of non participants, that the school system, through the individual school, is improving. Administrators must acknowledge that educational leadership, in the general view, is often measured by this one aspect alone. How well the students have learned, the most common appraisal measurement, is dependent upon how well the school teaches, how well it is administered, and how well the community and state provide educational opportunity for the specifically identified student group. These factors are the basis for effectiveness appraisal, but are far less often measured. Without measurable improvement, schools and systems retrograde. Factual criteria of effectiveness must be developed and communicated to counteract increasing criticism of education. Careful selection of program aspects for appraisal is critical, as is comprehensive evaluation (1955).

In working with community leadership to promote improvements in education, the individual decision-making processes of the community must be clearly understood. The informal balance of influential groups and individuals must be known and appraised. What strategies for protection of interest exist and how change is perceived by each
critical group or individual must be ascertained. Utilization of patterns of influence for educational improvement is essential. Community leadership should not be perceived as evil but as desirable and necessary support (1955).

In using the educational resources of the community, the administrator works to establish educational possibilities for community resources. The public is enlightened in this way through administrative interaction, by means of establishing productive concepts within the community. Availability of resources increases, as does the intensity and utility of associated learning activities, as instrumental learning concepts are promoted by the school. The resources-oriented administration is imaginatively pushed to seek the talents and wherewithal of others. Administrative behaviors are aligned to this end (1955).

By involving people, the administrator raises the stake in improvement. Negatively involved groups exist, as do those positively engaged. The majority, however, is inactive and non committed. Administrator knowledge concerning the groups as well as group difference is basic. Knowing their relationship to the school is essential. Efforts to arouse disinterested parties have minimal effect, except that they perceive some stake in educational improvement (1955).

In communicating, the administrator should comprehend ideas and feelings beneath the expressed communication. Consequent evocation of thought, derived from communication, is critical. Informal effort is equally, or more so, as important as media expertise. The end result, the context of communication transmission, and the disposition of the receiver, determine communication success (Ramseyer et al., 1955).
Spain (1956) suggested a list of twenty-five precepts for effective elementary school principal's behavior:

1. Develops sound human relations with and among members of his staff, parents, and pupils.

2. Stimulates each of his co-workers to catch a vision of a personal potential not previously perceived.

3. Helps the group raise its "sights" concerning what can be accomplished.

4. Releases, develops, and uses the talents of the total staff.

5. Recognizes that high morale is an important factor in good working situations and provides a permissive yet stimulating environment for all.

6. Uses the basic concerns of the group as the beginning point for study and action.

7. Helps the group decide which problems are of greater and lesser significance.

8. Provides assistance as the group decides how to attack the problems.

9. Makes sure that solutions are not approved until the evidence needed for sound judgement is available and has been considered.

10. Contributes suggestions as a member of the group.

11. Helps individual staff members become better able to discuss issues in such a manner that divergent opinions are not merely tolerated, but carefully considered as perhaps preferable to accepted majority opinion.
12. Uses skillfully his knowledge of how groups function, of techniques for improving the effectiveness of groups, and of the potentialities of each group member.

13. Recognizes that some problems require group consideration, while others may best be handled in other ways.

14. Involves in the deliberations leading to a decision those persons (or their representatives) who are likely to be affected by the decision.

15. Makes sure that the actions implied by group decisions are subsequently taken.

16. Builds acceptance within the group that decisions once made are not irrevocable—that frequent review of the consequences of decisions is desirable.

17. Relates his actions to the community served, taking into account the power structure, socioeconomic conditions, geographic factors, mores, and traditions.

18. Bases his actions upon what is known concerning the nature of human development and learning.

19. Handles administrative details expeditiously.


21. Develops the leadership potential in others.

22. Maintains constant faith in people and their ability to improve.

23. Brings all elements of the educational enterprise to focus upon educating the individual child.
24. Builds understanding of the responsibilities of democratic leadership to the individual and of the individual to democratic leadership.

25. Recognizes that growth in the people served is the final test of leadership (Spain, 1956, p. 21-22).

Jordan (1959) suggested that the elementary school principal is responsible for all activities of the school life, and for the achievement of educational goals. Principal behaviors are influenced by individual life experiences, such as the area and the culture which the principal grew up in, as well as the principal's education, successes, failures, religion, and life style. All of these affect principal attitude. The principal should know how to lead the three groups critical to the school: staff, students, and parents. Some principals may not be able to lead all these groups. Some principals may not understand administration, organization, and supervision sufficiently. Principals should be flexible concerning changes in curriculum, students, teachers, and those brought about by emergency situations (1959).

The concept of individual differences among persons must be accepted by the principal concerning everyone in the school. The principal's attitude should be friendly toward every student in the school. Creating a better relationship among school, home, and students is the principal's responsibility. The principal must act in the community for each student. Each student is important in the education process. The principal must understand that children need flexible methods adapted to the curriculum. Educators should work as a team with the school community to develop all aspects of the education
system. The principal is responsible for promoting understanding and cooperation within the community for the school (Jordan, 1959).

Jacobson et al., (1963) suggested that the principal should organize and administer the elementary school to help each member to comprehend and to carry out desirable social relations. In addition, the principal should contribute to the socialization of all students. This ideally results in changing the students from mere individuals into functioning members of society. The principal influences the direction of individuals' associations with other students. Understanding of the need for cooperation, self-control, and consideration for others are reinforced through the actions of the principal. The principal provides guidance to prevent and correct nonproductive student behaviors. The principal acts to create developmental values. In the elementary school, guidance results from coordinating the curriculum with the needs of the student. Assistance is needed so that the student can successfully adjust to individual potential. The elementary school principal strives to advance correct guidance or counseling practices. The guidance practices are enhanced to conform to the objectives of the school system. The principal must be aware of the problems which students encounter as they advance through the grades. The active cooperation of parents is critical in working with the principal to maintain sound guidance practices. The principal actively works with parents to clarify school policies and objectives (1963).

In addition to the above organization leadership responsibilities, Jacobson et al., (1963) clearly establishes the principal's role in offering guidance leadership to the
organization, but especially to the students, in terms of both their learning and their related maturational development. Writing in the 1960's, the author could not have been aware of the growth and acquisition of influence within schools of a separate, highly professional counseling and psychological function, which to some extent may have obviated or at least reduced the guidance role of principals in schools in recent decades. In terms of the parameters of this present study, however, the principal's guidance role may deserve the delineation Jacobson et al., provide: relative to any school guidance or counseling program, the elementary school principal maintains a regular and specific set of duties. These include, first, providing leadership necessary for establishing a school atmosphere which contributes toward the process of child development; second, assisting with the planning of the overall counseling or guidance program in such a way that the role of principal makes effective contribution to the total guidance program throughout the school system; third, creating administrative provisions for wholesome development through participation in the school's program of extra curricular activities, including sports, assembly programs, and civic projects and community, while fitting the curriculum to individual students; and fourth, ensuring that all persons involved with counseling or guidance practices carry them out cooperatively (1963).

Rubin (1970) defined the school principal as someone who has a sound grasp of what a school is for and what ought to go on in it. The principal does the best job possible for the students, in terms of all school activities and teaching. The principal is endowed with certain legal, mandated responsibilities for all school programs; is the
visible school executive in the community; is the link between the school and the district; is responsible for visiting classrooms; and is responsible for making classroom observations and leading staff meetings in discussion. The principal's leadership behaviors should serve to create the incentive and desire to improve school performance through constant appraisal of the school and to insist upon renewal and change which is intelligent and purposeful (1970).

Tye (1974) concludes that principal behavior, school climate, and group decision making are importantly related. Principal leadership establishes organization climate, which in turn largely establishes either openness and productivity or a restricted environment, where the leader determines individually all organization actions and directions, while maintaining aloofness from group participation. Restriction, leader dominance, and isolation in decision processing, inhibit organization integration and stifle staff emotional needs and organization purpose (1974).

Kellams (1979) examined articles written from 1949 to 1979 concerning school principal behavior. Common elements gleaned were as follows:

1. Works as a teacher to help specialists to broaden their competencies, share their authority, and serve as the instructional leader.

2. Should be a creative administrator of the school and a statesman.

3. Must have a compelling philosophy of education, demonstrated capacity for leadership, and understanding of democratic policy and process.
4. Should have understanding of the teachers' duties, relisted time, extra curricular assignments, and control of students.

5. Is responsible to create the right atmosphere between discipline and guidance.

6. Must be a person of sympathy and understanding, well adjusted, a good citizen, and a friend for students.

7. Works to support teachers.

8. Should play a role in politics as the need arises.

9. Should both control the decision-making process and share it with others.

10. Should keep an open door as a democratic leader.

11. Should help all groups of the community to work as one team to achieve educational goals.

12. Should develop a good working relationship with the educational board, should display professional behavior, and should develop the school's beliefs and put them into practice.

13. Should assume the guidance point of view.

14. Should have knowledge and skill in public relations.


16. Must take management responsibility of school activities.

17. Should be more flexible for complex situations.

18. Should be a change facilitator.

19. Must be able to inspire others (1979).
The principal must represent and coordinate these elements to be an effective principal and to achieve educational goals.

Lipham (1981) examined research focusing on specific school processes and behaviors associated with students' attitude and achievements. Research examined focused on information from schools grouped by students' socioeconomic status, and concerned administrative and instructional processes in high and low achieving schools within similar socioeconomic categories. The intent was to discover what might account for achievement differences. Qualitative procedures were used to examine a host of variables: school goals and objectives, attitudes and norms, roles and relationships, and the leadership and instructional behavior of staff and students within the school. Basic to all of the studies was the question of why some schools are more effective than others. Lipham (1981) suggested that in providing leadership, principals make decisions about eight impelling issues directly related to their schools' effectiveness as:

1. Effective principals work closely with school personnel and patrons to select a reasonable number of goals and objectives to be implemented and evaluated each year (p. 4).

2. Effective principals analyze their own and others' value orientation and work to establish open lines of communication for all school personnel and for the community (p. 6).
3. Effective principals utilize the human and material resources available within their own schools, districts, and states. Principals are the key to successful leadership in the school (p. 8).

4. Effective principals are skilled in exercising both directive and supportive leadership as the situation warrants (p. 10).

5. Effective principals must pay attention to what a decision concerns, who should be involved in making it, how the decision is to be made, and recognize the need of situational leadership (p. 11).

6. Effective principals appreciate and acknowledge the abilities and efforts of teachers and others (p. 14).

7. Effective principals have the primary responsibility for constructive change. They acknowledge the dynamic interaction between their own administrative behavior and various phases of the implementation process. They must take the time to assist their staff to be adequately informed of the magnitude and complexity of the change program being attempted (p. 16).

8. Effective principals know how to determine the degree of interaction vs. insularity in relations of the school with the external environment. They know the functions of home-school-community relations. They find ways to reach out and link with the external environment for ideas and programs that can improve the local school. Each of these issues is complex; there are no prescriptive solutions (Lipham, 1981, p. 17).
Kelley (1980; in McCurdy, 1983) specifies principal behaviors beneficial to establishing an educationally optimal climate as including seven steps:

1. State expected outcomes.

2. State expected behaviors on the part of teachers as a means of achieving intended outcomes.

3. Determine whether teachers understand and share in the expectations that have been established.

4. Secure necessary support services so that teachers are able to implement behaviors aimed at accomplishing the expectations.

5. Supervise teacher performance of expected behaviors.

6. Provide feedback about teacher behaviors and about progress toward attainment of expectations.

7. Collect feedback from teachers and others to determine how well goals were attained and whether the principal was helpful in the accomplishment of intended behaviors and outcomes (p. 32).

Principals must establish group collaboration for decision process and problem solution in order to establish school site success and to influence students toward educational achievement and competence. McCurdy (1983) stipulates creation of a school climate that is "safe and orderly and conducive to learning" (p. 5). Principals should establish basic skills emphasis across the curriculum, encouraging high teacher expectations for students, attentive monitoring of student progress directly formulated
within school academic goals, and coordinated and inspired through strong school principal leadership. Principal leadership in education, moreover, effectuates the following desirable actions:

1. Getting good teachers and helping them continue to grow professionally
2. Providing instructional support through an emphasis on instruction, a good school climate, and resources for teachers.
3. Skilled supervision/evaluation of teachers.
5. Motivating and coordinating instruction among teachers.

The siege mentality, noted by Kelley (1980), has been an important theme for understanding administration in schools, primarily after the 1970's. Blumberg & Greenfield (1980) note the climate of schools has placed virtually everyone involved in education on their guards. From this near paranoia, a feeling of goal ambiguity has been established. The overall reaction, even at the leadership organizational level, amounts to what Laing (1969; as cit in 1980) has determined to be ontological insecurity, or lack of security in essential "raison d'etre" (p. 237). It is possible for organizations to experience a similar kind of insecurity, or ontological threat. Even though individual administrators or other education personnel may feel secure, the organization itself, or the educational
enterprise as a whole may come to be insecure in its sense of role or purpose or identity (1980).

The manifest behaviors of educational institutions can emerge to suggest such ontological insecurity, which in turn works to establish an educational orientation geared toward preservation from environment hostility. The self-preservation syndrome, if it might be so characterized among organizations, results in organizational lethargy, defensiveness, and an attitude of boredom. Whereas, ironically, individuals functioning within the organization, when approached individually, very likely evidence contrasting educational involvement of positive attitudes and productive dispositions. It clearly is possible that individual security may be maintained while working within organizations rendered ontologically insecure and dysfunctional, primarily as they engage with hostile and critical environments. As constraints both from within and without act to disengage the institution from its core identity and purpose, thinking in terms of positive function and organization concept formation can be virtually extinguished. The organizational dysfunction solution devolves, particularly in education, to leadership's ability to work within a context of organization ontological insecurity, while also striving to reestablish the organization identity on a more secure basis (Blumberg & Greenfield, 1980).

Leadership within the educational context of ontological ambiguity can be created through six principal attributes: goal organization, ontological security, high tolerance for ambiguity, sensitivity, and the capacity to always remain in charge of the job, rather than allowing the job to be in charge of the leader. Blumberg & Greenfield (1980) expand
upon these essential school leadership attributes. Goal clarity must amount to more than simply espousing or enumerating clear goals. Expression of clear goals is critical. But such expression should include motivation for goal accomplishment. Clarity of goals involves continuous action for their accomplishment, remaining alert for accomplishment enactment, and proactive direction for creation of opportunities. Both long-term and day-to-day operations are essential. Goals without knowledge of pragmatic operations can be overtly dysfunctional. Ontological security, the sense of self and purpose, is highly developed among principals who exercise high leadership ability. The security characteristic is essential for confronting threatening situations both within and without the system boundary. With ontological security, people are viewed as potentially valuable rather than as threatening. New ideas are openly welcomed for testing and evaluation. Ontological insecurity, on the other hand, leads to intolerably high stress, anxiety, and tension levels in confrontation with ambiguity. Security cannot be affirmed through resort to inner resources which are not available. Thus, it is likely that leaders lacking such inner resources will avoid changes or situations promising of change, and will instead cling to routine situations and agendas. Testing the limits, characteristic of successful and proactive leaders, suggests a search. The possible is not assumed a priori, but is tested for, with limits testing, before anything about the given situation is accepted. Sensitivity to the dynamics of power is critical. Seeking out and cultivating informal networks of power relationships are a basic exercise of power at which effective leaders are adept. Problem solving approach which manifests itself from a highly developed analytical
perspective allows effective organization leaders to pull back from the immediate situation, rather than possibly becoming consumed by the problem. The leader's problem confrontation reflex is to objectify and understand the immediate substance of the problem, prior to analysis of outcomes, consequences, and their personal reaction dimensions. Meaning, in the sense of consequences, follows only upon ascertaining with some precision what is really going on. Being in charge of the job, rather than the other way round, suggests handling immediate administrative needs with despatch, so that time, talent, and energy is freed up for more important and interesting procedures (1980).

Schutz (1958) suggests three focal needs for inter-personal relations orientation. These are inclusion, control, and affection, with, additionally, two dimensions for each need—one expressive of behavior toward others, the other expressive of wants or expectations from others. Concerning control, Schutz, focusing on principals who approach their role or position as leaders who wish to be in charge, propose ideas, and initiate action, suggests these principals dislike and tend to resent constraints on their decisions and actions. They wish to discover in their own way solutions specific to their own organization. In terms of inclusion, the goal of leadership-oriented principals is to involve themselves in all facets of problem-solving and outcomes. Characteristically, these principals are immersed in communication with students, faculty, administration, parents, and community stakeholder. They require that other organization members contact, consult, or include them in their own projects or concerns. principals interact
with friendliness, warmth, and good fellowship. They are not detached. They express and wish to receive warmth and affection (1958).

As principal effectiveness was viewed as critical to the educational impact of schools, the concepts of organizational leadership and educational leadership came into sharper focus. McCurdy (1983) cited an Indiana University study of 59 successful urban schools, each of which exhibited strong leadership styles among their principals. These strong leadership behaviors included: principal intuitiveness in identifying and articulating school goals and priorities; principal refusal to allow schools to be run simply by force of habit (in other words, the principal runs the school, not vice-versa); principal total understanding of instructional program and making it the school's first priority; spending around half of the work day in the classrooms and in the corridors; making students' success, not collegial relations with teachers and staff, the first concern; fighting bureaucracies and unions to handpick the best staff; and setting high expectations and standards for teachers and students (McCurdy, 1983).

Krajewski (1977 in McCurdy, 1983) noted a discrepancy between what elementary school principals would prefer doing, as opposed to what they actually spend their time on in the work situation. Krajewski's findings are depicted in Table 1. The areas of widest discrepancy, ranked according to extent of difference, were perceived as first, discipline; second, curriculum supervision and also staff selection; and third, instruction and administration. Clearly, from a theoretical and professional preference ideal, principals would wish to involve themselves much more with faculty and students.
in terms of curriculum and instruction, but find themselves allocating more time than they would wish to more bureaucratic functions (1977).

Bossert (in McCurdy, 1983) discovered seven key behaviors for school principals for school effectiveness:

1. Emphasize achievement by setting instructional goals, developing performance standards for students, and expressing optimism about the ability of students to meet instructional goals.

2. Devote more time to the coordination and control of instruction.

Table 1

What Principals Do—and Would Like To Do—in Elementary Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Ranking</th>
<th>Ideal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public relations</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruction</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morale building</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public service</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher evaluation</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum supervision</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff selection</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-evaluation</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Have more skill in instructional matters, observe teachers' work more, discuss work with teachers more often, and engage in more in service and evaluation activities with teachers.

4. Project more power than other principals, especially in decision making involving curriculum and instruction.

5. Have influence in the mobilization of district support and involvement in the school's instructional plans.

6. Foster structured learning environments with few disciplinary problems and buffer classrooms from interruptions by stressing discipline and relieving teachers of paperwork.

7. Know community power structures and maintain appropriate relations with parents (p. 25).

Yukl (NIL report; cited in McCurdy, 1983) recognizes specific organization management skills as critical for principal leadership effectiveness. Principal management skills for organization leadership include 22 elements or behaviors: performance emphasis; role clarification; training-coaching; goal setting; planning; innovating; problem solving; work facilitation; monitoring operation; external monitoring; information dissemination; discipline; representation; consideration; career counseling and facilitation; inspiration; praise recognition; structuring reward contingencies; decision participation; autonomy-delegation; interaction facilitation; and conflict management (1983).
The principal acting as educational resource demonstrates the following behaviors: first, the ability to evaluate and reinforce appropriate and effective instructional strategies. Components of this instructional factor include encouraging new ideas through sharing current research findings involving teaching and learning with the staff; expressing knowledge concerning strategic instructional factors for students of different age groups; and demonstrating knowledge and skill in effective learning strategies. Second is staff supervision involving strategies for focusing on instructional improvement. Components include teacher instructional performance documentation; post-conferences which include staff member or administrator suggestions for developmental objectives; and providing staff members with evidence of continuity between clinical supervisory observations. Third is educational program assessment through use of student outcome information related directly to instructional issues. Components include reading and offering interpretation of standardized and criterion-referenced district test information; identification of strengths and remediation of weaknesses through specifically designed intervention procedures; and, when needed, identification of external consultant evaluation assistance uses. Fourth is demonstration of successful application of personnel evaluation policies for the district. Components include design of relevant annual evaluation including effective goal setting and measurement of attainment with the employee; and effectiveness of performance conferencing with the employee. Fifth is awareness of the importance of student learning objectives to instructional program implementation. Components include: communication of learning objectives to staff and
community; and assistance giving to teachers so that student mastery is achieved (Smith & Andrews, 1989).

The principal's role as communicator has been described by Sergiovanni (1984) as "purposing" or the signaling of critical values through emphasis of selective attention and important goal modeling. Communication of vision is viewed as the most critical effectiveness role of the principal and includes "fostering clarity, consensus, and commitment for" the organization's basic purposes (Vail, 1982; in Smith & Andrews, 1989, p. 16).

Rutherford (1985, in Smith & Andrews, 1989) describes the characteristic behaviors of effective principals as follows:

(1) have clear, informed visions of what they want their schools to become—visions focusing on students and their needs; (2) translate these visions into goals for their schools and expectations for their teachers, students, and administrators; (3) continuously monitor progress; and (4) intervene in a supportive or corrective manner when this seems necessary (p. 1).

The principal as strong leader (Persell & Cookson, 1982) incorporates specific personal characteristics and practices evincing professional dynamism and force: a demonstrated academic commitment; a high expectation organization climate; instructional leadership; dynamic and forceful leadership; effective consultation with individuals and groups; creation of an ordered and disciplined learning environment; capability for marshaling resources; efficient use of time; proficient and ongoing evaluation of results; as well as high energy, assertiveness, initiative, openness to new thinking, high tolerance for ambiguity, a strong sense of humor, analytic ability, and a
pragmatic disposition toward life. Further characterizing the strong and effective principal as instructional leader are four areas of strategic interaction with the school professional staff: acting as resource provider, as instructional resource, as communicator, and as a visible presence (1982).

The effective resource provider displays high personal ability for acquiring needed materials and for coordinating routine with higher-order tasks, so that effective managerial skills are brought into play and are well coordinated, and so that time is managed to squeeze out every potential moment for strategic productivity. The strong and effective leader analyzes and fully understands the resources needed. Smith & Andrews (1989) cite also as indications of the effective principal as resource manager that high control and connection are not perceived as possible nor necessarily desirable. Predictable situations, goal consensus, and self-correcting organization are not viewed as characteristic. Effective principals, rather, operate in schools which require considerable principal management of symbols in order to hold the school together (Weick, 1982):

People need to be part of sensible projects. Their action becomes richer, more confident, and more satisfying when it is linked with underlying themes, values, and movement. Administrators must be attentive to the "glue" that holds loosely coupled systems together because such forms are just barely systems. The administrator who manages symbols does not just sit in his or her office mouthing clever slogans. Eloquence must be disseminated. And since chances are unpredictable, administrators must get out of their office and spend lots of time one-on-one—both to remind people of central visions and to assist them in applying these visions to their own activities. The administrator teaches people to interpret what they are doing in a common language (pp, 675-676; in Smith & Andrews, 1989, pp. 19 - 20).
A structure which is both loosely and tightly coupled is characteristic of schools overall (Sergiovanni, 1984). Clear sense of purpose and structure is joined with freedom among organization associates to determine realization of purpose. Tightened loose structure, according to Sergiovanni provides meaning, control, and experience of success for organization members. Effective school principals must balance these aspects of leadership. Manasse (1984) suggests that effective leaders recognize systems of individuals, resources, and appropriate substitutes for leadership, within the organization, typified in the writing of Sergiovanni, as working together to define leadership itself (1984).

Smith & Andrews (1989) suggest that effective principal communication behavior includes six dimensions: the first is effective evaluation and dealing with others, including three components: accurate, sensitive, and reliable two-way communication; promotion of mutual conflict resolution, problem solving, cooperation, and sharing; and recognition of information appropriate for communication. The second dimension is clear and concise speaking and writing, including three components: organized oral and written communication; coherency in communication; and recognition of specific audiences with interaction appropriate to their respective needs. Third is principal acceptable conflict management with application of skills and strategies satisfactory to disputants, incorporating three components: ability and commitment to see others' points of view with precise articulation in conflict situations; ability to develop mutually acceptable solutions; and conflict management effectiveness. Fourth is utilization of problem-solving
techniques for facilitation of group selection of courses of action, inclusive of three components: accurate current situation assessment through collection of relevant and valid data; development and analysis of complex problem solutions; and inclusion of evaluation provisions within the implementation plan. The fifth dimension is interaction with all organization components, importantly, staff, parents, and students, incorporating a variety of group process skills, and inclusive of three components: development of process commitment in others for goal achievement; clearly understandable and applicable formulation, with input from others, of final outcomes; and process and outcome evaluation procedure development. And sixth is demonstration of personal teamwork skill, including three components: assessment of team member strengths and weaknesses; demonstration of strong group process skills; and demonstration of ability to integrate group and personal goals (1989).

Smith & Andrews (1989) propose that the school principal behavior in terms of acting as a visible presence includes two dimensions. The first is establishing and maintaining a cooperative work relationship with staff and community for development of clear goals in fulfillment of the mission of the district. This dimension includes two components: the vision of the school expressed with clarity and effective organization of people and resources for school and district goal accomplishment. The second dimension is high visibility of the principal to staff, students, and parents. This dimension incorporates seven components: informal observation of classes without disruption of the learning process; manifestation of behavior in keeping with the articulated school vision;
active participation in staff development; buffering the organization from the outside environment; visible presence throughout the school environment during school hours; offering of opportunities for others to express understanding of the principal's commitment to priority school goals; and clear communication of educators' obligations for student learning (1989).

Principals' Length of Experience and Effectiveness

Kelley (1980) suggested that school principals who work three years or more in the school are likely to be held accountable for 60 percent or more of the school's activities. The patterns that exist are those the principal has initiated (1980).

Parkay & Hall (1992) maintain that principals learn from their experience a good deal concerning future leadership situations. Also, they learn how to meet future leadership challenges: creating more effective schools in the future and improving students' performance (1992).

In a study entitled, "Beginning Principal School" (Parkay, Rhodes, Currie, & Rao, 1990, in Parkay & Hall, 1992) school principals identified finance and community relations as two critical areas demanding increased principal attention. The majority of principals tended to have had experiences as an assistant principal. Principal experience in the assistant principal role acts as one of three critical success determinants. The other two, school size and location, are significantly related to the importance the principal attaches to working with parents, community, and the administrative team. Principals'
experience as assistant principals was related to the importance of dealing with finance, budget, problems on campus, and with community relations. On the other hand, the new principal without this experience works closely with teachers, staff, the community, and the district. Also, new principals tend to be more concerned about being successful (1992).

In a 1968 study (Department of Elementary Principals Education Association) principals generally attributed success to experience as classroom teachers and on-the-job experience as principals. Principals with less than 5 years experience in the principal role were more likely to emphasize classroom experience as a major success factor than were principals with 15 years experience or more. The more on-the-job experience possessed by the principal, the more likely the principal was to report job experience as a principal as most important. Additionally, the higher the academic degree of the principal, the more likely he would be to report experience as critical (1968). Another examination of the role of experience (Kimbrough, 1968) suggests that with experience, especially for the school principal, comes creation of values systems and clarification of values. This alone might be sufficient to warrant principals' own high valuation concerning job experience in the principal's role and function. Kimbrough (1968) cites a 1966 study by Graff et al., to the effect that "philosophic theorizing" is essential to principal preparation and exercise of leadership. This kind of inner inexperience evolves best within the leadership context. It involves personal clarification of beliefs which establish the basis of acts. It acquires the habit of considering alternative beliefs and their consequences. Experience is viewed
as necessary for creating "comprehensives and unity in the personalized system of values used as a basis of behavior" (p. 44). Only through experience in the job within which decisions will be made and carried out and through which both organizational and environmental contexts will be confronted can the principal clarify what he believes. Without such clarification, especially in terms of the function carried out, effective leadership is not likely to result. Conflicting social forces demand that leadership thinking itself be rather well sorted out in both its perceptions and in its stances related to belief and social value issues (1968).

Kimbrough (1968) similarly reinforces school principal administrative and leadership practice as based in experience, even when understood theoretically from a scientific frame of reference. The role of the principal, more or less objectively understood, may appear to be a process of influencing numerous interacting variables which are "interrelated so that a change in one may bring about profound variations in others associated with it" (p. vii). The variables themselves extend in their implications to form the social systems of enormous complexity which are school systems and individual schools. Strategies devised as workable for one complex structure can not predictably be made to work in another. Change strategies produce different results dependent upon the contextual variable complex. The school administrator comes to recognize and deal with a unique system. Implications are manifest for successful transfer of administrative knowledge, skills, and abilities. Topological situational illustrations provide guidelines to requisite personal analysis of individual administrative situations.
Variations among faculties alone tend to destabilize perfect replication of systems. Organization structure and climate always demand personal direct experience and involvement. Generalize ability in the sense of providing for scientific measurement is in nearly all situations the exception to the rule. These factors of variability underlie possibilities for principal educational leadership. More routinized administrative functions are more amenable to applications of the regularities envisioned by science and thus abstract determinations (1968).

As has been emphasized in many ways from research associated with organization leadership, developing effective leadership depends upon the organization socializing experience. School principal leadership behavior works toward effectiveness through socialization process, which is organization experience, but from a specific vantage, that of organizational leadership. To some extent the experience and learning that take place are organization-specific, but in another sense, the principal, besides learning a specific organization system, is also learning about organization leadership as part of the totality of education involvement, and about the experience of leadership overall.

Leadership is a quality that emerges from the behavior of the person in a social system. A person is not a leader apart from the system. Thus the possession of traits as an individual, even though some of them can contribute to the differentiation of role among persons is not automatically a basis for leadership (Kimbrough, 1968, p. 107).

Another way of understanding how socialization process and experience develop organization leadership is to focus upon how group norms establish leadership role: "Adherence to the group norm gives a person group legitimization as a licensed practitioner
of leadership in the social system” (Kimbrough, 1968, p. 107). The leader follows a path of legitimation within the system to act as a focal point of the interaction structure in the system. From this focal point, arrived at through effective socialization and interaction, the processes of organization experience, the leader "is perceived to control resources that are valued by persons in the system" (p. 107). Relatedness to the system through socialization experience develops effectiveness in the use of resources at the disposal of the leader. Continued positioning and support within the leadership position by organization participants for the organization leader demonstrate participants' perception and endorsement of leadership marshaling and stewardship of resources. Ineffective use results in withdrawal of support and positional loss:

As the members of a social system interact, role differentiation results, leadership, then, is in part a result of the differentiation of leadership roles among the members of the system. Perception is an important factor in the emergence of leadership, especially in the differentiation of roles of leadership in a system. Objectively measured personality qualities are not as important in leadership as is the way in which the led perceive the leader's qualities. Leadership is a quality that emerges within the complex structural, cultural, and inter factional patterns of a social system (p. 108).

Studies relating effectiveness in carrying out administrative functions to experience in administration often focus on two aspects of the situation: first, the unexpected difficulties of first year principals in adjusting to the demands of school leadership, and second, a compendium of recommendations for training and otherwise familiarizing incoming principals concerning the performance that will be demanded of them. Anderson (1991) notes that on an annual basis in the United States alone eleven thousand first-year principals assume school administrative command. Anxiety is part of their stock
in trade. Components of this anxiety, and therefore the elements of process distinguishing the novice from the veteran, include first of all the sudden immersion into authoritative role. Since the principal exists as the designated leader, everyone expects autonomy. They expect the leader knows what to do and will act without precondition, formal introduction, advice, or consultation. Very few individuals come to grips with such fluid sense of command easily. Some never do. Most build gradually, possibly over a period of years, into constructing a certain comfort zone in terms of the prerogatives of authority and its exercise. Beyond the kind of psychological awakening such a perspective is likely to provide, additional variables which appear to be incumbent with the principal's role take effect. Each much be confronted, experienced, and mastered if requisite leadership is to be provided. The variables, with indeterminate time spans required for their mastery include isolation, time management, technical problems, socialization to the school system, lack of feedback, and the twenty-one administrative tasks identified in Table 2.

Additionally, time management may be a problem for beginning principals of nonforecastable dimensions. To some extent each organization time problem is specific to the individual organization system. Demands on incoming principals can be especially overwhelming. The time problem appears to be the most significant area of adjustment to the principal's role. An important task critical to time management appears to be delegation of authority and assignment of priorities to schedules of tasks. Again, such skill may develop slowly with experience and with familiarity concerning specific organization contexts. Management of details eventually devolves toward a question of
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plan and manage school budget</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understand “unwritten” rules, procedures, and expectations</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan and direct improvements in curriculum and instruction</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understand district goals, philosophy, and expectations of principals</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation to and understanding of staff</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assess relevance of instruction, curriculum, and evaluate program outcomes</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understand and implement school board policies, district rules, and administrative procedures</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervise accounting procedures for school monies</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understand curriculum content, objectives, and organization</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understand and work through district decision making processes</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assess community needs, problems, and expectations</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop master schedule</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set goals and develop long-range plans</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervise and evaluate staff</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deal with staff concerns and resolve conflicts</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help staff improve and plan staff development activities</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Select, assign, and orient staff</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervise and direct custodial service, maintenance of facilities, and plant systems</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervise special programs</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervise purchasing procedures</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinate the opening and closing of each school year</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Anderson, 1991, p. 58
a pro-active posture toward the myriad of organization detail. The experience of total fragmentation due to the myriad of demands made upon one's time is disconcerting moving to overwhelming depending on the organization's specific situation. Time management, as an organization-specific difficulty, and therefore one virtually demanding of on the job experience to master, has been substantiated through principals' report of experience and difficulty (Anderson, 1991).

To some extent, since the tendency seems to be with intention to create situations of involvement for new principals within which they are totally and immediately responsible for outcomes, it must be assumed that organization approach is to first discover the leadership strength of the new administrator, providing challenges wherein either the new leader will emerge intact in terms of meeting executive demands to somehow learn necessary individual survival skill, or will come to terms with the situation in another way. Even though principals themselves suggest and demand university preparation that might simulate and better meet actual job requirements, the greater truth which the organization context expresses is that only through the job experience context of sink or swim, or in effect "being thrown to the lions," can the necessary organization leadership be manifested. It may be that traditional school organization intuitive approach realizes this necessity and resists too much assistance and restructuring for the individual in the leadership context as dysfunctional. Such summation, if valid, would tend to support the critical success determination of job experience (Anderson, 1991).
More apparent principal leadership needs concern technical problem mastery or "the logistics of many mundane, yet important, school system-specific procedures" (Anderson, 1991, p. 53). For principals, the organization approach for even apparently routine and essentially simplistic performance is likely to flow from the "learn-on-your own philosophy or orientation" (1991, p. 54). However, an approach allowing leadership itself to establish its own basis, while perhaps appearing dysfunctional in detracting from seemingly more important, strategic processes, carries with it the benefit of establishing and to some extent selecting individuals imbued with the ancient but essential leadership virtue of "standing on one's own two feet." For experiential acquisition, application, and demonstration of such virtue, there is likely no substitute (1991).

All situations and demands of on-the-job learning for principals which are identified as strategically important carry the dual significance of situation-specific knowledge, skill, and experience acquisition, along with built-in leadership demonstration and development criteria. Socialization to the specific school system or to school systems in the more universal, experiential sense is a leadership development category of this type. New leaders must discover, absorb, and systematize the organization's logistics, or simply the system of functions and procedures. More importantly, however, within the socialization process of principal to school, the principals find much greater difficulty in mastering strategies designated by the organization to be "appropriate to the roles they assumed and the social relations in the organization" (Anderson, 1991, p. 54).
Socialization process for school organization leadership tends to be based on a learning of unwritten rules, codes, and procedures. Principals may express a desire that the unwritten dimensions of organizations be codified and transferred to them, but, it seems apparent, such procedure would be defeating to the experiential testing and demonstration process necessary for leadership realization. In no other aspect or circumstance is this demonstration aspect more demanded than in school system socialization. New leaders realize the tremendous time and talent commitment required "to learn subtle, district-specific nuances" (Anderson, 1991, p. 55).

Other than through the directly experiential and personally involving, principals are likely to find their only learning resource to be reaching out to and inquiring of the available peer or similar repository of information. Discovering the when, how, and of whom such inquiry should appropriate itself toward demands an experiential agenda unto itself. Models for behavior are generally not available for immediate observation. One has after all replaced some other figurehead previously residing at the top. One's schedule precludes time out for observational excursions. Facilitation of interaction among administrators seems not in the offing (Anderson, 1991).

The impact of direct, experiential learning with minimal reinforcement of directive structuring is explicitly conveyed through lack of feedback provided to the new principal. Even though it is widely accepted that new organization members require considerable feedback concerning their performance in order to elicit commitment to the system, loyalty, and acceptance of organizational goals and values, as well as to raise their
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functional leadership and principal skill levels, for new principals such evaluation and
guidance, especially at the formal level, tend not to be forthcoming. Apparently the
experiential dimension of self-development and self-reliance is deemed more critical to
maximizing leadership output, and thus more valuable, in the long term, than are the
immediate needs, to the organization, of providing situational correction and evaluation

Learning-Centered Principalship, the concept which provides the title of Webster
(1994), principal leadership approach, subtitled "The Principal as Teacher of Teachers,"
emphasizes effective principal leadership as an art form. As such, principal leadership is
essentially experience-based. The activity of school administration is essentially problem
solving, but lacking the precision of science. As an art-form, effective principalship
nevertheless employs scientifically derived principals and findings when these things fulfill
some pragmatic purpose. The specific context governs most importantly in school
administration practice. The predictability of science largely is not possible. The
individual must become personally familiar with common organization practice, shared
understandings, legalities, traditions, negotiated relationships, and multiple aspects hardly
predictable except given familiarity with total organization dynamics. Problem solutions,
beyond those controlling contextual factors, are arrived at through principals' approaches:
"reliance on past practices, political resolutions, common sense, and many other devices"
(p. 6). The entire approach to leadership success evolves from experiential, pragmatic
learning, and not scientific regularity and replication of effect. Successful school
administration develops from experiential emergence and strategic application appropriate for "the complex web of people, values, and similar human dynamics" (p. 6). New principals quickly learn that their graduate school training according to models of science, paradigms, and formulations hardly serves them well. Experience stands as the only teacher and path to success. Only through experience can the reality of problem and solution manifest itself. Academic preparation approaches administrative learning as atomistic and in composition an array of identifiable, discrete elements. These elements of structure, beyond being isolatable, are open to control and manipulation through the inquiry process of science. Administrative experience totally reshapes these expectations and, moreover, moves to an almost opposite formulation of knowing and activation of practice. Experience-derived practice understands administrative situations and problems as complex entities, interlinking facets of a composite not knowable except in its original manifestation. The majority of manifestations are furthermore hardly knowable through observation and measurement. They exist as attitudes merely, or viewpoints, or simply contextual working relationships. Solutions tend to be intuitive rather than analytically framed, working from experientially driven intuition. Administrative problems manifest in terms of dynamic, ever-changing contexts. Changing people, the change in values, and the impacts of political process and forces call for solution adjustment or reversal as the problem and context evolve. Experience alone creates and refines these adjustment possibilities and solution opportunities (1994).
Emphasizing the critical nature of socialization in terms of principal leadership behavior, Wiggings (1972) demonstrates how compliance rather than individuality manifests the shaping principle of leader behavior. Research supports the view that behavioral characteristics of elementary school principals are influenced by experience within the administrative role as a socializing effect. Research indicates that behavioral variance within principal administrative roles is minimal. Analysis of school climates additionally supports this view. Research indicates that principal performance emanates primarily from expectations of the group, the organization as a whole, rather than from individual aspect, or personality. Moreover, indications are that the roles and expectations associated with school administration are more often than not in conflict with administrator needs and expectations (1972).

Allison & Allison (1991), in examining school principals' perceptions of problems, focused upon three divisions—rookie, seasoned, and veteran—corresponding to level of administrative experience. Problem areas confronted were delineated as routine administrative procedure, walk-in student/teacher/parent, concerns; other walk-in problems; and long-range projects. Perceptions of problem solving were not found to be significantly related to level of experience. The study seemed to suggest that an ability to detect need and to transform problems into projects was a major asset to effective school administration (1991).

Principal effectiveness drawing from administrative experience may interact importantly with leadership approach. That is, effectiveness through experience may be
enhanced in cases of principals who emphasize employment of subordinate skills and knowledge, since leaders largely learn leadership effectiveness through group process. The two factors of group interaction and length of experience may thus be viewed as mutually reinforcing and enhancing. Effective leadership may from this mutual perspective be construed as social validation for all group members. Social validation may especially be the case for principal's leadership in schools. As leadership succession and organization socialization interact through the principal's role within the school context, the classic struggle of integration with creativity emerges. Leadership relationships emerge and develop to address social pressures related to leader change efforts and process. Leader experience of the change process evokes opportunities for examination of organization relationship. Experience may favor integration over creativity and principal innovation effort, which differentiation in turn may reflect upon outcomes of organization socialization experience. Principal emphasis on social validation and interaction may point to leadership approach enhancing to organization creativity outside the leadership role and to leadership outcome success responsibility among organization superiors to the principal (Hart, 1994).

Ediger (1994) emphasizes principal experience as necessary for school instructional leadership. Frequent observation of teaching and learning situations are important as are direct principal recommendations to specific teachers. Leadership within schools demands appropriate knowledge and experience. These organizations, however, must be joined with appropriate attitudes for modifying, revising, and improving
education methods (1993). Nagy (1991) in a study of principals with varying experience levels determined interpretable differences between those experienced and those not experienced. Ogletree (1991) determined that leader style or approach and level of experience were not related. Principals themselves, on the other hand, value on-the-job experience along with basic common sense as the two most important elements in their success and the basis of true expertise (Beck, 1988). Alvy & Coladarci (1986) emphasize two difficult areas of administration for first and second year principals: curriculum and instruction, and personnel relations.

Peterson (1985) suggested that through focusing on the four stages of experiential learning (concrete experience, reflective analysis, abstract conceptualization, and active experimentation), principal experiential learning for administrative effectiveness can be improved upon. McMuray & Bentley (1987) determined in a study of administrators, researchers, teachers, and practitioners in education that higher survey scores in flexibility-effectiveness, at least among males, were related to increasing age. Women did not reflect this trend. Smith (1973) found experience and effectiveness not related. Rousseau (1971) provides evidence that principal effectiveness is enhanced through undergraduate scholarship proclivity, graduate training in educational administration, and considerable administrative experience (1971).

In analyzing the experiential basis of principal effectiveness in organization leadership, a distinction has been made between professional socialization and organizational socialization. The socialization process overall, in terms of mastering the
profession of principalship, involves principals' adjustment to group expectations and learning social roles, internalizing group values, norms, and beliefs, and largely accepting the meanings of groups in which they participate. In other words, within the sense of this process, "an individual selectively acquires the knowledge, skills, and dispositions needed to adequately perform a social role, in this case the school principalship (Leithwood et al., cited in Hart, 1993, p. 11). Important to this socialization are all training, preparation, and education experiences directed toward developing individuals specifically suited for education administration. These aspects comprise professional socialization. The other form of socialization, organizational socialization, differs significantly from its professional counterpart: organizational socialization occurs almost entirely within the context of school district and school building experience. It is specifically on-the-job experience:

It teaches a person knowledge, values, and behaviors required in a particular role within a particular organization. These values and norms may be very different from those learned as part of his professional socialization (Hart, 1993, p. 11).

Organization socialization tends to replace professional socialization in designation and acceptance of social norms and roles. Superintendents, or the school organization itself, as a whole, can act to totally shape or reshape principal education, leadership, and organization approach, given sufficient strength in "fostering changes in orientations and training, evaluation systems, incentives, and sanctions provided by the district" (Hart, 1993, p. 12). The deeper cultural and pragmatic purpose of organizational socialization is primarily to ensure that individual initiative and influence do not exert undue impact
upon the organization or other social context as a whole. Sustaining organization norms, values, and practices is viewed as legitimate and suggestive of vigorous relationship with the society, culture, and greater contextual environment as a whole. The organization survives as a result of maintaining internal institutional forms and passing these forward to organization membership and all the society. The power associated with this process is such that "organizational socialization binds the members of work organizations into communities with far deeper ties than those forged through previous experiences or formal structure" (1993, p. 12).

In terms of organization principal leadership behavior, organization socialization is virtually concomitant with organization experience. From this perspective, one which is widely and pervasively advanced within the literature of organization and education studies, the power of organization experience to shape leadership behavior in principals would seem to make other factors subordinate to it. Such experience shaping power, however, does not necessarily equate with length of organization administrative experience being directly correlated with administrative effectiveness. What might seem necessary to such analysis would be examination of critically related factors: the kind of leadership principles agenda and expectations incorporated into the given organization socialization; the secondary effect of duration of socialization; and the standard of effectiveness subscribed to (Hart, 1993).

Greenfield (as cited by Hart, 1993) examined phases of administrative position candidacy, concluding that interpersonal, social process, and organizational context
variables developed the administrative perspective. Socialization to administration was
determined to be informal and largely random, occurring over a variable time frame,
importantly requiring candidates to dispense with their previous teacher identities.
Greenfield asserted that professional socialization had two objectives: moral socialization
and technical socialization. The former concerns values, norms, and attitudes; whereas
the latter stresses knowledge, skills, and techniques directed toward performance
requirements. Greenfield emphasized that "different socialization responses are a function
of differences in organizational socialization tactics, contexts, and conditions" (cited in

Leithwood et al. (as cited in Hart, 1993) in attempting to connect socialization
with instructional leadership conceptualized professional socialization as initiation,
transition, and incorporation. These processes or phases occurred within four major
areas: relationships, experience with the formal organization, formal training, and
outcomes. The work concluded that socialization experiences designed to effectuate
instructional leadership had no impact on principal sense of importance placed on
instructional leadership tasks in their work (p. 20, 1993).

Educational Leadership and Administration in Saudi Arabia

In general, education in Saudi Arabia has a formal system like any other
educational system in the world and centralized system by the government. The aim goal
of education is to provide students with sound and proper educational and religious
guidance to help develop their characters, and to furnish useful knowledge for students' daily lives. There are two major government organizations that supervise public education: The Ministry of Education and Girls' Education Administration. Both govern public educational systems as maintain in Chapter I.

Public education consists of the following stages:

**Kindergarten**

Admits children age 4-6 to teach them simple information and how to function independently. This stage was originally established through private organizations. Some private schools remain for kindergarten exclusively, and some kindergartens are part of a larger private school.

**Elementary School**

Children are admitted to this stage after age six. The elementary school has six levels and is the basis on which the preparation of growing children rests for their next phase of life. It is a general phase that covers all the citizens of the nation and provides them with the principles of Islamic faith. Also, the elementary level provides sound guidance, experience, information, and skills.
Intermediate School

Children must be 12 years old and have completed the elementary school for admittance to this stage. Children spend three years in this stage, passing through three levels.

Secondary School

This stage is divided into three levels over three years. Children have to complete the intermediate school to be admitted into this stage. After the first year in this stage, children go into either a science or an arts program.

Higher Education

Higher education is provided through universities and colleges; in addition, some institutions impart higher education but do not offer the first university degree. Any student who has a secondary stage diploma can study in this stage. There are some colleges that do not admit students who have low grade averages. In Saudi Arabia seven university.

Overview of Educational Systems

Historically, in Saudi Arabia education has been considered synonymous with religious teachings. This perspective of the nature and mission of education has been predominant throughout the Arab world, and is considered as a command of faith, with
Prophet Mohammed (Peace be Upon Him) as the first teacher and the mosque as the first school. Seeking knowledge, from "cradle to grave" (Fozan, cited in Al Salloom, 1995, p. 7) is not an option but a necessity for Muslims (1995).

Yet, in Saudi Arabia, education in the formal sense remained largely undeveloped until the advent of the modern state. Also, even with this development trend, the ideals and projections of state, formal, and comprehensive education remained restricted:

Economic constraints limited the impact of the pioneering efforts of the Directorate of Education in laying the foundation for a modern educational system in Saudi Arabia, especially during World War II. In 1947 the number of schools in the entire Kingdom, from preparatory through secondary levels, totaled only 65 with a total enrolment of approximately 10,000 male students (Al Salloom, 1995, p. 10).

In the course of the last quarter century of Saudi development these restrictive conditions have fallen away. Development of Saudi education has proceeded toward its religious commitment, while simultaneously sustaining the economic and social progress of the nation. Through the 1980's education was increasingly supported and reconstructed as the means for full development of Saudi society and its human resources. The basic structural component to Saudi educational policy and philosophy, at present, is to realize the economic and social goal of "Saudization" (Al Salloom, 1995, p. 12) of the nation's workforce. Al Salloom believes this underlying objective has become more of a reality. Innovation in directives and procedures made during of this period (1986-1988) reflect the impetus of present-day educational leadership thinking in Saudi Arabia.
Issuance of Royal Decree which recognized the Ministry of Education and led to the creation of the "Directorate General for Educational Technology." The new Directorate, consisting of two departments: "Design Department" and "Production Department" adopted the three following objectives (1) to stress the training of the senior staff of the Educational Ministry and Educational District in the fields of educational technology, teaching aids and equipment; (2) to pay more attention to the design and production of educational materials; (3) to supply all types of advanced educational technology materials to schools, such as films, laboratories, equipment, computers (which was interdict in the newly developed secondary school curriculum). In addition, the Directorate made available video tapes in its main office.

Gearing the efforts of the Directorate General for Educational Supervision and Training towards raising the standard and efficiency of teachers in educational supervision and to develop a program for Teachers' In-Service training.


Significant changes which took place in 1990-1992 were (a) the completion of the English language books, i.e., student's book, teacher's book and activity book in the intermediate level (which are now in use in all schools following a trial period); (b) phasing out of the credit hour system in the secondary level effective from the First Grade of Secondary level—1990/91; and (c) upgrading of programs in the seventeen Teachers'
Colleges to grant a Bachelor's Degree to graduates who completed 149 credit hours over four consecutive years (Development of Education, 1990-1992, pp.45-49).

Implementation of a new curriculum, following a thorough study by the Ministry of Education that takes into consideration learners' inclinations and the reduction of the period of study from four to three years.

In Special Education a ministerial order instructed that no student may be dismissed from any level of education for repeated failure as long as he/she is still in the age bracket of that level. Also the establishment of new units and facilities and modernizing existing ones to improve the care and services offered to the handicapped. An improved curricula for special education was ordered and the launching of a program at the King Saud University's College of Education to produce teachers who can specialize in teaching the blind, deaf and mentally retarded students (Al Salloom, 1995, p. 12-13).

The essence of all Saudi educational thinking in terms of policy and administrative commitment flows from Islam. The principles and curriculum of Saudi Education are integral with Islamic faith and way of life. Thus, Saudi education is enjoined with its duty to:

1. Strengthen faith in God and Islam, and Mohammad (Peace be Upon him) as Prophet and Messenger of God.
2. Foster a holistic, Islamic concept of the universe, man and life, such that the entire world is subject to the laws of God in fulfilling its duty without any interruption or confusion.

3. Emphasize that life is a stage of work and production during which the Muslim invests his capacities with a full understanding of and faith in the eternal life in the other world. Today is work without judgment and tomorrow is judgement without work.

4. Proclaim that the message of Mohammad (Peace be Upon Him) ensures happiness to man and rescues humanity from all the corruption and misery.

5. Instill the Islamic ideals of a humane, prudent and constructive civilization guided by the message of Mohammad (Peace be Upon Him) to realize glory on earth and happiness in the other world.

6. Engender faith in human dignity as decreed by the holy Qur'an and each Muslim is entrusted with the task of fulfilling God's wishes on earth.

7. Reinforce that it is the duty of each Muslim to seek education and the duty of the state to provide education in its various stages within the state's capacity and resource.

8. Incorporate religious education as basic element in all the primary, intermediary, and secondary stages of education and maintain Islamic culture as a basic course in all the years of higher education.
9. Integrate Islamic orientation in sciences and knowledge in all their forms, items, curricula, writing and teaching so that they would fall in harmony with sound Islamic thinking.

10. Stimulate the use of human knowledge in the light of Islam to raise the standard of living of our country and nation and to fulfill our role in world cultural progress.

11. Foster absolute faith in the fundamentals of the Islamic nation and its unity regardless of race, color and geographical distance.

12. Teach the importance of our national history, the preservation of the heritage of the Islamic religion, and learn from the lives of our ancestors using their experience as a guiding light for our present and future.

13. Promote Islamic solidarity and strengthen cooperation among Islamic peoples in order to protect them against all dangers.

14. Teach respect for the general rights guaranteed by Islam in order to maintain law and order and achieve stability for the Muslim community in its religion, soul, family, honor, mind and property.

15. Advocate social solidarity among the members of the Muslim community through cooperation, love, fraternity and through placing public interest over private interest.

16. Enlighten that God has bestowed a special responsibility on the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia as: (a) guardian of Islam's Sacred Places;(b) defender of the land in which
inspiration descended on Prophet Mohammad (Peace be Upon Him); (c) in her adoption of Islam as creed, worship, law, constitution and way of life; and (d) in its responsibility of spreading the word and wisdom of Islam throughout humanity.

17. Pronounce that the preaching of Islam throughout the world, with prudence and persuasion, is the duty of the state and its citizens.

18. Inspire strength in its most sublime form-strength of faith, character, and body- because a strong faith is closer to God's heart than a weak faith.

Corollary to the above articles on education policy, Article 28 declares the general purpose of education is "to have the student understand Islam in a correct and comprehensive manner; to plant and spread the Islamic creed; to furnish the student with the values, teachings and ideals of Islam; to equip him with the various skills and knowledge; to develop his conduct in constructive directions; to develop the society economically; socially and culturally; and to prepare the individual to become a useful member in the building of his community."

Articles 29 to 61 of The Education Policy specifies the objectives of Islam in achieving the purpose of education, stressing the cultural and religious role of the Kingdom; most prominent of which are as follows: (Ministry of Education, 1980, pp. 11-12)

1. Promoting the spirit of loyalty to Islamic law by denouncing any system or theory that conflicts with this law and by honest action and behavior in conformity with the general provisions of this law.
2. Demonstrating the full harmony between science and religion in the Islamic law, as Islam is a combination of religion and secularism, and Islamic thought meets all the human needs in their highest forms and in all ages.

3. Encouraging and promoting the spirit of scientific thinking and research, strengthening the faculties of observation and mediation, and enlightening the student about God's miracles in the world and God's wisdom in His creatures; thus enabling the individual to fulfill an active role in building a social life and in steering it toward the right direction.

4. Understanding the environment in all forms, broadening the horizons of students by introducing them to the different parts of the world and the natural resources and products that characterize each country, emphasizing the wealth and raw resources of our country, their geographical location, and economic position. Accepting a leadership role in safeguarding Islam, calling people to accept it, and working for the solidarity of the Islamic world.

5. Furnishing the students with at least one of the living languages, in addition to their original language, to enable them to acquire knowledge, arts and useful inventions, transmit our knowledge and sciences to other communities, and participate in the spreading of Islam and serving humanity.

6. Keeping pace with the characteristics of each phase of the psychological growth of young people, helping the individual to grow spiritually, mentally, emotionally,
and socially in a well-rounded way, and emphasizing Islamic spirituality so that it will be the main guideline of private and public behavior for the individual and the society.

7. Studying individual differences among students so as to properly orient them and assist them to grow in line with their abilities, capabilities and inclinations.

8. Caring for academically retarded students and eliminating as many of their handicaps as possible setting up special permanent and provisional programs to fit their needs.

9. Training the necessary manpower and diversifying education with special attention to vocational training.

10. Planting the zeal of work in the hearts of students, commending it in all its forms, urging individuals to excel in their work and to emphasize its role in the construction of the nation. This is done by (a) forming scientific skills and attending to applied sciences in school to give the student the chance to practice handicraft activities, participate in production, and acquire experience in laboratories, construction work, and farms; and (b) Studying the scientific principles of various activities so that the level of mechanical production will attain progress and invention.

11. Awakening the spirit of Islamic struggle to fight ignorance and poverty, resume its glory, and fulfill the mission of Islam.

12. Establishing the strong relations that exist among Muslims and protect the unity of the Muslim nation (Al Salloom, 195, pp, 15-19).
Hariri (1982), in a study of Saudi Arabian school administration attempting to relate principal behavior equated with effectiveness to administrative training and preparation, discovered that from the perspective of school teachers served by the administrators the school principals were rated very high for behaviors such as "maintain school records" (p. 78), but very low for behaviors such as "creative in thinking of many approaches to solving a problem in addition to the usual methods which he knows well" (p. 78). Principals also rated very low in such behaviors as "confer with staff regarding, teachers' needs" (p. 78), and for matters such as "make friends to eliminate a social gap between the students and administrators...help, supervise, counsel, and provide a direction and orientation to staff members with their problems... utilize staff suggestions for the improvement of instruction" (p. 78). Even administratively trained principals received many ratings of "does not or cannot do this" (p. 78).

Hariri (1982), in attempting to interpret Saudi principals response in a preliminary study conducted to refine research procedures for assessing Saudi Arabian school principal effectiveness, offered the following as rationale for decisions to reduce or eliminate specific questionnaire categories: in items of "Category VI, Problem Solving" (p. 56), even principals who had received formal training had not been taught problem solving strategies. Beyond this training deficiency, "the structure of and habits within the Saudi Arabian school system do not encourage this practice" (p. 56). In the Saudi situation, as problems are encountered, "parents or teachers on the one hand, and principals on the other, often take their concerns directly to the school districts rather than
attempting to solve the problem internally" (p. 56, 57). This approach tends to add to a
cclimate of distrust between the school administrator and the school district. The district
may develop its own image as something more of an accusatory body acting to align
principal focus and behavior with policy and behavioral standards and decisions. The
principal, on the other hand, may come to view his position as one of being subject to
reports concerning his behavior to a higher disciplinary function. "Problem-solving
strategies and the principal's role as participant and mediator in these strategies do not
formally exist in Saudi Arabian..." (p. 57). Similarly, in terms of principals' interpretation
of "how well they design and create evaluation programs and how they demonstrate the
variate of evaluation procedures available to teachers" (Hariri, 1982, p. 57), the relative
lack of importance or relevance of these concepts in the views of Saudi principals can be
attributed to the fact that

In Saudi Arabia, the entire evaluation process must be carried out by the
principal in accordance with specific rules established by the Ministry of
Education and the school district. Since these two administrative bodies
describe the frequency, content, and form that evaluation must take, the
principal simply oversees the process. He has no hand in creating new
methods of evaluation nor does he have the opportunity to admit
modifications and, therefore, probably saw many of the questions in this
category as less relevant (Hariri, 1982, p. 57).

"Professional development" (Hariri, 1982, p. 57) was also viewed as somewhat alien to
the respective spheres of influence of Saudi principals. In Saudi Arabia no injunction is
placed upon school teachers to upgrade their skills. Opportunities for teachers to
individually seek self-development are not widely available, and in any case are not
professionally supported but must be sought out by the teachers themselves. Saudi
principals tend not to perceive themselves as actively involved, in the historical course of Saudi education, in determining, shaping or encouraging faculty and staff improvement. To some extent, Saudi teachers who actively seek self-improvement may even be conceived of as threats by principals to their own positions. Principals in Saudi schools tend even to detach themselves from "provision of Instructional Materials and Facilities" (p. 58). Such activities are not perceived by the principals as germane to their administrative roles. Principals have no direct involvement in Saudi Arabia with the process of obtaining instructional material and resources for their schools. The entire matter falls to the national Ministry of Education. Some principal effect and interaction, however, is possible, in that they may "select from among the materials which are offered and available" (p. 58). But in general "principals lack power over materials and facilities" (p. 58). They are limited also in terms of use of school facilities for community activities (p.58).

Hariri (1982), examined assumptions related to school climate's interaction with administrative skill and knowledge. School climate, or the overall composite perceptions of the school organization concerning its own structures, goals, commitment, working order, and so forth, was judged to be importantly related to the organization's ability to achieve academic excellence, social development, and curriculum improvement (1982).

Positive school climate was viewed as being essential to "a satisfying and meaningful situation in which both adults and students care to spend a substantial portion of their time" (Fox et al., as cited in Hariri, 1982, p. 19). In turn, the role of school
administrators was viewed as essentially working to create a positive school climate so that administrative and leadership functions and responsibilities could be carried out. Leadership can be provided through appropriate training programs with necessary skills and knowledge to establish such productive climates (1982).

From the above perspective, administrative training for leadership would appear essential for educational effectiveness. Administrative process in the Saudi Arabian school system was viewed as suffering in terms of goal realization because administrative training programs were judged to be inadequate. The problem undermining the relationship among administrative training, administrative effectiveness, and positive school outcomes was interpreted as resulting from not enough administrators attending professional training sessions and questionable adequacy concerning training programs themselves, as conceived for educational administrators in Saudi Arabia. Even though such training programs were headed for expansion, their individual adequacy to meet administrative and organizational needs had to be addressed and examined closely, in order that program expansion could proceed in a positive direction. Thus, to some extent, to create more effective schools in Saudi Arabia, principal competency and school climate, in combination essential for fulfilling educational needs, could be best served through enhancement of administrative training. Potential for enhancing climate and thus educational outcomes would be reflected in observable characteristics and changes in terms of principals' behaviors more clearly emulating advanced and professionally supported educational and administrative theory (Hariri, 1982).
In Saudi Arabia, directors of educational districts or superintendents select school principals from among schools' teachers or assistant principals, if any are available. A principal is appointed for life, and cannot be fired. He usually keeps his position until retirement (Al Salloom, 1988).

The role of elementary school principals is formally defined as

1. Responsibility for the quality and success of instruction. Responsibility for the organization system in his school. Responsibility for class scheduling, class assignments, teacher absences, student attendance, ordering supplies, and so forth. All paper work and work assignments in the school are the principal's responsibility.

2. Supervision of teaching the school curriculum, providing periods for every subject, and carrying out the regulations which come from the Ministry.

3. Maintaining awareness of school regulations and apprising all teachers who are assigned to the school of these. The principal must orient teachers to the best educational methods available.

4. Holding conferences from time to time with the staff in order to improve the educational level of the school. Conferences should be written and copies sent to the educational district after the staff signs them.

5. Visiting teachers in their classes to observe their planning for lessons. Writing notes about each teacher and consulting these notes for written evaluations of the teachers.
6. Reprimanding any erring employee in private, the first time. Writing a letter to the teacher explaining the problem and the appropriate steps for correcting it, the second time. Writing a letter to the teacher and sending a copy to the educational district, the third time.

7. Maintaining files for all employees with the employee's name, certification, starting time, experience, salary, marital status, address, and permit to leave.

8. Keeping attendance of the staff and making sure they sign in daily.

9. Taking care of non-class activities and distributing responsibility for them to the staff according to their desires (Ministry of Education, 1964).

Chapter Summary

The six dimensions identified in this chapter: principals behavior and school effectiveness, organizational leadership behavior, educational leadership behavior, principal organizational leadership behavior, principals' length of experience and effectiveness, and educational leadership and administration in Saudi Arabia, provide the basis of the following summary.

The leadership role of school principals has become centralized within the total social community. The principal appears destined on the one side to forge new, more complex, and more meaningful relationships with community-wide environments, acting as necessary change agent and transformational leader. On the other side, the principal remains highly constrained by formal, institutional, and traditional organizational systems.
which seem to wish to act against any agenda of change or creation of new vision for organization transformation. Principal school leadership and the array of behaviors manifested from the leader to achieve organization cohesion and success tend to follow two more or less conflicting patterning. First, depending upon personal disposition, training, and cultural background, the principal as leader strives to create improvement, as suggested above, community-wide in scope. Within this pattern or role, the principal acts largely as individual when attempting to formulate and promulgate the organization vision of change. Second, depending upon cultural characteristics and structural strength and cohesion of the organization and its defining climate, the principal must perform and position his role to follow the preestablished norms and edicts of the organization as a whole. Much in the literature indicates that the organization acts almost irresistibly to exert its own shaping force upon the would be leader and to ensure that its own cultural and structural identities remain intact. Organization experience becomes largely a matter of learning and mastering organizational form, procedure, principle, and relationship. These matters cannot be learned in the abstract but only experientially and as part of the extant organization context. Thus, the essential learning for leadership necessarily becomes a pervasive acknowledgment and acceptance of organization realities and protocols on the part of the leader, through complex socialization processes demanding the full engagement of individual leadership will and understanding. The leader is virtually unable to engage with the organization or to act except that socialization process and its inevitable outcomes are accepted. It is through this complex engagement that the will of
the leader submits and conforms to organization design. The leader becomes in effect fully an administrator. That is, rather than implementing an individually imposed or envisioned change agenda, the administrator, immersed within the social context, exercises all potential for maintenance of the status quo, accepted procedure, and refinement of social norms and cultural characteristics. The leadership role, acting to effect change for maximizing organization potential, is largely diminished in favor of administrative function, ensuring accuracy, completeness, and exacting fidelity in organization procedure.

When interpreting analysis of organization leader behavior in the literature, it becomes critical to distinguish leader behavior which is expertly and completely in fulfillment of organizationally socialized administrative purposes and expectations, from leader behavior which is breaking new ground and transforming toward important change and necessary deviation from the status quo. The former is the leadership of maintenance of administration, or in a slightly different parlance, simply management. It is the product of social conditioning and organization structure control. The latter is the leadership of innovation, demanding both individual comprehension of all organization aspects toward change, and leadership capacity to inspire and enlist the effort and demanded attitude change of all organization members toward deep structural and cultural reconstitution and revitalization. In consequence, such leadership pragmatically strives for release and expression of both individual organization member potential and maximum group process. When organizational leadership thought addresses the issues surrounding leadership
effectiveness, it is generally, albeit as often as not, unknowingly, exploring one side of the concept of effectiveness or the other. That is, it is addressing administrative effectiveness and serving maintenance of the status quo; or it is cognizant and expressive of leadership action agenda for change, innovation, and realignment of individual organization member experience for maximum potential realization. It seems reasonable, moreover, at this point to state that the most enlightening and likely pragmatically useful approach to creating organizational leadership effectiveness is that which is in fact fully informed itself and cognizant of how organization output is governed through the interplay of transformative design with administrative maintenance. This hypothetical formulation of enlightened leadership exposition suggests to us the burdensome nature of exerting individual will toward positive change in the face of social system dominance and coercion. It further suggests, however, that despite social system inertia and propensity to subvert individual intent and organization vision to simply social maintenance. Transformational leadership strategy is communicated, beneficial change activated, and organization potential manifested, though such phenomena may in any viable sense be much rarer in occurrence than might be supposed after review of the literature of transformational leadership in and of itself. What might be reasonably conjectured, however, is that specific constituent factors to the given leadership personality, background, experience, and context tend to better dispose leadership toward effectiveness in the transformational sense than do some others. Such reasoning providesin essence the basis of the present inquiry and the point for development of
formal investigative statements which initiate the methodological exposition of Chapter III.
CHAPTER III

DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

Introduction

The present educational situation within Saudi Arabian schools, as presented in Chapter I suggested that improvement within the system may depend upon the state of school administrative leadership. Chapter I suggested that identified areas of administrative leadership deficiency in the Saudi school system may act to prohibit effective realization of educational goals. Review of related literature in Chapter II indicated the important relationship between school effectiveness in achieving educational goals and principal effectiveness in providing necessary educational organization leadership. Through examination and interpretation of six dimensions of organizational leadership, moving from principal behavior and effectiveness to principal length of experience and principal effectiveness ultimately focusing on the educational system of Saudi Arabia, research suggested that principal transformational leadership effectiveness was supported in the literature as essential for positive school development and improvement in education. Summation of research findings concluded with the conjecture that specific factors in school principal background, training, and experience could be significant determinants of effective organizational leadership behavior.
Factors selected for examination of principal organizational leadership behavior in Saudi Arabian schools were academic degree, length of classroom teaching experience, length of assistant principal experience, length of additional administrative training, age, school districts, and length of administrative experience. These factors were examined as to their effect on elementary school principals' organizational leadership behavior in three school districts in Qasim region, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. The decision was made to focus most specifically on the importance of principal length of administrative experience as a determining leadership effectiveness factor. Research questions, hypotheses, design of the study, null hypotheses, operational hypotheses, identification of population and research sample, instrumentation, response scale, procedures, treatment of data and data analysis, and pilot test are described in separate sections.

Research Questions

Areas of inquiry suggesting needed research include: do identified experiential and background factors associated with school principals influence their organizational leadership behaviors? Do these identified factors influence leadership effectiveness in terms of exhibited transformational leadership behaviors among elementary school principals within the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia? Does length of school administrative experience among elementary school principals within the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia affect organizational leadership behavior and thus effectiveness?
Hypotheses

Review of literature suggests that school principals are influenced in their organizational leadership behaviors according to individual experience and background factors. Leadership effectiveness among elementary school principals in Saudi Arabia, in terms of transformational leadership theory, is influenced by individual experience and background factors. Among these factors, length of school principal administrative experience is a critical determinant of organizational leadership behavior.

Null Hypotheses

Conceptual hypotheses developed from the specified areas of inquiry suggest that identified determining principals' experience and background factors, as the independent variables, and principals' organizational leadership behavior as the dependent variable can be expressed in the following null hypotheses for examination of data.

1. No relationship exists between elementary school principals' organizational leadership behavior and their level of academic degree.

2. No relationship exists between elementary school principals' organizational leadership behavior and their length of classroom teaching experience.

3. No relationship exists between elementary school principals' organizational leadership behavior and their length of assistant principal experience.

4. No relationship exists between elementary school principals' organizational leadership behavior and their length of additional administrative training.
5. No relationship exists between elementary school principals' organizational leadership behavior and their age.

6. No relationship exists between elementary school principals' organizational leadership behavior and their school district.

7. No relationship exists between elementary school principals' organizational leadership behavior and their length of principal administrative experience.

From null hypothesis seven above five null hypotheses concerning the relationship of length of principal administrative experience with identified components of organizational leadership behavior, grouped according to five critical categories, are developed as follows:

8. No relationship exists between length of principal administrative experience and principals' role in administrative organization.

9. No relationship exists between length of principal administrative experience and the principals' relationship with school teachers.

10. No relationship exists between length of principal administrative experience and the principals' relationship with school students.

11. No relationship exists between length of principal administrative experience and the principals' relationship with school environment, parents, and society.

12. No relationship exists between length of principal administrative experience and the principals' relation to school curricula.
Design of the Study

The study will investigate elementary school principal leadership behaviors and associated background and experience factors in the public schools of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. Identified population of elementary school principals will be surveyed in selected school districts. Data will be tabulated and analyzed according to statistical procedures. Results will be interpreted within the context of overall research perspectives developed in the study.

Operational Hypotheses

Null hypotheses developed for research examination will be tested against operational hypotheses stated as:

1. Among specified categories of school principals' level of academic degree at least one mean score for organizational leadership behavior will be different from other mean scores.

2. Among specified categories of school principals' length of classroom teaching experience, at least one mean score for organizational leadership behavior will be different from other mean scores.

3. Among specified categories of school principals' length of assistant principal experience, at least one mean score for organizational leadership behavior will be different from other mean scores.
4. Among specified categories of school principals' length of additional administrative training, at least one mean score for organizational leadership behavior will be different from other mean scores.

5. Among specified categories of school principals' age, at least one mean score for organizational leadership behavior will be different from other mean scores.

6. Among specified categories of school principals' school districts, at least one mean score for organizational leadership behavior will be different from other mean scores.

7. Among specified categories of school principals' length of administrative experience, at least one mean score for organizational leadership behavior will be different from other mean scores.

8. Among specified categories of school principals' administrative experience, at least one mean score for principals' role in administrative organization will be different from other mean scores.

9. Among specified categories of school principals' administrative experience, at least one mean scores for principals' relationship with school teachers will be different from other mean scores.

10. Among specified categories of school principals' administrative experience, at least one mean score for principals' relationship with school students will be different from other mean scores.
11. Among specified categories of school principals' administrative experience, at least one mean score for principals' relationship with environment, parents, and family will be different from other mean scores.

12. Among specified categories of school principals' administrative experience, at least one mean score for principals' relationship with school curricula will be different from other mean scores.

Identification of Population and Research Sample

The identified population for examination of research hypotheses consisted of elementary school principals in three school districts in Qasim region, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. These three school districts, Buraidh, Al-Rus, and Unaizah, form an important and representative component of the Kingdom's forty school districts overall. The three school districts include a total of three hundred ninety elementary schools. From this population, a research sample of boys' elementary school principals comprising thirty percent of the total for the three school districts was selected using random process. Specifications of the identified population providing the research sample are indicted in Table 3.

Instrumentation

To measure the leadership behaviors of elementary school principals in Saudi Arabia, a survey questionnaire was constructed. The questionnaire incorporated of
Table 3

Number of Elementary School in Qasim Districts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Number of School</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Buraidh</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al-Rus</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unaizah</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Information selected by the researcher and developed with the assistance of the Ministry of Education in Saudi Arabia according to the following criteria:

1. The list of elementary school principals' roles in Saudi Arabia, as defined by the Ministry of Education.

2. Information from the review of literature concerning organization, education, and principal leadership behavior.

3. A meeting with selected elementary school principals in Saudi Arabia to obtain opinions about which behaviors are effective for elementary school principals.

4. Development of the questionnaire in two languages, Arabic and English (Appendix D and E).

The questionnaire consisted of two sections. The first section included six items: principals' level of academic degree, length of classroom teaching experience, length of assistant principal experience, length of additional administrative training, age, school district, and length of administrative experience. The second section concerned
elementary school principal organizational leadership behaviors in Saudi Arabia and consisted of sixty items grouped according to five categories, twelve items in each category. The five categories were: principals' role in administrative organization; principals' relationship with school teachers; principals' relationship with school students; principals' relationship with school environment, parents, and society; and principals' relationship to school curricula.

Response Scale

A 5-point scale was utilized in measuring the dependent variable. Responses indicated (1) things you always do, (2) things you often do, (3) things you sometimes do, (4) things you seldom do, and (5) things you never do. Scores for items indicated level of transformational leadership behavior (Appendix E).

Procedures

The researcher was on site and personally supervised all research procedures, including collection of questionnaires. Survey questionnaires were distributed to research participants. When sending or delivering the questionnaire, a self-addressed stamped return envelope was enclosed for the return of the completed questionnaire.

During Spring, 1995, the researcher went to Saudi Arabia to collect the study data. The random sample for the study was chosen from the school districts' lists using tables of random numbers (Ary et al., 1985). Collection of data required letters of
approval from the Ministry of Education in Riyadh. Special request and direct interview with Ministry of Education officials in Riyadh were necessary. The letters of approval were obtained in three copies for distribution to the three school districts. Each district then provided me with its own a letter to explain the purpose of the questionnaire to individual schools and to ask principals to participate and provide assistance to the researcher as required (appendix B). Buraidh and Al-Rus districts accepted the questionnaires and distributed them to the study sample. Questionnaires were then sent after completion to the researcher. The researcher delivered the district letter and the questionnaires to the 22 schools in Unaizah district and later also individually collected all responses.

Treatment of Data and Data Analysis

Data was analyzed using the SPSS program. One-way analysis of variance ANOVA with alpha set at the .05 level of significance was used for testing research null hypotheses. LSD (least-significant difference) Multiple Range Testing Procedure was used to compare the means of the difference among levels in order to determine whatever means are different. One independent variable was examined in each test, with different levels, and one dependent variable. The scores of the sixty items in the five categories of the questionnaire were computed as one score. The scores of the twelve items in each category were computed as one score. Changes and differences in the dependent variable were presumed to be the result of changes in the independent variables (Hinkle et al.,
Identified independent variables were the principals' six specified background factors and the length of principal administrative experience. Each independent variable was examined according to different levels. The specified background independent variables were principals' level of academic degree, length of classroom teaching experience, length of assistant principal experience, length of additional administrative training, age, school district, and length of administrative experience. Each of these independent variables had different levels. The dependent variable was principal organizational leadership behavior as represented by the sixty items on the survey. The sixty items on the survey were divided into five categories of twelve items each. Each category corresponded to principal organizational leadership behavior in one of five identified critical areas (1) principals' role in administrative organizations, (2) relationship with school teachers, (3) relationship with students (4) relationship with parents, family, or caretakers, and (5) relationship to views concerning school curriculum content.

Variance in principal organizational leadership behavior for each of the 60 questionnaire items was examined according to (a) four levels of academic degree, (b) four levels of length of classroom teaching experience, (c) four levels of length of assistant principal experience, (d) four levels of additional training, (e) six levels of principals' age, (f) three levels of principals' school district, and (g) five levels of length of administrative experience. The five levels of length of principal administrative experience will be examined in terms of variation among them of effect on each of the five critical categories of organizational leadership behavior.
Pilot Test

The pilot test for the study was conducted in Spring 1994, with twenty elementary school principals in Qasim region, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. These principals were selected randomly from Unaizah District. Each principal was given a copy of the questionnaire in Arabic language, including a draft of the cover letter which provided an explanation of the purpose of the study and directions for completing the questionnaire (Appendix G). One month following the initial distribution of pilot questionnaires, 90% (N=18) had responded and returned data to the researcher.

The computer program Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) was used to analyze the data. The pilot test helped to determine the appropriateness of the research instrument and overall study for the identified population. Research findings helped to correct informational errors in the questionnaires, to refine questions, and to make statistical adjustments for the final investigation.
CHAPTER IV

RESEARCH FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS

Introduction

Analysis of research findings comprises data collection, frequencies of selected individual experience and background factor characteristics of respondents identified as independent variables, principals' organizational leadership behavior as the dependent variable, null hypotheses testing, and summary of the chapter.

Data Collection

Data collection for the study, a survey of organizational leadership behaviors of selected public boys' elementary school principals, was collected spring of 1995. Procedure was initiated with hand-delivered questionnaires to 22 schools in Unaizah District in Qasim region of Saudi Arabia. Results were obtained at the end of two weeks. Also hand-delivered were 65 questionnaires to Buraidh and 45 to Al-Rus District. These two districts required 70 days to return results to the investigator. As shown in Table 3, there was a total of 120 principals involved in the study. One-hundred-two principals returned the questionnaire, resulting in an 84% response rate. Six of the responses were incomplete questionnaires, or 4% of the total, which could not be used. Follow-up
telephone contact was necessary to obtain responses in 25 instances. In all, 80% (N=96) of distributed questionnaires were used in the computer program SPSS for the study.

Table 4
Number of Respondents by District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Questionnaires distributed</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Buraidah</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al-Rus</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unaizah</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Individual Experience and Background Factor Characteristics of Respondents as the Independent Variables

Background factors and personal characteristics of respondents were identified as the independent variables hypothesized as affecting investigated behaviors. These included academic degree; length of classroom teaching experience; length of assistant principal experience; length of administrative experience; length of any additional administrative training; age; and school district. Respondents self-reported background and personal characteristics in the opening section of the questionnaire, with the exception of "school district," which was noted for respondents by the investigator at the time of data collection. Results for identified individual experience and background factor characteristics are summarized.
For academic degree, 34.4% (N=33) of respondents had a Junior College degree; 31.3% (N=31) had a University degree; 16.7% (N=16) had a Teachers Institute degree; and 15.6% (N=16) had some other degree.

Classroom teaching experience results indicated that 35.4% (N=34) of the respondents taught for one to less than five years; 28.1% (N=27) taught for five to less than ten years; 13.5% (N=13) taught for ten to less than fifteen years; and 22.9% (N=22) taught for fifteen years and above.

Length of assistant principal experience results indicated that 63.5% (N=61) did not work as assistant principal at all; 20.8% (N=20) worked for one to less than five years; 8.3% (N=8) worked for five to less than ten years; and 7.3% (N=7) worked for ten years and above.

For Length of administrative experience 29.2% (N=28) of respondents worked as principal for one to less than five years; 26% (N=25) worked for five to less than ten years; 17.7% (N=17) worked for ten to less than fifteen years; 19.8% (N=19) worked for fifteen to less than twenty years; and 7.3% (N=7) worked for twenty years and above.

Findings for length of additional administrative training results indicated that 47.9% (N=46) of the respondents did not receive any additional training; 21.9% (N=21) had less than one month; 20.8% (N=20) had one to less than three months; and 9.4% (n=9) had three months and above.

Results for principals' age indicated that 7.3% (N=7) of the respondents were less than thirty years old; 14.6% (N=14) were thirty to less than thirty-five years old; 26%
were thirty-five to less than forty years old; 26% (N=25) were forty to less than forty-five years old; 10.4% (N=10) were forty-five to less than fifty years old; and 15.6% (N=15) were fifty years old and above.

Identification of school districts indicated that, as noted in Table 2, 51.0% (N=49) of respondents were principals in Buraidh District; 26.1% (N=25) were principals in Al-Rus District; and 22.9% (N=22) were principals in Unaizah District.

Principal Organizational Leadership Behavior
as the Dependent Variable

Principal organizational leadership behaviors were investigated in relation to the independent variables described above. First, the total of 60 variables identified as indicating important leadership behaviors were examined.

Individual respondents' answers provided indication of the respondents' associated level of transformational leadership behavior, as developed and defined in this study. For some items, increasing instance of the identified behavior indicated increasing transformational leadership behavior level. For the remainder of the items the opposite was true. Increasing instance indicated decreasing level of transformational leadership behavior (specific identification for all dependent variable items in respect to denoting transformational leadership is presented in the Appendix).

Maximum obtainable score indicating maximum transformational leadership behavior in terms of this study was 300, based on 60 items, with 5 point maximum per item. As indicated above for some items identification of maximum exhibition of the
behavior achieved the full 5 point total. For others, identification of minimum exhibition of the specified behavior achieved the full 5 points, depending on whether the behavior measured was considered transformational or not.

Possible scores for individual items thus ranged from 1 to 5, producing the 300 maximum and the accompanying 60 point minimum (60 items times 5 points, 60 items times 1 point, respectively).

Among the 96 respondents neither limit of this range was achieved. Actual scores ranged from a low of 160 to a high of 234. The mean score achieved by respondents for all 60 items indicating level of transformational leadership behavior for the identified population was 199.33.

Indication of population group means and variance for identified critical groupings or categories of behavior are presented and a total of 60 items are presented in (Appendix A). Categories are identified in Table 3 according to numerical sequence as the appeared in the questionnaire. Thus, principals' role in administrative organization is identified as 1; principals' relationship with school teachers is identified as 2; principals' relationship with students is identified as 3; principals' relationship with environment is identified as 4; and principals' relationship to school curriculum is identified as 5.
Table 5

Critical Categories or Groupings of Above Behaviors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>37.99</td>
<td>5.31</td>
<td>26.00</td>
<td>52.00</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>41.35</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>33.00</td>
<td>48.00</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>38.80</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>28.00</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>41.49</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>27.00</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>39.70</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>24.00</td>
<td>49.00</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>199.33</td>
<td>21.18</td>
<td>138.00</td>
<td>249.00</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Null Hypotheses Testing

To test null hypotheses 1-7, each of the identified experience and background factors was used as an independent variable. Each independent variable was examined, according to different levels, as to its effect on Principal Organizational Leadership Behavior, the combined 60 organizational leadership behavior items considered as one dependent variable.

Null hypotheses 8-12 considered the independent variable Length of Administrative Experience in its effect on each of the five critical categories. Each category contained 12 of the 60 principal organizational leadership behaviors examined. Each category of 12 items was thus considered as a separate dependent variable.
For each null hypothesis, one-way analysis of variance ANOVA with alpha at .05 level of significance was used to determine the degree of relationship between identified variables.

1. Principals' Academic Degree

The first null hypothesis, that no relationship existed between elementary school principals' organizational leadership behavior and their level of academic degree, was operationalized to determine if among specified categories of school principals' level of academic degree at least one mean score for organizational leadership behavior would be different from other mean scores. Data were analyzed using one-way analysis of variance ANOVA with alpha at the .05 level, resulting in an $F$ ratio of 3.41 with 3 and 92 degrees of freedom, for between groups and within groups, respectively. The probability for $F$ level was .02, smaller than alpha level of .05. Thus, the null hypothesis was rejected, and a relationship between variables was substantiated. Results are summarized in Table 6.

Table 6
ANOVA for Academic Degree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>$F$</th>
<th>$F$ Prop.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>1379.94</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>459.98</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>12407.40</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>134.86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $P < .05$. 

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
LSD, post-hoc analysis, demonstrated that a significant difference existed between
groups. Academic degree levels 2 and 4 (graduated from Junior College or other) were
different from levels 1 and 3 (graduated from Teachers' Institutes or Universities).
Results are summarized in Table 7, providing number of participants comprising each
variable, mean organizational leadership behavior scores, and standard deviation.

Table 7
Descriptive Data for Academic Degree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent variable</th>
<th>Independent variable level</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizational</td>
<td>Teachers Institute</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>200.19</td>
<td>10.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>Junior College</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>202.48</td>
<td>13.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavior</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>139.97</td>
<td>10.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>202.37</td>
<td>11.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2: Length of Classroom Teaching Experience

The second null hypothesis, that no relationship existed between elementary
school principals' organizational leadership behavior and their length of classroom
teaching experience, was operationalized to determine if among specified categories of
school principals' level of length of classroom teaching experience at least one mean score
for organizational leadership behavior would be different from other mean scores. Data
were analyzed using one-way analysis of variance ANOVA with alpha at the .05 level,
resulting in an $F$ ratio of .37 with 3 and 92 degrees of freedom, for between groups and within groups respectively. The Probability for $F$ level was .78, larger than alpha of .05. Thus the null hypothesis was accepted. No relationship between variables could be determined. Results are summarized in Table 8.

Table 8

ANOVA for Length of Classroom Teaching Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>$F$</th>
<th>$F$ Prop.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>162.93</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>54.31</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>13624.40</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>148.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $P > .05.$

LSD, post-hoc analysis demonstrated that no significant difference existed between groups. Results are summarized in Table 9.

3: Length of Assistant Principal Experience

The third null hypothesis, that no relationship existed between elementary school principals' organizational leadership behavior and their length of assistant principal experience, was operationalized to determine if among specified categories of school principals' level of length assistant principal experience at least one mean score for organizational leadership behavior would be different from other mean scores. Data were
Table 9
Descriptive Data for Classroom Teaching Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent variable</th>
<th>Independent variable level</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizational</td>
<td>Less than 5 years</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>201.09</td>
<td>12.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>05 to less than 10 years</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>198.41</td>
<td>11.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavior</td>
<td>10 to less than 15 years</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>198.15</td>
<td>12.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15 years and above</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>198.45</td>
<td>12.51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

analyzed using one-way analysis of variance ANOVA with alpha at the .05 level, resulting that in an $F$ ratio of 2.08 with 3 and 92 degrees of freedom, for between groups and within groups, respectively. The probability of $F$ level was .11, larger than alpha of .05. Thus the null hypothesis was accepted. No relationship between variables could be determined. Results are summarized in Table 10.

Table 10
ANOVA for Length of Assistant Principal Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>$F$ Prop.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>876.59</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>292.20</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>12910.74</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>140.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $P > .05$. 
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LSD, post-hoc analysis demonstrated that no significant difference existed between groups. Results are summarized in Table 11.

Table 11

Descriptive Data for Assistant Principal Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent variable</th>
<th>Independent variable level</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizational</td>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>200.43</td>
<td>10.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>One to less than 5 years</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>200.95</td>
<td>13.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavior</td>
<td>05 to less than 10 years</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>195.12</td>
<td>10.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10 and above</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>190.00</td>
<td>17.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4: Length of Additional Training

The fourth null hypothesis, that on relationship existed between elementary school principals' organizational leadership behavior and their length of additional administrative training, was operationalized to determine if among specified categories of school principals' level of length of additional administrative training at least one mean score for organizational leadership behavior would be different from other mean scores. Data were analyzed using one-way analysis of variance ANOVA with alpha at the .05 level, resulting in an F ratio of 3.75 with 3 and 92 degrees of freedom, for between groups and within groups, respectively. The probability for F level was .01, smaller than alpha level of .05.
Thus the null hypothesis was rejected and a relationship between variables was substantiated. Results are summarized in Table 12.

Table 12

ANOVA for Length of Additional Administrative Training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>F Prop.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>1500.74</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>500.25</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>12286.59</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>133.55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $P < .05$.

LSD post-hoc analysis demonstrated that a significant difference existed between groups. Additional administrative training level 4 different from levels 3, 2, 1. Results are summarized in Table 13, providing number of participants comprising each variable, mean organizational leadership behavior scores, and standard deviation.

Table 13

Descriptive Data for Additional Administrative Training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent variable</th>
<th>Independent variable level</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizational</td>
<td>No training</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>197.04</td>
<td>13.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>Less than one month</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>198.81</td>
<td>8.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavior</td>
<td>One to less than three months</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>199.85</td>
<td>12.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Three to less than six months</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>211.11</td>
<td>8.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. Age

The fifth null hypothesis, that no relationship existed between elementary principals' organizational leadership behavior and their age, was operationalized to determine if among specified categories of school principals' age at least one mean score for organizational leadership behavior would be different from other mean scores. Data were analyzed using one-way analysis of variance ANOVA with alpha at the .05 level, resulting in an $F$ ratio of 1.13 with 5 and 90 degrees of freedom, for between groups and within groups respectively. The probability for $F$ level was .35, larger than alpha level of .05. Thus the null hypothesis was accepted. No relationship between variables could be determined. Results are summarized in Table 14.

Table 14
ANOVA for Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>$F$</th>
<th>$F$ Prop.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>815.23</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>163.05</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>12972.10</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>144.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$LSD$, post-hoc analysis demonstrated that no significant difference existed between groups. Results are summarized in Table 15.
Table 15

Descriptive Data for Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent variable</th>
<th>Independent variable level</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizational</td>
<td>Less than 30 years</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>199.14</td>
<td>9.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>30 to less than 35 years</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>196.43</td>
<td>10.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavior</td>
<td>35 to less than 40 years</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>197.72</td>
<td>15.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40 to less than 45 years</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>201.68</td>
<td>9.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45 to less than 50 years</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>205.60</td>
<td>9.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50 years and above</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>196.73</td>
<td>12.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. School District

The sixth null hypothesis, that no relationship existed between elementary school principals' organizational leadership behavior and their school districts, was operationalized to determine if among specified categories of school principals' school districts at least one mean score for organizational leadership behavior would be different from other mean scores. Data were analyzed using one-way analysis of variance ANOVA with alpha at the .05 level, resulting in an F ratio of 4.53 with 2 and 93 degrees of freedom, for between groups and within groups, respectively. The probability for F level was .01, smaller than alpha of .05. Thus the null hypothesis was rejected, and a relationship between variables was substantiated. Results are summarized in Table 16.

LSD post-hoc analysis demonstrated that a significant difference existed between groups. Al-Rus school district level 4 was different from Unaizah and Buraidh school
districts levels 1 and 3. Results are summarized in Table 17, providing number of participants comprising each variable, mean organizational leadership behavior scores, and standard deviation.

Table 16
ANOVA for School District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Prop.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>1223.96</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>611.98</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>12563.37</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>135.09</td>
<td></td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* P &lt; .05.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 17
Descriptive Data for School District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent variable</th>
<th>Independent variable level</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizational</td>
<td>Less than 30 years</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>199.14</td>
<td>9.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>30 to less than 35 years</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>196.43</td>
<td>10.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavior</td>
<td>35 to less than 40 years</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>197.72</td>
<td>15.58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Length of Administrative Experience

The seventh null hypothesis, that on relationship between elementary school principals' organizational leadership behavior and their length of administrative experience, was operationalized to determine if among specified categories of school principals' level of length of administrative experience at least one mean score for
organizational leadership behavior would be different from other mean scores. Data were analyzed using one-way analysis of variance ANOVA with alpha at the .05 level, resulting in an $F$ ratio of 1.94 with 4 and 91 degrees of freedom, for between groups and within groups, respectively. The probability for $F$ level was .11, larger than alpha of .05. Thus the null hypothesis was rejected. No relationship between variables could be determined. Results are summarized in Table 18.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>$F$</th>
<th>$F$ Prop.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>1081.74</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>270.44</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>1270559</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>139.62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LSD, post-hoc analysis demonstrated that no significant difference existed between groups. Results are summarized in Table 19.

8: Principals' Role in Administrative Organization

The eighth null hypothesis, that no relationship existed between elementary school principals' role in administrative organization and their length of administrative experience, was operationalized to determine if at least one mean score for principals' role in administrative organization would be different from other mean scores. Data were analyzed using one way analyses of variance ANOVA with alpha at the .05 level, resulting
in an $F$ ratio of 1.68 with 4 and 91 degrees of freedom, for between groups and within groups, respectively. The probability for $F$ level was .16, larger than alpha of .05. Thus the null hypothesis was accepted. No relationship between variables could be determined.

Results are summarized in Table 20.

Table 19

Descriptive Data for Length of Administrative Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent variable</th>
<th>Independent variable level</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizational</td>
<td>Less than 5 years</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>194.14</td>
<td>11.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>05 to less than 10 years</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>201.52</td>
<td>10.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavior</td>
<td>10 to less than 15 years</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>201.41</td>
<td>12.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15 to less than 20 years</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>201.95</td>
<td>12.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20 years and above</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>200.14</td>
<td>11.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 20

ANOVA for Principals' Role in Administrative Organization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>$F$ Prop.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>184.77</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>46.19</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>2494.23</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>27.40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*LSD, post-hoc analysis demonstrated that no significant difference existed between groups. Results are summarized in Table 21.*
Table 21

Descriptive Data for Principals' Role in Administrative Organization.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent variable</th>
<th>Independent variable level</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principals' role in administrative organization</td>
<td>Less than 5 years</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>37.18</td>
<td>4.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>05 to less than 10 years</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>5.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10 to less than 15 years</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>36.88</td>
<td>6.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15 to less than 20 years</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>38.42</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20 years and above</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>35.57</td>
<td>5.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9: Principals' Relationship with School Teachers

The ninth null hypothesis, that no relationship existed between principals' relationship with school teachers and principals' length of administrative experience, was operationalized to determine if at least one mean score of principals' relationship with school teachers would be different from other mean scores. Data were analyzed using one-way analysis of variance ANOVA with alpha at the .05 level, resulting in an $F$ ratio of .53 with 4 and 91 degrees of freedom, for between groups and within groups, respectively. The Probability for $F$ level was .72, larger than alpha of .05. Thus the null hypothesis was accepted. No relationship between variables could be determined. Results are summarized in Table 22.
Table 22
ANOVA for Principals' Relationship With School Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>F Prop.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>19.61</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>848.35</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>9.32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* \( p > .05. \)

LSD, post-hoc analysis demonstrated that no significant difference existed between groups. Results are summarized in Table 23.

Table 23
Descriptive Data for Principals' Relationship With School Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent variable</th>
<th>Independent variable level</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principals'</td>
<td>Less than 30 years</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>199.14</td>
<td>9.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relationship with</td>
<td>30 to less than 35 years</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>196.43</td>
<td>10.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>school teachers</td>
<td>35 to less than 40 years</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>197.72</td>
<td>15.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40 to less than 45 years</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>205.60</td>
<td>9.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45 to less than 50 years</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>205.60</td>
<td>9.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50 years and above</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>196.73</td>
<td>12.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10: Principals' Relationship With Students

The tenth null hypothesis, that no relationship existed between principals' relationship with students and principals' length of administrative experience, was
operationalized to determine if at least one mean score would be different from other mean scores. Data were analyzed using one-way analysis of variance ANOVA with alpha at the .05 level, resulting in an F ratio of 2.63 with 4 and 91 degrees of freedom, for between groups and within groups, respectively. The Probability for F level was .04, smaller than alpha of .05. Thus, the null hypothesis was rejected. A relationship between variables was substantiated. Results are summarized in Table 24.

Table 24

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>F Prop.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>170.61</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>42.65</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>1474.64</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>16.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* P < .05.

LSD post-hoc analysis demonstrated that a significant difference existed between groups. Level 3 (ten to less than fifteen years experience) was different from levels 1 and 2, also showed that level 4 (who has 15 to less than 20 years experience) was different from level 1 at alpha of .05 level. Results are summarized in Table 25, providing number of participants comprising each variable, mean organizational leadership behavior scores, and standard deviation.
Table 25

Descriptive Data for Principals' Relationship With Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent variable</th>
<th>Independent variable level</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principals'</td>
<td>Less than 5 years</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>37.21</td>
<td>4.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relationship with</td>
<td>05 to less than 10 years</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>38.32</td>
<td>4.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>students</td>
<td>10 to less than 15 years</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>40.94</td>
<td>4.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15 to less than 20 years</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>39.68</td>
<td>3.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20 years and above</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>39.29</td>
<td>4.39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11: Principals' Relationship With Environment

The eleventh null hypothesis, that no relationship existed between principals' relationship to school environment, parents, and society and Principals' length of administrative experience, was operationalized to determine if at least one mean score of principals' relationship with environment would be different from other means scores. Data were analyzed using one-way analysis of variance ANOVA with alpha at the .05 level, resulting in an F ratio of .24 with 4 and 91 degrees of freedom, for between groups and within groups, respectively. The Probability for F level was .91, larger than alpha level of .05. Thus, the null hypothesis was accepted. No relationship between variables could be determined. Results are summarized in Table 26.

LSD, post-hoc analysis demonstrated that no significant difference existed between groups. Results are summarized in Table 27.
Table 26
ANOVA for Principals' Relationship With Environment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>F Prop.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>16.04</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>1537.73</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>16.90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* P > .05.

Table 27
Descriptive Data for Principals' Relationship With Environment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent variable</th>
<th>Independent variable level</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principals' relationship with environment</td>
<td>Less than 5 years</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>41.04</td>
<td>4.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>05 to less than 10 years</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>41.60</td>
<td>3.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10 to less than 15 years</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>41.53</td>
<td>4.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15 to less than 20 years</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>42.16</td>
<td>4.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20 years and above</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>41.00</td>
<td>2.52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12: Relationship to School Curriculum

The twelfth null hypothesis, that no relationship existed between principals' relationship to school curriculum content and their length of administrative experience, was operationalized to determine if at least one mean score would be different from other mean scores. Data were analyzed using one-way analysis of variance ANOVA with alpha at the .05 level, resulting in an F ratio of 1.69 with 4 and 91 degrees of freedom, for
between groups and within groups, respectively. The Probability for $F$ level was .16, larger than alpha level of .05. Thus, the null hypothesis was accepted. No relationship between variables could be determined. Results are summarized in Table 28.

Table 28
ANOVA for Principals' Relation to School Curriculum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>$F$</th>
<th>$F$ Prop.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>142.02</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>35.50</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>1910.22</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>20.99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $P > .05.$

LSD, post-hoc analysis demonstrated that no significant difference existed between groups. Results are summarized in Table 29.

Table 29
Descriptive Data for Principals' Relation to School Curriculum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent variable</th>
<th>Independent variable level</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principals'</td>
<td>Less than 5 years</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>38.00</td>
<td>4.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relationship to</td>
<td>05 to less than 10 years</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>40.12</td>
<td>4.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>school curricula</td>
<td>10 to less than 15 years</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>40.18</td>
<td>4.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15 to less than 20 years</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>40.26</td>
<td>4.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20 years and above</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>42.29</td>
<td>4.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter Summary

One-way variance analysis ANOVA with alpha at .05 level was used to examine research findings in terms of study null hypotheses. Post-hoc analysis (LSD) was also used to examine difference between groups.

Null hypotheses one, four, and six were rejected. Thus, relationships between principals' organizational leadership behavior and each of three experiential background factors were substantiated. These factors included: level of academic degree, length of additional administrative training, and school district. Null hypothesis ten was also rejected. A relationship between length of principals' administrative experience and principals' relationship with school students was substantiated. Chapter V will present study interpretations and recommendations.
CHAPTER V
INTERPRETATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The study's concluding chapter comprises four sections: discussion and conclusion, recommendations, limitations, and future research.

Discussion and Conclusion

Analysis of individual experience and background factors among elementary school principals in relation to their exhibited organizational leadership behaviors suggested that transformational leadership was influenced by three identified factors: academic degree, leadership training after completion of formal preparatory studies and after assumption of the administrative position, and school district of principal employment. The remaining four factors: length of classroom teaching experience, length of assistant principal experience, length of administrative experience, and age, were shown to not be influential.

Preliminary assumptions and research had indicated that length of principal administrative experience was importantly related to organizational leadership behavior. These preliminary indications provided the original basis of the present study. Examination of the independent variable, principal administrative experience, in addition
to not finding confirmation in this study in terms of its relation to a hypothesized influence on organizational leadership behavior, considered in terms of the study's combined 60 survey questionnaire items, found confirmation of influence in terms of only one of the five critical categories or groupings, each composed of 12 specific, identified leadership behaviors. That category evidencing influence was the identified grouping designated as Principal Relationship with Students.

Interpretation of study results initiates with a detailed examination of the suggested central focus, effect of administrative experience, as outlined above, and then proceeds to examination of the remaining independent variables. Discussion derives primarily from the attempt made here to correlate literature research findings with survey questionnaire results and to reach at least preliminary conclusion in these matters.

**Length of Principal Administrative Experience**

Examination of principal administrative experience as related to organizational leadership behavior revealed a complex and often conflicting body of information. Preliminary conclusion, as mentioned, however, was made in support of the conjecture that principal administrative experience acted importantly as an influence factor in determining principal organization leadership. Lack of study confirmation for this conjecture was consistent throughout survey study results, with the single exception of interaction between principal administrative experience and principal with student relationship.
The complexity of principal school administration leadership alone would seem to logically argue in support of experience as a defining component of principal success. This complexity had been established as multidisciplinary, extending beyond the role of traditionally serving school interests, and likely not to have been prepared for entirely in the course of formal, academic, administrative study. A 1993 study by Crowson, Boyd, Murphy, and Louis (1994), suggested that complex interdisciplinary ability had to be brought to bear within immediate, experiential situations operating within the larger school scenario (1994). Wilkinson (cited in Chapman, 1990) viewed the school principal as acting at the apex of the community of human interests and relations. Much of this complex interaction would come within the context of the wider public sector, according to which the principal's actions and decisions would be determined and would take hold. Chapman (1990) saw the principal role as increasingly that of boundary spanner and community action agent (1990).

Smith & Andrews (1989) emphasized that principals, largely through a process of self-redefinition amassed through principal role experience, worked to individually shape organizational outcomes. Effectiveness in leadership from role theory (1989) perspective thus became a matter of familiarity concerning tasks, situations, and expectations, leading to routinization, which in turn would free up principal discretionary time and perspective for transformational accomplishment (1989).

Greenfield (as cited in McCurdy, 1983) suggested support for principal role experience as the primary organizational leadership factor, in that school and learning
effectiveness seemed to be emanations of differentiation among schools themselves as whole entities. Effective education appeared to be the project of the total school, which in turn was viewed as the projection of principal effort as agent for positive change (1983). Creating an entire school structure conducive to organizational, and thus educational, effectiveness clearly required not only time but also the acquired knowledge of both school structural components and the interrelationships among such components. Principals' experiential factors seemed critical in shaping the total learning organization.

Leadership opportunity for effective change, toward organization structural enhancement and strengthening of learning and development outcomes, has been widely interpreted as emanating largely from intra organizational conflict, resultant effects of stress, and leadership ability to resolve conflict toward positive effects and higher organization orderings. Origins of conflict and the organizational tendencies and strains giving rise to these origins are viewed as deeply submerged in the complexity of organization culture phenomena (Bowditch & Bouno, 1994). Clearly, leadership ability to adequately perceive, conceptualize, and resolve conflict for organization betterment would appear to rest upon organization-specific social determinants, and would appear to logically depend upon leadership penetration, over time, to the determining constituents themselves. Positional experience in principal organization leadership would appear to be the elementally required basis for such penetration. It would seem reasonable, moreover, that such administrative situational experience would lie at the heart of leadership capacity to position itself to monitor and deal with underlying conflict.
and resultant stress, which otherwise might prove overwhelming hindrances to organization success, internally debilitating and immobilizing the leader's individual ability to act in itself (Gibson et al., 1985).

Just as organization conflict and stress establish the parameters for leadership effectiveness, individual organization situational specifications and circumstances dictate choices for leadership approaches used. Specific organization experience would appear to be requisite for balancing conflict stimulation with conflict resolution leadership modes (Gibson et al., 1985).

Even when considering leadership activity in organizational contexts as following a projected course different from transformational goals or visions, it seems no less reasonable to conclude that success, to the extent that leadership is capable of or empowered to achieve that success, hinges upon accumulation of leader organizationally specific knowledge. Moreover, it may reasonably be supposed that exercise or manipulation of power sources which are organizationally defined—primarily: legitimate, reward, and coercive power bases—depends upon organization and role-specific experience; more so than does exercise of power from personal bases—primarily: expert and charismatic (Gibson, et al., 1985).

All such power when exercised through leader activity within the organization context follows interaction with patterns of communication arising from organization structures. Whether individual leadership seeks fulfillment of already defined and maintained organization goals, its own power enhancement distinctive from organization
commitment, or in fact, personal, organizational, and individual transformation, considerable refinement of political expertise and organization-specific gamesmanship is mandated. Organization-specific experience within the appropriate or related administrative role would seem highly desirable for leadership effectiveness, if not entirely requisite. Gibson et al., (1985) maintained that such gamesmanship refinement among organization leaders became their abiding preoccupation, critically enabling them to influence decision process (1985). Individual expertise and charisma aside, requisite knowledge concerning whatever organization-specific and role-specific game is determining power access and process control would appear to be largely experientially determined. The view of organization knowledge, even in the sense of gaining gamesmanship expertise, as critical for leadership impact and success, and as rooted in experience, follows from several generalizable principals concerning organizational problem resolution: identification of problems, understanding of organization personnel, comprehension of the unique adaptation each organization makes to the surrounding environment, identification of constraints and alternatives, and understanding of processes for maximizing expected organization outputs (Gibson et al., 1985).

Sergiovanni (1984) characterized effective organizational leadership as a search within specific contexts, beneath surface events and activities, for profound value and significance. Effective leadership brings understanding and conceptualization of the transformational process to the educational context, but this is merely a beginning. Effective behavior, decision, and action can only derive experientially, through leadership
Exploratory process. Willingness and ability to engage in such process of course, indicates manifestation of transformational disposition (1984). In effect, Sergiovanni's analysis casts the central question of this study, the relationship between effectiveness and experience, in a more complex and refracted light. The question becomes a matter of whether transformational leadership perspective, and thus hypothetically effective transformational behavior, derives from experience, or is thereby enhanced; or rather instead must act itself entirely as the agent of change, altering both organization vision and practice through processes and perspectives brought to the organizational context by the leadership. In following upon the above suggested need for clarification, the question of whether organization administrative experience directly correlates with transformational leadership behavior may not be the question which specifically demands asking. The transformational leader brings the transformational process to the organization context. In so doing, the leader stimulates and helps to structure leadership responsibility, behavior, and accountability throughout the organization. Organization membership and structure increasingly become attuned to, and characteristically manifest, transformational, shared engagement, group leadership, and reciprocal-benefit process. In other words, it is seemingly more correct or more to the point to attempt to discern the extent to which the organization membership increases in effective behavior, in part in the sense of leadership effectiveness, as administrative experience increases and decisions based on that added experience are actualized. The organization leader, as organization
transformation initiates and transpires, introduces appropriate concepts, behaviors, and practices. It is, however, the organization as a whole which is mandated to increasingly manifest effectiveness outcomes. The operative question for measuring transformational leadership effectiveness in relation to organization administrative experience might logically concern the levels of organization membership effective behavior in relation to organization leader experience. Such measurement focus may constitute the appropriate research perspective for later expansion and recrement of the present analysis.

Following from the above perspective of administrative experience-transformational leadership behavior relationship (that the leader must initiate the behavior for the organization and thus implement and carry through the experience among organization membership) are the Post Modernist views of Blount (1993) and others, as collected by Maxcy (1994). They suggest that educational leadership administrative experience manifests the effect (intentionally so, it is maintained) of controlling, subverting, and eliminating effective transformational leadership behavior. Transformational leadership behavior, given the opportunity to manifest, acts to subvert and eliminate the effect of ordinary educational administrative practice, a practice which unfolds and is originally inculcated within graduate educational administrative training. This training acts to render the prospective educational leader as complicitous in an overall hierarchical design to immobilize transformational leadership, so that ongoing, elite-dominated, hierarchical administrative structure is maintained and perpetually renewed. The difficulty and complexity of such control design demand deliberate,
elaborate, and pervasive administrative co-optation of its own leadership. The co-optation process is ongoing and thus importantly experiential. In sum then, administrative experience, including its initiatory form of academic preparation, and transformational leadership behavior tend each to be the antithesis of the other (1994). One would likely expect, following this view, that as the one increases, so does the other diminish.

In Blount's (1994) view, administrative leadership that is not transformational is not leadership but rather administration, which by definition acts to maintain and enforce the status quo of privileged hierarchical hegemony. Orders, structures, processes are imposed from above. The leader or more correctly, "non leader," carries out, through whatever process necessary, their imposition. To the extent that the non leader follows through on this functionary process, the sum of experience becomes hierarchical adeptness and an administrative history or experience of success in counteracting and guarding against transformational possibility. The true leader, on the other side, by definition transformational, works through direct interaction with and ongoing empowerment of all levels of organization membership, to counteract privileged hierarchical dominance and to supplant it with organization-wide authority, responsibility, and leadership for maximum potential development, both individual and organizational. Such transformational action stipulates direct, conscious, active, and deliberate countering of administrative control prerogatives. Transformational leadership behavior thus manifests as ongoing struggle with the ordinary course of educational administrative experience (1994).
A complex issue related to the experiential basis of organization leadership behavior effectiveness is school administration interaction with the community as a whole. This study has presented critical analysis of the community role of educational leadership. Analysis in the section at hand began with reexamination of the complex community role which appears to be in contemporary terms both intensifying and increasingly drawing school administration into a central position of providing community leadership for many social need elements finding their focus today through schools. Such comprehensive demands call for not only an eclectic array of administrative and leadership abilities and educational and knowledge accomplishments, but clearly also community-specific experience as manifested through the perceptions of school leadership. The importance of such community attachment and experiential expertise has been stressed in educational research literature for decades. For principal organization leadership behavior effectiveness, three aspects of community involvement appear to be essential. First, the principal should remain open to community input, viewing it as a necessary educational resource; second, effort should be exerted to shape and guide this input toward fulfilling school purposes; and third, school leadership should actively solicit community input while expanding the educational role into a community-wide action base and agenda. Community and society action agenda become the fullest learning focus and mainstay of school leadership involvement. Leader involvement, community accomplishment, and action-based experience become virtually synonymous with the whole of educational leadership effectiveness. The inseparability of community
educational components, while appearing to define the present trend in school leadership, has been an important factor in provision of education, increasingly stipulating that experience and involvement within the core of community need virtually create effectiveness. Kyte (1952) as presented in this study suggested the principal's first area of responsibility was the success and safety of the school's students. It is to this end, as Kyte also noted, well over four decades ago, that the principal coordinates and actively promotes involvement of all community aspects for educational success (1952).

One aspect which may manifest difference between past and present school leadership effectiveness analysis is that whereas today, increasingly, community interrelationship is viewed as inseparable from educational commitment, formerly such interrelationship tended to be perceived more as a separate, supportive activity, the importance of which could not be allowed to subsume concentration upon traditional academic learning goals.

Ramseyer et al. (1955) understood, for example, that within the context of community-school interaction, the shared expectations of both school participants and non participants, the general perspective of school success, solidity, and improvement were the pervasive effectiveness measures. At that time, of four decades past, educational professionals would be apt to complain that the factual, objectively measurable learning and achievement elements were not separated out and focused upon intently enough to more precisely and quantitatively judge school realization of achievement (1955). Today it seems very likely that what Ramseyer and associates viewed as a handicap is seen now
as the vital context of leadership experiential involvement within which greater success can be measured and educational aims solidly achieved. Formerly, educational leadership was enjoined to arouse community support and participation for education, but simultaneously to maintain something like a purity of vision in attaining academic goals. Today the whole of community involvement is viewed as essentially contained within the educational enterprise. Leadership behavior be isolated and restricted to academic achievement but must grapple with the whole of community involvement for success.

Throughout educational leadership writing related to school principals, recognition has continued to be elaborated that community relatedness and experiential involvement have acted as perhaps the critically determining factors of school leadership success. No matter the academic credentials and track records brought on line, the contextual community experience largely defined success and effective leadership behaviors. Lipham (1981) emphasized that in this critical experiential aspect prescriptive solutions did not exist. The principal, experientially and in many ways in isolation from contexts other than the community in question, had to determine, utilize, and improve the entire arena of school with external environment relations (1981).

The critical nature of such leadership experiential involvement became more apparent to school administration in the 1980's with the advent of what Kelley (1980) viewed as a siege mentality pervading education. It may to some have seemed ironic that school administration previously bent on protecting academic virtue in isolation from community impact began to sense what Blumberg & Greenfield (1980), citing the
psychological study of R. D. Laing, determined was a kind of "ontological insecurity" (p. 237). The educational enterprise as a whole, Blumberg & Greenfield maintained, began to feel insecure in its role, purpose, and identity. This identity crisis, in one way or another, evolved from the school leadership experiential detachment from community context (1980). Educational leadership's contemporary emphasis on community experiential basis of success importantly derives from this isolation and ontological crisis experience.

Individually, the concept of ontological security, or inner security related to purpose and sense of integral being, is further related to experiential context. Schutz's 1958 study of experiential basis of leadership effectiveness suggested that principals as effective organization leaders were characteristically dedicated to the experience of problem solving. Their experiential passion was total immersion in communication with students, faculty, other administrators, parents, and the community as a whole. Within this context the principal self-projection of warmth and friendliness suggested also to initiate ideas, proposals, and action agendas. Constraints upon principal activities in this regard were resented. But most importantly, successfully principals' interpretation of effective leadership was that of experiential discovery of solutions specific to their own organizations. Within this complex educational arena, they wished for total involvement in all determining aspects (1958).

Kelley's (1980) assertion, that after three years continuance in the same principal position the administrative and organizational plans were those initiated by the principal,
supports Schutz's (1958) characterization of effective organizational leaders as wishing to experiment and create their own individual leadership and organizational structures. In terms of transforming leadership, however, it may not be certain that the patterns so initiated reflect actual deviation from the patterns previously established. The new patterns may reflect merely attempts to revitalize the customary practices, agendas, and decision process. Research of the present study would apparently lend some support to this latter possibility. Even in terms of transformational effort and some success within a given organization, it may not be clear that the transformational experience has been engendered in the macro rather than merely the micro (Burns, 1978) sense. Transformational process, in eliciting increased organization member input, effort, and responsibility—through creating greater intensity and authenticity in leader-organization-participant relationship—may, nevertheless, only be pursuing increased underwriting of established organization agendas. Creating new organizational patterns may often not be commensurate with creating new direction or new, transforming purpose, in the macro sense maintained in this study as essential for satisfactory organization transformation.

Results of this study and considerable background research suggest that principal organization experience is not strongly linked to macro transformational leadership, but may be linked to use of the modes of transformation process for preservation and expansion of organizational purpose and direction which have been ongoing. Emphasis of change of organization process patterns and effectiveness in terms of outcomes may
be strongly developed, in other words, but still directed almost entirely toward goals and success which are merely transactional, ultimately, in nature.

Kimbrough's (1968) study of principal effectiveness suggested that principal role experience led to greater emphasis on creation of values systems and clarification of values. Although the implication in this respect is more in the direction of leader introspection and philosophical probing and awareness, nevertheless, reconsideration of values, clarification of beliefs, and consideration of alternative principles and bases of action are foundational to effective leader behavior (1968). No clear indication is provided, however, that such consideration necessarily results in social action or social change agenda. The suggestion, moreover, is that such clarification of inner thought is preparatory to organization action not necessarily concomitant to establishing a social change agenda. Experience and reflection, once experience has established a base of power and control, may move in the direction of better reconciling the leadership role and function to perceived conflicting social forces.

It may be a relatively straightforward matter, in other words, to determine that administrative experience leads to transactional success, and in part, thereby, within the transactional, reconciliation, refinement formula, to diminution of transformational impetus. Some research substantiates the above conjecture rather directly. Parkay, Rhodes, Currie, & Rao (1990) found that new principals work more closely with teachers, staff, the community, and the district, which is basic to transformational disposition and input. Additionally, new principals strive more for success. With survival and experience
are apt to come reliance on routinization and abstraction of the leadership function (1990, p. 101).

Some suggestion is developed in the literature that the school administrative socialization process that involves virtually all of the principal's time, talent, and effort, may be intended to have the effect of creating leaders who have learned to focus intently on transactional process and by virtue of the weight and complexity of such involvement are dissuaded or to a great extent prevented from actualizing as transformational leaders.

Anderson (1991) carries the discussion of relevance of experience to effectiveness to the point of suggesting that the formal academic training brought to the administrative situation is very often at odds with the organizational realities faced. An important situation in this regard concerns the demands within the reality situation. The administrative social environment, generally, as depicted by Anderson, creates situations wherein the leader must cope with isolation, in terms of conceptualizing decision necessity and process, and in terms of establishing virtually all decision parameters associated with specific organization contexts. The process of shifting, allocating, and even clarifying centers of responsibility, while seeking collaborative input—the experience of formal administrative training—finds little corroboration in administrative reality (1991).

The social system of the organization, with some apparent intention, forces the individual designated as leader to establish the context of leadership in isolation. This reality has several aspects. It suggests the need for the designated leader to come to grips, individually and directly, through the specific, present reality, with leadership
situations; it suggests organization expectation that leadership persons will be individuals capable of demonstrating this ability; and it suggests an organizational perspective that confrontation and experience engendered between leader and organization circumstances may be the only viable method for determining and acquiring leadership capability; and it likely also suggests, in a somewhat more negative vein, that the social, organizational system forces the leader, primarily the new or incoming leader, into contexts of overwhelming complexity and ambiguity, not merely to test the leader's metal, but also to subject the leader to the control mechanisms of the system. Through a rather harsh socialization process, the leader acquires requisite experience; however, the leader may lose much if not all capacity for standing outside of or going beyond and transforming the organization so that it too stands in position to transform its own surrounding society. The experiential factor of leadership as presently constituted, for reasons of social expectation and control, may serve to facilitate transactional while prohibiting transformational modes of leadership (1991).

Anderson (1991) delineates requisite leadership experience as a direct immersion in unwritten rules, codes, and procedures. Subtle nuances prevail. Models for appropriate reactions and behavior are not available. Reinforcement and feedback for performance are not readily available. The system not only demands but enforces loyalty to its process, leadership strength and dedication in terms of organizational unity, and experiential mastery of organization-specific transactional detail (1991).
Other scholarship maintains that leadership must be experientially self-created through the leader's specific interaction with the organization, much in the manner that Anderson (1991) depicts as social system imposition, but through a more individually controlled and integrated process. Webster's (1994) view of school principal leadership emphasizes that integration process as an art form demanding personal familiarity with a complex of interacting components which are unpredictable and nonabstractable from the given unique organization context. Scientific, historical, and philosophical understanding and generalization can be brought to bear, can be applied, but always in the sense of the negotiable, through a process of experientially derived intuition. The knowledge bases of formal structure and academic abstraction are totally reshaped through experience. The majority of situations and problems principals face are likely to be in the forms of contextual working relationships, attitudes, and kaleidoscopically shifting points of view. Solutions are intuitive and not open to either observation or measurement (1994).

Wiggings (1972) concluded that the experiential process for principals evoked compliance to school administration needs and roles. These needs and roles were found to be in conflict with the administrator's needs and expectations. Wiggings summarized research up through the time of his writing as suggesting that administrative role experience created administrator role behavior with minimal variance among individual administrators. These findings are substantially in line with Anderson's conclusions some two decades later. These conclusions appear also to find corroboration in the present study's findings concerning principal leadership behavior: little behavioral variance; wide
background experience and training differentiation; and indication of administrative socialization experience as formative and controlling of administrative behavioral outcomes.

In general, the present investigation supports the findings of Allison and Allison (1991) that school principal leadership effectiveness is not related to level of experience. Allison & Allison (1991) discovered that certain abilities, likely relating to transformational leadership, at least in the micro sense (Burns, 1978) of transforming organization contexts and relationships to better solve organization-specific problems, were, however, did increase leadership effectiveness. These ability factors centered on capacity to detect need and to restructure problems into solution projects (1991). The weight of investigation thus far suggests that the usual course of administrative experience rather demands organization commitment to the status quo and is not evocative of transformational insight or effort. Thus, as Allison & Allison (1991) maintain, the possibility for transformational effectiveness largely falls to the ability of the leader, or rather what the leader, first, brings to the administrative situation, and second, is then able to exercise beyond social system dominance, control, and infringement (1991).

Hart's (1994) analysis comments provocatively upon the relationship between leader experience and leader effectiveness, by postulating that leaders who are effective are able to create organizational experience, within which they participate, which then acts in turn to strengthen and deepen effectiveness, both the leader's own and that of the organization. In this interactive configuration, Hart (1994) maintains that effective
leaders utilize subordinate skills and knowledge, ultimately refining their own leadership ability through the maintenance of group process. The downside of such interaction is that through the group interplay, creativity of the individual leader is sacrificed to integration process. Hart's complex view demands further investigation but substantiates research of this study indicating dominance of organization social process over leader individual self-projection. Hart's analysis also supports the view that transformational process is introduced by the leader and may establish transformational awareness among followers and transformational process within the organization. This process is likely, however, to be micro process (Burns, 1978). As such, its group integrative focus tends to remain dominant. Leader creative projection demanded of macro transformation may be lost in the experiential process (Hart, 1994).

Edger's (1993) assertion that knowledge and experience within the principal administrative role must be derived from appropriately enlightened leader attitudes for modifying, revising, and improving education seems compatible with Hart's (1994) analysis suggesting that through transformational approach, initially, the leader is able to create a context for organizationally transforming experience and subordinate interaction, which in turn work to further develop the leader's transformational powers and perspectives. In terms of analysis of the present study and background research, the need has been underlined for examination of a proliferation of transformational dispositions throughout organizations and evaluation of this data in terms of measure of leader transformational behavior. This examination and comparison could help to establish the
initially transformational leader's ability, generally, to establish the kind of reinforcing context Hart (1994) and Ediger (1994) may be indicating is necessary for administrative experience to be strengthening of leader effectiveness.

Other than this possibility of complex interrelationship between leader transformational intent, initially, along with success in implementation, and leadership benefit derived from experience, the research in this area is highly contradictory. Studies by Ogletree (1990) and Smith (1973) found experience and effectiveness not related. Principals themselves, however, perceive experience as critical to effectiveness (Beck, 1988). Alvy & Coladarci (1985) support the importance of experience with difference notable primarily during the first two years on the job. Peterson (1985) suggested that through conscious intentional focus on experiential learning principals could benefit in terms of exercise of leadership. McMurray & Bentley (1987) and Rousseau (1971) provide evidence of experience improving effectiveness.

Hart (1993), in citing examination of school principalship made by Leithwood, Steinbach, & Begley, believes that professional experience primarily creates organizational socialization. This socialization differs from and may counteract professional socialization, or the teachings and ideas the principal brings to the organization originally. Hart maintains, as have others, that the organization may totally reshape the individual leader's organizational and leadership thinking. The organization's need and power to maintain its specific identity are virtually irresistible. Difference in leadership behavioral outcomes among leaders, derived experientially, appears to Hart in the 1993 study to be
entirely a matter of leadership principles and expectations incorporated within the
organization and consequently socialized within the principal. In other words, the effect
of experience on leadership behavior effectiveness is determined from the outset by
organizational predispositions (Hart, 1993).

Research and indications of the study at hand tend to support Hart's later, 1994,
study which suggests a variant and more complex view that maintained by Hart in 1993,
as analyzed above. Greenfield's analysis of principal socialization is cited by Hart (1993)
as supportive of the view that organization predisposition determines leader behavior and
is the true source of variation among leaders. Hart's study, however, also cites
Leithwood, Steinbach, & Begley to specifically determine that school organization
attempts to influence principals organization leadership had no effect (1993).

Principals' Relationship With Students

The present analysis determined a single category of principals' organizational
leadership behavior was related to their length of administrative experience. This
category, principal relationship with students, was shown to impose with increased level
of administrative experience. Overall research perspectives of the present study may
suggest that principal interaction with students rests somewhat outside of the usual
administrative, bureaucratic, transactional context, and may therefore allow greater
transformational initiative to develop and take hold. as derived experiential.
Analysis will next move to examination of the other independent variables of the present study found to have a relationship with principal organizational leadership behavior effectiveness.

**Academic Degree**

Levels of academic degree were found significantly related to principals' organizational leadership behavior effectiveness. Thus levels within the independent variable Academic Degree were inclusive of four groups; Teachers Institute, Junior College, University, and Other Level of Education. Three of the four groups or levels included specific training for educational administration. Only the University group did not. School principals in Saudi Arabia holding academic degrees from university programs generally do not receive administrative training. LSD, Post-Hoc Analysis indicated significant difference among the four academic levels in terms of organizational leadership behavior. The mean level of behaviors for University graduates was much lower than the next lowest group, Teacher Institute, which itself demonstrated indication of significant difference from the two highest levels, Junior College and Other Level of Education. Further analysis of specific program preparation components for each level is indicated for future study to determine if factors other than absence or inclusion of administrative training contribute to leadership behaviors difference among the groups.

In terms of background research for the present study, some support has been demonstrated for academic administrative training as critical for organization leadership
effectiveness. Smith & Andrews (1989) found consensus within educational leadership and administrative scholarship for redesigning school administrative academic programs to develop more effective school leaders. To some extent, however, the collective vision of what constituted effective school leadership seemed limited in its transformational aspects, emphasizing primarily the development of leaders who act as instructional resource providers (1989).

The present study's attempt to measure principals' behavior goes well beyond these earlier strictures, resulting in mean leadership behaviors scores for each academic level examined which are quite low. Sapone's (1985) emphasis on effectiveness as derived from instructional and curricular leadership may be congruent with academic level findings' focus on educational administration preparation. Similarly, Austin's (1979) finding that school success and principal command of educational basics were coterminous may be supported in the present study. Effective communication of educational leadership vision, critical to all aspects of transformational leadership, seems less likely to be effectively maintained without administrative training. Such vision communication has been widely viewed as necessary for leadership and school success (Andrews, Soder, & Jacoby, 1985; Andrews & Soder, 1987).

Role theorists emphasize the educational leader's ability to overcome situational and environmental factors through persistence in maintaining goals (Smith & Andrews, 1989). It may be reasonable to suppose that school leaders without academic training in educational administration are more likely to fall into a pattern consistent with Brookover
& Lezotte's (1979) characterization of leaders of less effective schools as tending toward permissive behavior, emphasizing informal aspects of education and collegial relationships with teachers, and placing high level of importance on public relations. Those with administrative training may be more likely to follow the rationale of successful schools, within which the principal acts as instructional leader, provides necessary strong discipline, and assumes responsibility for evaluation achievement (1979).

Studies by Gibson et al., (1985); Bowditch & Buono (1994) identify and catalog the wide areas of knowledge and preparation concerning motivation, communication, group interaction, individual and group perception, and indicators of educational success which must be measured by school leaders to create school success. Such mastery of the basics and bringing all relevant factors into focus to solve school leadership problems seem unlikely to occur without the kind of distillation and coordination of appropriate knowledge that administrative training provides (1985; 1994).

Blount (in Maxcy, 1994) suggests that the intent and effect of academic training in education is to maintain the educational status quo and the hierarchical administrative bureaucracy which protects, prolongs, and manipulates ongoing educational process. Academic training in educational administration is thus viewed as intentionally antithetical to transformational leadership, at least in the macro (Burns, 1978) sense. Blount (1994) views educational leadership, initiated through its own educational processes, as rigidly supporting traditional and idealist visions while eschewing needed response to social change and adjustment. Leadership academic training follows modes guaranteed to
ensure realization of traditional expectations. Constructing patterns of expectation and control are intended to remove the possibility of introducing individuals who are themselves leaders into the educational administrative context. Leadership in education remains the province of privileged class control. Expectations concerning leadership traits suggest merely the necessity for display of behaviors supporting status quo maintenance. The leader who may act to transform organizationally in terms of the social need, educational nexus is conceptually removed from the notion of leadership. Leadership practice, as academically and traditionally defined and perpetuated, is controllable, is in contemporary terms the essence of control; whereas the actions of individual educational leaders establishing transformational contexts are not. The socially dominant class reconstructs the integral purposes of education, leadership, and organization and social transformation into a system of externally directed control. Because of the socially transformational dynamics of education as well as because of the individual initiative dynamics of leaders, for purposes of privileged social control it is essential that educational leadership be constructed as complicitous in the instigation and maintenance of control (Blount, 1994).

Through formal academic preparation the distinction between educational administration and leadership becomes blurred. For privileged control it is essential that the administrative structure define educational process and as nearly as this is realizable, educational thinking. Leadership, coterminous with administration, is academically conditioned to seek only its security within the structure of administration, and to
transactional persevere in realization or fruition of privileged class directives (Blount, 1993).

The academic and school administrative systems are interlocked and mutually sustaining. Transformational leadership behavior, especially in the macro sense of Burns (1978) clearly demands acting as an educational leader in the terms Blount (1994) sets out as oppositional to traditional educational administration. These terms would include development of an individual, unique approach within the organization leadership context; individually and directly maintaining mutual bonds with those organization members who agree to follow; conception and enactment of individual leader response to particular challenges; achieving a vital organizational role as leader and not reducing leadership involvement to that of a dispensable, interchangeable administrative component; refusing to act in isolation or merely as a conduit of hierarchical and privileged discretion and will; establishing bonds throughout the organization membership while disavowing unidirectional, hierarchical power flow and discreet administrator function as per identified discrete group; nurturing reciprocal relationships which are caring, trusting, and mutually supportive and receptive; and allowing and developing the exchange of traditional leader and follower roles, which must act to break down the privileged, hierarchical, and structurally subservient purposes of traditionally defined and maintained leadership (Blount, 1993).

From the above Post Modern critical perspective, sustained through academic inculcation, educational leadership not only does not assume the transformational
initiative and mantle, it also deliberately constructs and maintains positional educational leadership power to deny the widening, deepening, and democratizing of educational discourse and initiative. From this perspective, educational leadership struggles against a democratizing tendency underway within society. Academic structures persevere in subverting diverse channels of criticism, discourse, and needs identification from the broader spectrum of society. New educational leadership theory beginning at the academic preparation level is needed to counteract what Davies & Foster (in Maxcy, 1994) identify as present foundation a list assumptions, assumptions clearly standing in the way of a greatly needed new form of critical pragmatism.

Foundationalist assumptions maintained and purveyed through academic educational leadership process act to block creation of new theory necessary to invoke educational improvement at the deepest levels. These assumptions support an intentional agenda of realizing and predetermining institutional outcomes through administrative control. Thus, academic training in educational leadership enforces a morbidly isolated focus upon research process emulative of hard science, with clear emphasis on predetermination and control of outcomes through precise modeling of specified behaviors with statistically managed precision of designed, prefigured leadership response. Academic training follows generation of science of management which believes in and enforces reliance upon behavioral concepts previously tested and approved which systematize and formulate all leadership process. Competing and alternate perspectives are disallowed. Abstract formulations are purified through academic texts, classes,
teachings, and certification into self-justifying models for sustaining the kind of academic educational leadership research which notably and intentionally maintains control through a process standing outside of the context of individual leader confrontation with actual circumstances (Davies & Foster; in Maxcy, 1994).

For this perspective it is most directly through academic influence that educational administration and leadership converge to promulgate a positivistic science of behavioral systems, competencies defined, tests and formalized valuative procedures, and a protective, controlling, bureaucratic layer limiting access to legal and financial systems. Penetration to the conceptual structure of leadership, education, and social improvement is not only avoided but structurally prevented through total academic immersion within structures of authority, competence, and precisely modeled and measured performance (Davies & Foster; in Maxcy, 1994).

To some extent, results of research of the present study contradict the assumptions and theorizing of the Post Modernist critics as they have been introduced within the present discussion. Academic level has been demonstrated to be an influencing factor in terms of increasing leadership behaviors within educational institutions. Notably, academic preparation which included training in educational administration proved to be more effective in developing leadership behaviors in school principals. Difference, in this behavior sense, between preparation which included educational administrative training and that which did not was significant.
Other review of literature research also testifies against the kind of deeply structural alliance of academic educational leadership and organizationally practicing institutions of education, designed to control and subvert for purposes of privileged and elite advantage and discouragement of educational and social systems. Whereas much indication has been brought forth here that educational systems and hierarchies and the organizations they control may act to subvert behaviors within educational organizations, the overall process may not be the rather overt, oppressive alliance depicted by Blount; Davies & Foster (in Maxcy, 1994). The more generalizable indication thus far seems to be that conflict exists between academic educational leadership preparation and the organizational leadership context within which preparation must be actualized. Through socialization, the organization may control and subvert leadership action, placing, as it does, maximum priority on preservation and continuity in organizational identity and control. Nevertheless, academic preparation seems largely responsible for creating effective behaviors perspective within educational leaders. It seems fairly certain that at least in some cases, through exercise of academic knowledge and training, educational leaders can create transformational experience and change process for their own continued leadership transformation, as well as for organizational purposes. Results of the present study suggest support for positive connection between academic administrative preparation and leader transformational behavior.

Impact of academic training in administration for educational organizational success is challenged in several respects in the findings of studies emphasizing not only
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the importance of principal administrative role experience but also the difference and likely conflict occurring between academic preparation and that role experience. Kimbrough's study (1968) supports experience as more important than academic training for effective administrative leadership, citing reasons which have become familiar in this study: the role of principal demands management of such a vast array of variables, most of which are specific to the given institution, that generalizable systems of training are more often than not at a loss when attempting to manifest appropriate real world applications; systems are unique entities; and, therefore, administrative leadership must thus ordinarily process through individual adaptation by means of direct, personal experience. Kimbrough (1968) does point out, however, that transfer of academic leadership preparation to routinized organization situations and functions is commonly maintained. Kimbrough suggests that these transactional functions are appropriately prepared for through formal administrative and educational leadership programs, thus, effectually agreeing with Post Modern thinking formulated three decades after Kimbrough's own investigations: leadership training in academic contexts largely applies to routinization, perceived regularities of science, and mostly abstract determinations (1968). However, when turning to examination of studies of earlier decades which reference academic preparation in contrast to experiential role playing for educational leadership behaviors, the findings of the present study indicate that administrative analysis is fully preoccupied with transactional considerations. Kimbrough (1968) perceives the
necessity, as well as desirability, of acquiring pervasive, experiential, situational leadership knowledge, all of which, as it turns out, are transactional (1968).

Whereas transformational insight emphasizes individual leader capability to alter organizations, participant commitments, and through organizational change, social conditions, an equally compelling research perspective underscores socialization process, institutional experience, and group norms as determining leadership roles. Leaders and leadership, in this view, exist primarily as the perceptions of organization participants. The social system is structurally and culturally complex. From this complexity, leadership emerges, virtually as a quality of the system itself, based on necessity for resolving interfactional conflict and divergence from the commonly shared group interaction pattern (Kimbrough, 1968).

This perspective may lend support to the experiential basis rather than the academic for determining the character or nature of leader behavior, with all attendant implications for denying or subverting leadership bent on carrying out organization and social transformation. What seems likely, however, is that educational organization analyses delineating social systems in their power and complexity, have also provided the knowledge base for informing leaders and educational programs developing leaders concerning access to educational social systems, for creating change, and for recreating those systems through leader-involved innovation. The power, structure, and social processes of organizations have provided leadership analysis access to channels of transformational possibility, but at levels of complexity which could only be accessed and
understood through applied, scholarly investigation, and according to resultant theories and strategies which could only be communicated through specialized and formalized learning process. Hence, analysis of social structure complexity in connection with awareness of its power for determining organization process and outcomes clearly suggests the necessity of a correspondingly complex academic study to prepare leaders for accessing such structural complexity, for educational and social improvement. Sophisticated organizational analysis and leadership training might with equal effectiveness of course be used for control and maintenance of the status quo. Analysis might provide merely the basis of transformational endeavor at the micro level (Burns, 1978), which is likely to seek status quo maintenance and transactional precision only, as has been pointed out earlier in this study. Transformational leadership directed toward using academic organizational knowledge for macro level change (1978), through access to organization systems, however—that is, leadership directed to actual social improvement through organization outcomes, but beyond the organization itself—cannot very readily be configured as transactional only, nor as serving the status quo (p. 100).

From this perspective, evidence may suggest that leadership organization experience, especially as presented by Anderson (1991) may not be so much conducive to effective leader selection, initiation, and development as it is evidence of a proactive and status quo maintenance perspective on the parts of educational institutions. Organizational demand for leaders to learn the ropes and prove themselves through immersion in transactional detail may rather prevent, discourage, and gradually dissuade
leaders from engaging in transformational process, as the omnipresent transactional reality continues to overwhelm them. This disabling process may constitute the major conflict between academically mastered leader process and behavior and actual experimental outcomes. Knowledge of such a demanding, experiential situation would likely be requisite for establishing leadership capacity to attempt organization transformation.

Webster (1994), in contrasting the roles and provisions associated with academic training as opposed to administrative experience, suggested that the first lesson learned by new principals was that educational organization leadership behaviors demanded to be practiced as an art form. It was essentially the personal outcome of individual actions and experiences in the face of daily organization problem solving. The precision of science, which rapidly becomes merely a carry-over from graduate training is largely inapplicable. Absorption in the organizational context demands negotiated and unpredictable relationship. Total organization dynamics respond to a paradigm of pragmatic resolution and not control and manipulation of scientific inquiry. Graduate training in administration has evolved through models of science, emphasis upon required, and paradigms replication of effect and statistical analysis of commonality among variables. In Webster's view, educational organization leaders quickly reach the conclusion that academic preparation has failed them in facing the shifting, contextual reality of situational education leadership (1994).

Academic preparation fails, in Webster's (1994) view, primarily because of its quest for identifiable, discreet, and ultimately controllable elements. The inquiry process
of science, which has created and informed, and continues to determine and control academic preparation in educational administrative leadership, must be totally reshaped for educational success. In Webster's view, administrative experience carries out this reshaping process. In effect, emphasis on the abstract perspective of science serves to delimit and acts at cross purposes with leadership affinity for contextual, immediate, and uniquely fabricated and interacting reality. Resort to fitting the complexity of administrative context into model, paradigm, or hypothetical projection of isolatible variable reaction is ill-conceived: first, it is unlikely to provide solution or pragmatic response; second, it conditions the thinking of the administrator to fail in realizing contextual organization reality and implications as complex entities composed of interacting facets, inextractable from their composite and unknowable except in original experiential manifestation. The majority of contextual circumstances are not open to sensory observation, measurement, or quantification. Circumstantial manifestations exist as viewpoints, attitudes, or circumstantial, contextual working relationships. Experientially driven intuition on the part of the leaders is demanded for understanding and formulation of solution. Attempts to analytically frame networks of variables are ill advised and ultimately beneath the level of requisite sophistication for contextual solution. Academic preparation, as presently constituted, fails in preparing the administrative leader for recognition of values, impacts of impinging political process, and the continuous flux of elements demanding situational response. In Webster's view, even though the academy essentially fails, as constituted, experience, by virtue of the reality that its manifestation
is isomorphic with constituent factors necessary for understanding, decision, and success, creates and refines adjustment possibilities and solution.

Contrary to negative evaluation of academic preparation for educational leadership, Hart's (1994) perception is that school administrative experience creates socialization process for organization-specific interaction. Greater integration between leadership role and organization contextual demand emerges. Increased organizational pressures conflict leader efforts toward change process. Leader integration with organization is built up through experience, but at great cost to leader creativity and focus upon innovation. In Hart's view, it becomes incumbent upon leadership throughout organization process to monitor, structure, and intervene on behalf of the experience processing of the principal to help ensure that leadership creativity is enhanced, rather than sacrificed to integration of organization situational processes. In Hart's analysis, in other words, the leader brings creative and innovative thinking and energy to the organizational situation, but the need to comprehend and integrate contextual variables overwhelms and delimits creative interaction. Academic preparation tends to instill in the leader the creative change and educational enhancement motivation. The contextual, integrative organizational processing, in a very real sense, acts to sabotage this creative leadership impetus (1994).

Ediger (1994) correlates academic understanding with administrative experiential learning by suggesting that whereas experience provides knowledge and
integration requisite to circumstantial context, academic training must provide
development of appropriate attitudes and skills for revising, modifying, and improving
education through exercise of the administrative leadership function. Ogletree's finding
that no relationship exists between experience level and leadership approach (1990) may
conform to the results of many studies suggesting that leader individual intention and
approach become submerged in organizational socialization, experiential process.
Peterson suggested that despite the propensity for socialization experience to dominate
leadership input, academic training can provide knowledge, such as awareness of learning
stages (concrete experience, reflective analysis, abstract conceptualization, and active
experimentation), which should, if awareness is systematically maintained, allow leaders
a shaping power over organization experience, especially at the active experimentation
stage, acting to encourage potentially transformational leadership projection.

Rousseau (1971) supports academic training efficacy for leadership effectiveness.
Liethwood et al., (1993) reflect the position that academic preparation in administrative
leadership allows the administrator to selectively discriminate among socializing,
experiential variables, and thus, potentially, shape, monitor, and in some sense create their
own organizational, administrative experience. Ultimately, such experiential input and
control potentially create transformational interaction experience toward both leader and
organization transformational result. As discussed elsewhere in the present study,
educational administrative experience examination indicates, however, that the
transformational integration of experience with academic training is unlikely to take hold.
In terms of professional socialization (concomitant with academic training), organizational socialization (administrative experience) acts to ensure that academic, professional impact—through leader transformational projection—does not significantly alter sustaining, long term organization norms, values, and practices. Academic process should instill educational organization leaders with the requisite awareness and capacity to interact innovatively with organizational structure and process and thereby achieve transformational effect (1993).

Results of the present study, in indicating some transformational viability for administrative academic training in its effect on organization experience through leadership behavior, suggests that transformational potential can be instituted and enhanced through administrative, professional socialization and education process, and that this potential, even within highly structured and dominant organizational socialization circumstances, can effect and support educational leadership transformational input.

School District

Examination of principal organizational leadership behavior indicated that school district of principal employment was an important determining factor. This finding appears to be congruent with several aspects brought out in the present study's background research. School district influence on leader effectiveness may lend credence to Expectancy Theory (Nebecker & Mitechell, 1974) which predicts principal behavior according to organization expectation concerning desirable outcomes.
School district influence would seem to support the importance of social system control of individual input and impetus. Osborn & Hunt (1975) emphasize larger structural variables within the overall environment which tend to be dominant over not only individual leader volition but over also organization administration. These underlining factors would include community size and makeup, school size, and changes occurring within the community. Such factors resolve issues of principals behavior. Importance of school district in determining leader behavior is coherent with this view and may support Osborn & Hunt's (1975) assertion that large, community, structural factors outweigh even contextual immediate social system factors, such as work task, attitudes and expectations of associates, and principal attitudes themselves, in determining principal performance behaviors.

Findings of school district impact on principal behavioral may support organizational views suggesting how the principal acts to adapt to environmental conditions (in the large, community context identified above) and subsequently governs reactions to organization-specific factors according to this larger, structural shaping and adjustment (1975).

Importance of school district in this respect may tend also to support findings of the 1960's Coleman Report, which stressed parents' of students educational levels, family incomes, classmate associations, and other community-determined factors, as more relevant than quality of education institution input. Community or school district may,
in effect, largely determine kind and degree of educational professional input, through atonement to community factors (Coleman Report, 1966, as cited in McCurpy, 1983).

Schmuck (1985) emphasized in a similar vein the necessity of compatibility between leaders and those affected by leadership processes for successful outcomes. School districts may act as dominant cultures in terms of school leadership behavior and success. School districts may define a specific educational culture, manifesting shared and agreed upon beliefs and reflecting these shared aspects back upon school district leadership (Bowditch & Buono, 1994). School district as a determining factor in relative level of organizational leadership behavior displayed may support findings indicating that strength of surrounding culture is inversely related to organization, and thus, in the case at hand, educational innovation and advancement, and opportunity for leadership intervention for improvement and redirection (1994). In other words, strength of social-structural, environmental factors in determining transformational leadership input may not bode well for direct leader intervention in schools as means of educational improvement. At this point in the discussion of findings, school district is construed primarily as constituting a large, social structural, community factor. Importance of school district may, however, also be constituted in district superintendency leadership, considered by way of conclusion to this section.

Findings relating to school district essentially support systems theory which views organization as it exists within the total social system, context, and environment. Organization survival in this view is paramount for organization leadership, which factor
critically depends upon organizational satisfaction of environmental demand. School district impact on organizational leadership in terms of transformational leadership behavior may be a reflection of changes within the school district environment. Organization development change or transformation is often in relation to environmental change. Thus, changing school districts may create a need for demonstration of school transformational leadership, whereas those which are unchanging may fail in providing transformational leadership context (Gibson et al., 1985). Hershey & Blanchard's (1995) analysis of Situational Leadership, as this designation implies, suggests that leadership stratagem and behavior are motivated by contingency and environment demands. Thus, a social system, such as the given school district, demands a certain level, degree, kind, or manifestation of leadership, in appropriate response to situational needs. The informed leader responds appropriately, which is in kind, according to the nature of the situational demand. Environmental contingencies, as for example those constituting a given school district, thus effectively determine leadership behavior (1995).

Leadership as a manifestation of ongoing organization-wide or wider social system commitment, which may be individuated from other such systems in vision and values, fits with emphasis on matching organization member background with defining organization characteristics and with working to conform individual personality to organizational values (Harrington, 1995).

Emphasis upon implementation of networks for decision making and teamwork for organization process reflect submergence of individuality within the structural whole.
Team processes are carried out to fulfill organization commitments. Leaders in turn act as coordinators among team members (Harrington, 1995). Egan (1994) suggests that transformational leadership proceeds through identification of the preferred or ideal culture of the organization, and then works to change or strengthen culture through elimination of deficiencies (1994). Hall & Norris (1993) suggest that leadership variation among leaders is largely derived from differences in level of support received from the organization, including interaction, system and procedures established, and role models contained within the organization (1993).

Rigidity in vertical, hierarchical power structure, which is likely to be determined from school district leadership, was investigated by Schofield (1974) and found to be detrimental to effective school leadership. Effective leadership relies on close contact with each decision impact point throughout organization structure. Less formal and less rigid structure opens up leadership process to input from those best able to define problems and solutions. Through relaxation of organizational rigidity, as directed through hierarchical channels, the organization in effect creates a transformational perspective (1974).

Just as Hershey & Blanchard's construction of situational leadership suggests that system variables effectively determine leadership role and process, so also does Post-Modern theory stipulate dominance over leadership by ongoing systems, to the extent that leadership itself becomes totally submerged and devitalized. The Post Modern
perspective seems to suggest that intitative for leadership change can only come from fundamental shifts and redirection within larger systems (Maxcy, 1994).

Educational organization conditions define the boundaries of leader decision. These conditions or parameters determine educational leadership behavior (Kahan & Rosenthal, 1964; Pfeffer & Salancik, 1975).

Nine critical areas of educational leadership identified by Ramseyer et al. (1955) were viewed as fluctuating widely according to school system. Much of this fluctuation was viewed as philosophically or value based. Importance attached to identified variables, considered individually, fluctuated according to district, and these beliefs or value systems appeared to be reflected in school leadership behaviors and organization outcomes. Systems influence on effective leadership extended to influence from throughout the associated, surrounding community, the utilization of which influence was viewed as essential to educational leadership. Level of public support and interest varied district by district and was viewed as a critical determinant of leader effectiveness (1955).

Rubin (1970) in perceiving the principal as structurally defining the link between school system and school district, understood principals as thus responding to and coordinating two social systems. Such perspective may suggest the preponderance of social system dominance over principal decision and action (1970).

Blumberg & Greenfield (1980) stressed that educational systems as entire entities could experience insecurity in their role and purpose. Such organization insecurity could effectively stifle organizational leadership behavior. Such insecurity could result in
organizational lethargy, boredom, and defensiveness, and would generally be established from a sense of hostility emanating from the larger social and political environment. The demand was for individual leadership to maintain its own ontological security intact, even when subjected to organizational confines which manifested debilitating circumstances. This demand might, however, not often be met in terms of exercise of organization transformation, but merely in terms of maintaining the individual leader perspective, however frustrated that perspective might be in terms of organizational leadership effectiveness. The essence of leader ontological security, however, manifested at sufficient level, is to go beyond environmental, organization, system confines and create positive intervention, change, and improvement (1980). Schutz (1958) agrees with the view that effective leaders are those who characteristically do not tolerate situational restrictions on their discretionary action and who fundamentally reach beyond these restrictions, demanding and receiving the support they need (1958). McCurdy's (1983) findings similarly suggest that organization success demands leadership which is willing and fully able to go beyond, override, and in essence defeat bureaucratic stagnation and the smothering effect of social and systemic delimitation of leadership effective action. Much recent indication, going back to the thinking similar to that evidenced in the study of leader ontological security (Blumberg & Greenfield, 1980), emphasized that specific leader personal characteristics are necessary for resisting systemic limitation and restriction. Leader effectiveness demands ability to secure from the system whatever is necessary so that leader dispositions, goals, and demands for achievement are not
submerged by systemic controls, limitations, and focus upon the systemic sense of survival based upon severely limiting change (Smith & Andrews 1989). Effective leaders work within the system in the sense of fully utilizing whatever it possesses to achieve necessary goals (Manasse, 1984).

Preponderance of evidence suggesting the weight and impact of school system, environment, and community in determining and generally acting to limit and control leadership activation of transformational will to change has been considered in detail in this study. Two factors which can serve to counteract school system and wider community effort to control and maintain status quo have been identified also. These factors would be first support within the school district for school system leader-directed transformation; and second, individual leader manifestation of personal characteristics—indicated within the concept, ontological security, and based in transformational leadership theory, but going beyond theory to pragmatic application—which categorically refuses systemic limitation of transformational goals and, further, understands and correctly uses necessary means for extracting from the system whatever is required for leadership success.

Each of the above factors which may serve to override school system, community, and institutional inertia and strategy for limitation of leader behaviors depends in turn on leadership effectiveness and force, from the school district, more than likely in the person of a supportive district superintendent and in the individual school leader, the principal who is totally secure in sense of self, educational purpose, and leadership role, and will
perforce exercise all abilities and organizational facets to persevere toward goal achievement and organization leadership transformational.

**Length of Additional Administrative Training**

Examination of the independent variable Additional Administrative Training was supported by study findings as having a significant relationship with organizational leadership behavior. This finding may substantiate study findings which as discussed above suggested academic training in administrative leadership contributed to higher mean levels for organizational leadership behavior.

Background research discussed in terms of academic preparation prior to assumption of the organizational leadership role would seem to also apply to the additional training variable. For purposes of the present study, material presented in Chapter V in analysis of academic preparation is extended in application to added administrative training, without need for adjustment in that commentary. However, the sum of research, analysis, and discussion thus far may suggest a further basis for interaction between added training and effective leadership behavior. That further basis may be in terms of the influence of social systems on leadership effectiveness, as presented in this study according to several perspectives and dimensions. Social system influence is relevant to additional administrative training because such added training experience may act in multiple ways to counteract social system's influence. Social system influence on educational leadership behavior, as presented in organizational leadership research,
creates organizational socialization of the leader behavior. This level of socialization tends to act outside of, beyond, and in dominant relationship to previously acquired academic training, or professional socialization.

Social system or organizational socialization dominance proceeds to control leadership behavior and to subjugate leadership initiatives to the survival, maintenance, and control agenda of the ongoing organizational or social system. Subjugation proceeds primarily through immersing and in effect overwhelming the leader with transactional detail and with minimum advisory or structuring assistance. Requirements structuring leadership to struggle independently to adjust to transactional demands and to cope with routine social system procedures may positively be interpreted as a type of test by fire, from which process the leader should emerge intact, if qualified to lead. More negatively, the transactional inundation of leadership adjustment to the organizational social system likely precludes leadership transformational discretionary impact and agenda. Through such analysis it may readily be seen that added administrative training acts to interrupt and break up the pattern of social system dominance.

Additional training provides respite for the leader from transactional routine and inundation. It allows some new footing to be gained, through time away from day to day routine, and through some additional leadership thinking, likely directed toward furthering professional socialization and toward both equipping and encouraging the leader to intervene within organizational processes in behalf of higher educational goals. In two complementary ways—increase in necessary academic knowledge and creation of a new
vantage from which to carry forth leadership's assault on institutional and organizational routine process and inertia—additional administrative training contributes to principal organizational leadership effectiveness behavior.

**Remaining Variables**

The remaining variables examined in the present study in terms of possible relationship with principals' organizational leadership behavior were not substantiated as manifesting influence. These variables were Length of Assistant Principal Experience, Length of Classroom Teaching Experience, and Age. Lack of relationship between the dependent variable and Length of Assistant Principal Experience may further corroborate study findings concerning the primary focus concerning impact of administrative experience on organizational leadership behavior. Discussion applied to the Principal Administrative Experience variable reasonably applies to the variable, Length of Assistant Principal Experience. More indirectly, Length of Classroom Teaching Experience may equally be interpreted as in a sense constituting immersion in social system, organizational processes not ordinarily conducive to assertion of effective, organizational leadership behavior. Also for similar reasons, Age was not a determining factor, indicating that immersion within immediate, ongoing, and pervasive homogenization effects related to administrative experience, in conjunction with leader subjugation to organizational agendas of survival and intact organizational identity prolongation are of themselves not conducive to effective principals' organizational leadership behavior.
Conclusion

The complexity of findings from the review of literature is in many ways, as suggested above, substantiated in research results of the present study. The essential study conclusion, that length of experience as constituted in formal educational roles, whether as teacher, assistant principal, or principal, has no effect on school principal organizational leadership behavior, while at first appearing to be illogical or in a sense self-contradictory, and to some degree, at least on the surface, in opposition to much research evidence and expert educational analysis opinion and judgement, upon more careful consideration points toward a more probing analysis of educational leadership research and theory. This study has explored that complex and seemingly deeper level of analysis from many perspectives. Without belaboring the several points already dwelt upon, a summary understanding suggests the following.

Leadership theory in educational administration, envisioning pragmatic success within institutional contexts greatly in need of transformation, toward improvement and growth in educational outcomes, must ordinarily find itself in oppositional struggle to overcome organizational, social, and administrative barriers within the educational context itself. Educational leadership for transformational improvement leading to socially viable betterment requires overcoming the inertia of organizational structure and procedure, the purposes of which are to maintain the status quo and to perpetuate organization identity, structure, and institutionalized form intact, from one leadership administration to the next. Administrative experience, without successful transformational intervention, deluges the
administrative leader with routine, structural process and inures the leader will toward acceptance of ongoing organizational immersion within transactional detail and status quo maintenance. Thus, administrative experience, or experience in general within ongoing educational institutions, is not an apt or appropriate teacher for transformation. The transformational insight and regimen must be founded, it would seem, in academic programs specifically focusing upon and providing training in educational transformation, administration, and leadership behaviors. Indications are that such training when joined with individual leader ability to persevere, in opposition to organizational socialization, and implement transformational vision as manifested initially in leader behavior, despite tremendous institutionalized opposition, can help to establish leadership which will instigate educational innovation and improvement.

In addition to appropriate administrative training and personal leadership sense of ontological security (Blumberg & Greenfield, 1980), such leadership effect, at the school principal level, benefits from hierarchical school district leadership support and from additional training during the administrative tenure, to revitalize professional socialization ability to overcome systemic, institutionalized opposing tendency.

Without inculcation of the transformational insight in the context of formal administrative training, without leaders temperamentally and psychologically equipped to pragmatically implement such insight and strategy in the face of virtually overwhelming opposition, and without supportive intervention and ongoing developmental consideration
of transformational leaders from the highest level of the institutionalized educational hierarchy, the process of educational stagnation will perpetuate itself. The spectrum of institutional, organizational, educational socialization experience is inexorably toward status quo survival. Apparently, without exception, strong organizational leadership behavior alone can avail reversal of this process.

Recommendations

Study findings suggest the following recommendations. Formal academic educational preparation in educational leadership and administration should be a minimal base requirement for assuming a position of educational leadership in Saudi Arabian school systems. At regular intervals throughout the administrative tenure, school administrators should be required to participate in additional training programs of educational leadership and administration. School district superintendents should receive special administrative education to enable them to better facilitate and support school principal transformational leadership interventions, strategies, and behaviors. Educational administrative personnel at all levels should receive training concerning the negative effects for education of prevalent organization socialization process directed toward educational administrative leaders. Deemphasis of transactional process and facilitation of school principal transformational leadership should be developed throughout Saudi Arabian school systems, through appropriate training, education, and leadership intervention from the highest levels. Formal training and educational programs in
educational leadership and administration should be greatly expanded, enriched, and 
structured according to advanced research and theory in educational leadership. It is 
suggested that for development of society in Saudi Arabia, nothing is more urgently 
demanded at the present time than such resurgence and revitalization of leadership within 
the educational systems.

Limitations

Review of literature was necessarily based on readings concerning educational 
leadership in the U.S. Focus of the study was three school districts in Qasim region, 
Saudi Arabia. Nevertheless, indications from data gathered tended to confirm many 
aspects of literature review findings. It is here suggested that strong commonalities in 
terms of organizational structure and practice between the U.S. and Saudi Arabia 
contributed to conformational findings. In terms of educational leadership research and 
organizational theory, a marked degree of universality may exist, for multi cultural 
application. Even though data was taken from only one region in Saudi Arabia, which 
may limit generalization of findings, it should be stressed here that Saudi Arabia exists as 
a highly unified and centralized national administrative entity and that education follows 
this centralized and unitary hierarchical format and process. To a greater extent than 
what might be the case in some other cultures and educational systems, results from 
random sampling of a single region may fairly well be expected to be representative of the 
whole.
The study included examination of male student education only. As has been clarified here, females receive separate education. Additional study would be required to examine female education or to perhaps combine examination of male with female. Because the two systems in Saudi Arabia are separate and somewhat different from one another, generically, additional limitations would require consideration for separate or combined female education study.

Application of study findings must be limited at this time to Qasim region, Saudi Arabia, with some generalizeability to Saudi Arabian Education as a whole. Interesting confirmations of leadership and organizational theory derived from educational research in the U.S., however, have been pointed out and discussed in the present analysis. Study findings suggest important indication and meaning for organization and leadership theory. Several important avenues are pointed toward for directing further inquiry in this subject matter.

Future Research

In order to better interpret present study research findings, as well as to clarify the many areas of inquiry suggested here as importantly associated with educational leadership effectiveness behavior, recommendations for future research are made to include the following:
The scope of the present study should be expanded to be better representative of the whole of Saudi Arabian Education, ideally incorporating analysis of female education, either considered separately or combined with male education.

The presence of, scope, and characteristics of organizational conflict in education between transformational leadership impetus and administrative inertia and organization transactional fixation demand immediate study. In depth examination of educational leadership and administrative training in Saudi Arabia should be initiated. Indications of the present study are that transformational insight and application among educational leaders in Saudi Arabia are at injuriously low levels. Research concerning the feasibility of dramatically increasing educational leadership and administration training in Saudi Arabia should be initiated.

Research concerning implementation of macro transformational leadership within education should be carried out. Leadership perceptions concerning difference and importance of difference between micro and macro transformational leadership should be investigated both within Saudi Arabian culture and within the professional practice of education more generally.

Consideration of the critical importance to educational transformation success of individual leader unwillingness to compromise in carrying out transformational leadership implementation in the face of organizational interference and opposition suggests the advisability of further study of individual leader psychological makeup, especially in terms of the concept of ontological security, as discussed in the present study. Such
investigation of leader psychological predisposition to persevere in leadership transformation of organizations might well include inquiry into possible educational and administrative training modes for facilitating or enhancing such positive and productive leadership dispositions and approaches. One area of immediate research possibility suggested in this context would be to carry out follow-up interviews with individuals in the study who scored high in terms of transformational leadership behaviors. These educational leaders could prove invaluable resources of information in terms of areas of research focused on in this study and in terms of confirming information, from both literature review and survey questionnaire findings.
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Organizational Leadership Behavior Items
Mean, SD, Minimum, Maximum, and Number
## Table

### Organizational Leadership Behavior Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>4.93</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>4.96</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48.</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52.</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53.</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54.</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55.</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56.</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57.</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58.</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59.</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60.</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Letters From School Districts
بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم

الملكة العربية السعودية
وزارة المعارف
إدارة التعليم بمحافظة عسير
التوجيه القربي والتدريبي

الموضوع: بشأن الموافقة على إجراء دراسة.

نشرة للمدارس الابتدائية في قطاعي عسير والباحة

المكرم

السلام عليكم ورحمة الله وبركاته...

فيناً على خلفية سماحة مدير عام إدارة البحوث القربية والتقويم بالوزارة رقم (4/4/12)
ف. 13/1/1214 ه. بشأن السماح للباحث / عبد بن عبد العزيز الحربي بإجازة دراسة بصحبة
( العلاقة بين مدة خبرة مدرسة الإبتدائية وتصوراته الإدارية والتربيتي في منطقة القصيم )
على عينة من مدارس المنطقة.

عليه أن يساهم الباحث في إجراء إراجاته. شاكرين ومتأمرين للجميع حسن تعاونهم.

والسلام عليكم ورحمة الله وبركاته .

مدير التحقيل بمحافظة عسير

عبد الرحمن بن عبد العزيز المنصور

م الموس

13/1/1214

صورة للبحوث القربية والتقويم (الأستاذ / علي الحسن )

لالاقات.
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البسمة الرحمن الرحيم

النطاق: المملكة العربية السعودية

وزارة المعارف

إدارة التعليم بمحافظة الرياض

البجعة الثورية

"نور لمبنى المدارس الابتدائية" 

الكامل

덱" مدير مدرسة

السلام عليكم، ورحمة الله وبركاته.

وفقًا لمرجع الاستجابة الخاصة بمرشدة الدراسة بين مدة خبرة مدير المدرسة الابتدائية.

يغش المراقبة والإشراف المدرسة والتي تتعلق باليماء، تخصوص درجة الدكتور الأديب / أحمد بن محمد الخير.

الখبر: تطابق ومها لا الإدارة باسم ما بمكن.

اللهم ماله وللنهى.

مدير التعليم بمحافظة الرياض

محمد بن صالح الغنيمي

1411/12

الإفلاسات.

الخريج الخارجي.

الإدارة المدرسية.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
الرقم: 148968
النسبة: 
العنوان: 
الموضوع: 

مدير مدرسة سبئ كليه

سلام عليكم ورحمة الله وبركاته

رقم 4 / 17 / 1 / 1416 ه، والمتخفي السماح للبائعين، حمد بن عبد الكريم السليبي، جراء دراسة بعض حالات الطلاق بين عدة طالبات مدربة في المدرسة الإبتدائية عرفات الادارية والتدريبية بمنطقة القيم، وفق الاستفادة المعنوية للسماح، في هذه الخصائص، على صفيحكم، من الإستفادة المشتركة من نظرة للمشكلة، وتحقيقها باستخدامها، أعادها لـ "إدارة التوجيه التربوي" على هيئة عمل على عشرة أيام من تاريخه.

وشقيلاً هيئات

/ مدير العام للتعليم بمنطقة القيم

/ عبد الطيف بن إبراهيم العبداللطيف

/ 18

العنوان: 
الموضوع: 
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Appendix C

Cover Letter of the Survey in Arabic and English
IN THE NAME OF GOD MOST BENEFICIAL MOST MERCIFUL

Dear Sir,

Peace be unto you. I am Hamad Abdul Aziz Al-kherb, a doctoral student at Western Michigan University in Kalamazoo, Michigan. I am currently on scholarship from Al-Imam Mohammed Bin Saud Islamic University, Qasim Branch. The questionnaire in hand is aimed at investigating the relationship between the elementary school principal's length of experience and his school organization leadership behavior. This study is a requirement for my doctoral degree in education leadership.

I understand that your time is very limited and precious to you, and I deeply appreciate the sacrifice and effort you will be making in my behalf. Please bear in mind the questionnaire and results or interpretations will only be used for academic purposes, as defined by my study. Because your confidentiality is critical to this study, there is no need to write your name or telephone number on the questionnaire.

In addition, the objectivity of this questionnaire and its results depend on the objectivity of your answers. So, please read its statements carefully, then choose the answer that appeals the most to you.

Thank you so much for your time and your cooperation.

Sincerely

Hamad Al-kherb
بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم

أخي الفاضل

 السلام عليكم ورحمة الله وبركاته

هذه الاستماع ليست إلا جزءاً من متطلبات إكمال درجة الدكتوراة في تخصص الإدارة التربوية من جامعة غرب منشج بالولايات المتحدة الأمريكية لأخيكم/ حمد بن عبد العزيز الخرب، المبتعث من قبل جامعة الإمام محمد بن سعود الإسلامية - (فرع التصميم).

والهدف من هذه الدراسة معرفة العلاقة بين مدة خبرة مدير المدرسة الإبتدائية وتصرفاته الإدارية والتربوية في المدرسة.

أخي الفاضل، أولاً أتقدم لك خاصاً شكري وتقديري على الجهد والوقت الذي سوف تتكرّر وتبثّه في تعبئة هذه الاستماع، مع استنادي بضيق الوقت لديك في وقت عملك اليومي حيث أعلم أنك في شغيل متواصل مع مدرستك وخصوصاً هذه الأيام. ولكن مع ذلك أمل منك التكرّر بما لديك من وقت يساري نساعيني في تعبئة هذه الاستماع ثم إعادتها في أقرب وقت ممكن.

إعلم أخي الفاضل أن صدق ووضعيّة نتائج هذا البحث يرتكز على درجة وأمانة الإجابة، وذلك أمل منك الحرص في إجابتك، وان تكون عروناً لي بعد الله في إكمال هذه الدرجة العلمية، كما أحب أن أضيف أن إجابتك لن تستعمل إلا لغرض البحث العلمي فقط، مع العلم أن البحث ليس في حاجة لذكر اسم أو عناوين أو رقم الهاتف في الإجابة حتى لا تعرض شخصية المجيب. أمل منك أخي الفاضل قراءة الأسئلة بدقة ثم اختيار الإجابة المناسبة على هذه الاستماع.

ولك جزيل الشكر والتقدير على تعاونك ووقتكم.

أخوك المخلص
حمد بن عبد العزيز الخرب
Appendix D

Survey Form in Arabic
الجزء الأول: يتضمن ستة أسئلة متعلقة بالأخلاق العلمية وخبرتك العملية، فأملك اختيار الاستجابة المناسبة يوضع

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>سؤال</th>
<th>استجابة</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1- ما هو أعلى مؤهل تلقنه علميًا؟</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(أ) شهادة عالية، (ب) شهادة معيد إعداد المعلم، (ج) شهادة علمية، (د) شهادة جامعة، (ه) غير ذلك مع الذكر.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2- كم عدد السنوات التي عملت بها مدرسة قلب عملك كمدير؟</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(أ) سنة إلى أقل من خمس سنوات، (ب) خمس إلى أقل من عشر سنوات، (ج) عشر إلى أقل من خمس عشرة سنة، (د) خمس عشرة سنة أو أكثر.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3- كم عدد السنوات التي عملت بها كمساعد مدير مدرسة؟</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(أ) لا عمل، (ب) سنة إلى أقل من خمس سنوات، (ج) خمس إلى أقل من عشر سنوات، (د) عشر إلى أقل من خمس عشرة سنة، (ه) خمس عشرة سنة أو أكثر.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4- كم عدد سنوات عملك مدير مدرسة إداريًا؟</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(أ) سنة إلى أقل من خمس سنوات، (ب) خمس إلى أقل من عشر سنوات، (ج) عشر إلى أقل من خمس عشرة سنة، (د) خمس عشرة سنة إلى أقل من عشر سنوات، (ه) عشر سنوات أو أكثر.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5- كم عدد برامج التدريبية التي تلقاها في الإدارة المدرسية؟</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(أ) لاQUALITY Program تدريبي، (ب) أقل من ثلاثة أشهر، (ج) ثلاثة إلى أقل من ستة أشهر، (د) ستة أشهر إلى أقل من ستة أشهر، (ه) ستة أشهر أو أكثر.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6- كم عدد سنوات العمل تحت عمرك؟</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(أ) أقل من ثلاث سنوات، (ب) ثلاث سنوات إلى أقل من خمس سنوات، (ج) خمس سنوات إلى أقل من أربع سنوات، (د) أربعة سنوات إلى أقل من خمس سنوات، (ه) خمس سنوات أو أكثر.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

الخ: القياس الدقيق يتم خصمه أقسام تتعلق بعمال في المدرسة وعلاقته بموضوع إدارة المدرسة والمعلمين، والطلبة والآباء والمناهج الدراسية. كل قسم يأخذ بعضاً من الجمل، وفي نهاية كل جملة هناك خمس اختيارات كما يلي:
- دائمًا ( ) غالباً ( ) أحيانًا ( ) نادراً ( ) أبداً ( )
- أملنا أن يقرأ كل جملة بدقة ثم وضع ( ) في الاختيار الذي يتناسب وطبيعة عملك في المدرسة.
القسم الأول
دور مدير المدرسة في الإدارة المدرسية

1- أقوم بعمل جدول إداري يومي شامل للمدرسة عند بداية كل عام دراسي.
2- أطلب أن تُتخذ جميع القرارات المدرسية من وجهة نظر المدير وحدة.
3- أعمل فقط كمنسق ومستشار لأعمال المدرسة.
4- أنظم جدول عمل المدرسة لليوم التالي قبل انتهاء اليوم الدراسي.
5- أخصص معظم جدول عملي اليومي للجوانب التعليمية فضلاً عن المشاكل الإدارية.
6- أقوم بتوزيع الإحصائيات المدرسية على المعلمين في المدرسة لا المشاركة فيها.
7- أكمل المعلمين في الإدارة المدرسية بتوزيع المواد الدراسية على المدرسون من غير تدخل الإدارة.
8- أخصص كل جدول يومي للعمل الإداري في المدرسة.
9- أجد صعوبة في التعامل مع المعلمين في المدرسة بسبب كثرة الأعمال المدرسية.
10- أقوم بزيارات مفاجئة للمدرسة داخل الفصل لتقييمه والإبلاغ على مدى قدرته في أداء درسه.
11- أعتر ضيق بين عمل الإداري وعمل التربوي في المدرسة.
12- أعمل على مشاركة الآخرين في القرارات الإدارية حتى يكون لها النجاح.
القسم الثاني

علاقة مدير المدرسة مع هيئة التدريس

1- أتيح المجال لمسرحي المدرسة لحل مشاكلهم الخاصة من غير تدخل إدارة المدرسة في ذلك:
( ) دائمًا ( ) غالباً ( ) أحياناً ( ) نادراً ( ) أبداً

2- أعد على إيجاد الجو المناسب في المدرسة للمدرسين:
( ) دائمًا ( ) غالباً ( ) أحياناً ( ) نادراً ( ) أبداً

3- أتيح المجال لمسرحي التخصص الواحد في توزيع الحصص الدراسية بينهم من غير تدخل الإدارة.
( ) دائمًا ( ) غالباً ( ) أحياناً ( ) نادراً ( ) أبداً

4- أعد مع مدرسي المدرسة أفكار واحد لتحقيق أهداف المدرسة التربوية.
( ) دائمًا ( ) غالباً ( ) أحياناً ( ) نادراً ( ) أبداً

5- أتيح المجال للمدرسين في توزيع جدول الحصص الأسبوعي.
( ) دائمًا ( ) غالباً ( ) أحياناً ( ) نادراً ( ) أبداً

6- ألغ المدرسين بكل ما يحدث في المدرسة من أعمال.
( ) دائمًا ( ) غالباً ( ) أحياناً ( ) نادراً ( ) أبداً

7- أعد على حل مشاكل المدرسين التربوية وفق حديثها.
( ) دائمًا ( ) غالباً ( ) أحياناً ( ) نادراً ( ) أبداً

8- أعد المدرس المتبوع لجميع الأطقم والقرارات الإدارية.
( ) دائمًا ( ) غالباً ( ) أحياناً ( ) نادراً ( ) أبداً

9- أعد على إعطاء المدرس التوجيهات المدرسية بصورة فردية.
( ) دائمًا ( ) غالباً ( ) أحياناً ( ) نادراً ( ) أبداً

10- أعد اجتماعات دورية مع المدرسين من أجل مساعدتهم لحل مشاكل التربوية.
( ) دائمًا ( ) غالباً ( ) أحياناً ( ) نادراً ( ) أبداً

11- أعد الفروق الفردية في التعامل مع المدرسين.
( ) دائمًا ( ) غالباً ( ) أحياناً ( ) نادراً ( ) أبداً

12- أعد على أن تكون علاقات المدرسين في المدرسة غير محدودة بنطاق الرسميات والأطقم.
( ) دائمًا ( ) غالباً ( ) أحياناً ( ) نادراً ( ) أبداً
القسم الثالث
علاقة مدير المدرسة مع الطلبة
1- أعني الأولوية من عمل مشاكل طلبة المدرسة.
 دائماً ( ) غالباً ( ) أحياناً ( ) نادراً ( ) أبداً ( )
2- أعمل كل طالب كشخصية مستقلة وحالة خاصة.
 دائماً ( ) غالباً ( ) أحياناً ( ) نادراً ( ) أبداً ( )
3- أحرص على معرفة الفروق الفردية بين طلبة مدرستي.
 دائماً ( ) غالباً ( ) أحياناً ( ) نادراً ( ) أبداً ( )
4- أقوم بعمل رحلة جماعية مع كل مرحلة من المراحل الدراسية المختلفة خلال العام الدراسي.
 دائماً ( ) غالباً ( ) أحياناً ( ) نادراً ( ) أبداً ( )
5- أقوم بزيارة الطلبة في منازلهم إذا دعت الحاجة لذلك.
 دائماً ( ) غالباً ( ) أحياناً ( ) نادراً ( ) أبداً ( )
6- أساعد في حل مشاكل الطلبة حتى ولو كانت خارج نطاق المدرسة.
 دائماً ( ) غالباً ( ) أحياناً ( ) نادراً ( ) أبداً ( )
7- أقدر الطلاب المميز على غيرهم من الطلاب.
 دائماً ( ) غالباً ( ) أحياناً ( ) نادراً ( ) أبداً ( )
8- أقدر الطلاب المتفوق في دروسه على بالي زملائه.
 دائماً ( ) غالباً ( ) أحياناً ( ) نادراً ( ) أبداً ( )
9- أقدر الطلاب النشيط في الأنشطة المدرسية على غيرهم من زملائه.
 دائماً ( ) غالباً ( ) أحياناً ( ) نادراً ( ) أبداً ( )
10- أعمل جميع طلبة المدرسة كأثاث لنري.
 دائماً ( ) غالباً ( ) أحياناً ( ) نادراً ( ) أبداً ( )
11- أصح بالطلاب بالخروج من المدرسة وفق الأنظمة الرسمية.
 دائماً ( ) غالباً ( ) أحياناً ( ) نادراً ( ) أبداً ( )
12- أقوم بالإشراف العام خلال ممارسة الطلبة لأنشطة المدرسة.
 دائماً ( ) غالباً ( ) أحياناً ( ) نادراً ( ) أبداً ( )
القسم الخامس

علاقة المدير بالمناهج المدرسية

1. تتطلع مهاني إلى المناهج الدراسية من مهاني مدرسي المواد الدراسية لأنهم المثقفين الحقيقيين للمنهج.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>دائمًا ( )</th>
<th>غالبًا ( )</th>
<th>نادرًا ( )</th>
<th>أبداً ( )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

2. أعله على معرفة آراء مدرسي المواد الدراسية فيما يتعلق بصلاحيات المناهج الدراسية.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>دائمًا ( )</th>
<th>غالبًا ( )</th>
<th>نادرًا ( )</th>
<th>أبداً ( )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

3. أحرص على الاتصال بأداري في وضع المناهج الدراسية.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>دائمًا ( )</th>
<th>غالبًا ( )</th>
<th>نادرًا ( )</th>
<th>أبداً ( )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

4. أعمل اجتماع مع مدرسي المدرسة لمناقشة على المناهج الدراسية قبل تدريسها.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>دائمًا ( )</th>
<th>غالبًا ( )</th>
<th>نادرًا ( )</th>
<th>أبداً ( )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

5. أصر على اختيار الطريقة التي تتم بها عملية اختيار وتنفيذ المناهج الدراسية من قبل المعلمين.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>دائمًا ( )</th>
<th>غالبًا ( )</th>
<th>نادرًا ( )</th>
<th>أبداً ( )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

6. أطلع يوميًا على تفكير تحضير المدرسين للمواد الدراسية.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>دائمًا ( )</th>
<th>غالبًا ( )</th>
<th>نادرًا ( )</th>
<th>أبداً ( )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

7. أتابع تنفيذ المناهج الدراسية من قبل مدرسي المدرسة من خلال زيارات المدرسة المتكررة للحصول على المناهج الدراسية.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>دائمًا ( )</th>
<th>غالبًا ( )</th>
<th>نادرًا ( )</th>
<th>أبداً ( )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

8. أعمل على أن تكون إدارة المدرسة منظمة لتنفيذ المناهج الدراسية من غير تغيير، ولم كان فيها بعض الملاحظات.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>دائمًا ( )</th>
<th>غالبًا ( )</th>
<th>نادرًا ( )</th>
<th>أبداً ( )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

9. أتابع استخدام الوسائل التعليمية من قبل مدرسي المدرسة عند تنفيذ المناهج الدراسية.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>دائمًا ( )</th>
<th>غالبًا ( )</th>
<th>نادرًا ( )</th>
<th>أبداً ( )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

10. أحرص على إقامة إجتماعات دورية مع المدرسين لمناقشة أفضل الطرق لتنفيذ المناهج الدراسية.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>دائمًا ( )</th>
<th>غالبًا ( )</th>
<th>نادرًا ( )</th>
<th>أبداً ( )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

11. أعمل على تنفيذ الزيارات الخارجية للكتابة الدراسية التي تساعد على الخدمة التعليمية.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>دائمًا ( )</th>
<th>غالبًا ( )</th>
<th>نادرًا ( )</th>
<th>أبداً ( )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

12. أرسل وجهة نظري في المناهج الدراسية إلى الجهات المنظمة.

| دائمًا ( ) | غالبًا ( ) | نادرًا ( ) | أبداً ( ) |
بالإضافة إلى إجابتك على الأسئلة السابقة، الرجاء استخدام هذه الورقة لإضافة ما تراه من معلومات مهمة تتعلق بإدارة المدرسة.
لم يرد ذكرها في هذه الإستبانة.
Appendix E

Survey Form in English With Answer Key
FIRST PART: The six questions below concern your education, background, and experience related to your administrative position. Please choose the response that best describes you for each question and mark (X) for the response you have chosen.

1. What is the highest academic degree you have earned to date?
   a. ( ) Teachers' Training Institute degree.
   b. ( ) Coaches' Training Institute degree.
   c. ( ) Junior College degree.
   d. ( ) Teachers' College degree.
   e. ( ) University.
   f. ( ) Other; please specify ................

2. How many years did you teach before you worked as a principal?
   a. ( ) One to less than five years.
   b. ( ) Five to less than ten years.
   c. ( ) Ten to less than fifteen years.
   d. ( ) Fifteen years and above.

3. How long did you work as assistant principal?
   a. ( ) Not at all.
   b. ( ) One to less than five years.
   c. ( ) Five to less than ten years.
   d. ( ) Ten to less than fifteen years.
   e. ( ) Fifteen years and above.

4. How many years of experience do you have as a school principal?
   a. ( ) One to less than five years.
   b. ( ) Five to less than ten years.
   c. ( ) Ten to less than fifteen years.
   d. ( ) Fifteen to less than twenty years.
   e. ( ) Twenty years and above.

5. How much additional administrative training have you received?
   a. ( ) None.
   b. ( ) Less than One month.
   c. ( ) One to less than three months.
   d. ( ) Three to less than six months.
   e. ( ) Six months to less than one year.
   f. ( ) One year and above.

6. Which of the following represents the age group you are in?
   a. ( ) Less than thirty years.
   b. ( ) Thirty to less than thirty-five years.
   c. ( ) Thirty-five to less than forty years.
   d. ( ) Forty to less than forty-five years.
   e. ( ) Forty-five to less than fifty years.
   f. ( ) Fifty years and above.
SECOND PART: The following five sections concern your job at school and your relationship with other administrators, administrative staff, teachers, students, parents, and school curricula. Each statement ends with five choices as follow: ( ) always ( ) often ( ) sometimes ( ) seldom ( ) never Please read each statement carefully and mark (x) for the response that indicates what you actually do in the situation described.

SECTION (1)

PRINCIPAL'S ROLE IN RELATION TO ADMINISTRATIVE ORGANIZATION

1. I make a comprehensive daily work plan for the school at the beginning of the school year.
   (1) always (2) often (3) sometimes (4) seldom (5) never

2. I require that school decisions be based on the principal's point of view.
   (1) always (2) often (3) sometimes (4) seldom (5) never

3. I act only as an organizer or coordinator of the school work.
   (1) always (2) often (3) sometimes (4) seldom (5) never

4. I organize my following day's schedule before the school day is over.
   (1) always (2) often (3) sometimes (4) seldom (5) never

5. I set aside a large portion of my daily schedule for attending to educational rather than administrative problems.
   (5) always (4) often (3) sometimes (2) seldom (1) never

6. I distribute work assignments to schools' employees rather than participating myself directly in the work.
   (1) always (2) often (3) sometimes (4) seldom (5) never

7. I direct administrators to distribute class assignments to teachers, rather than distributing them myself.
   (1) always (2) often (3) sometimes (4) seldom (5) never

8. I devote all my of daily schedule to the administrative process.
   (1) always (2) often (3) sometimes (4) seldom (5) never

9. I find it difficult to deal with school employees, due to my many school responsibilities.
   (1) always (2) often (3) sometimes (4) seldom (5) never
10. I make unexpected visits to assess teachers' ability to deliver their subject in class.
   (1) always (2) often (3) sometimes (4) seldom (5) never

11. I maintain a strict division between my administrative and educational roles.
   (1) always (2) often (3) sometimes (4) seldom (5) never

12. I request that others participate in my administrative decisions in order to assure success.
   (5) always (4) often (3) sometimes (2) seldom (1) never

SECTION (2)

THE PRINCIPAL'S RELATIONSHIP WITH SCHOOL TEACHERS

1. I allow school teachers to resolve their own problems individually without school administration interference.
   (1) always (2) often (3) sometimes (4) seldom (5) never

2. I work to create a suitable climate for school teachers.
   (5) always (4) often (3) sometimes (2) seldom (1) never

3. I allow teachers of the same subject area to allocate classes they will teach amongst themselves without administration interference.
   (5) always (4) often (3) sometimes (2) seldom (1) never

4. I work with school teachers as a team to achieve the educational goals.
   (5) always (4) often (3) sometimes (2) seldom (1) never

5. I accept teachers' opinions concerning the administration's distribution of weekly class schedules.
   (5) always (4) often (3) sometimes (2) seldom (1) never

6. I inform teachers in total detail concerning school operations
   (1) always (2) often (3) sometimes (4) seldom (5) never

7. I work to solve repetitive problems encountered by teachers at the time they happen.
   (1) always (2) often (3) sometimes (4) seldom (5) never

8. I emphasize having teacher obey all of the administrative rules and regulations.
   (1) always (2) often (3) sometimes (4) seldom (5) never
9. I emphasize teachers’ receiving administrative instructions individually.
   (5) always (4) often (3) sometimes (2) seldom (1) never

10. I hold meetings with my teachers in order to help resolve their problems.
    (5) always (4) often (3) sometimes (2) seldom (1) never

11. I respect Individual differences when dealing with the school teachers.
    (5) always (4) often (3) sometimes (2) seldom (1) never

12. I keep my relationship with my school faculty on a friendly and informal basis, rather than following conventional rules and regulations.
    (5) always (4) often (3) sometimes (2) seldom (1) never

SECTION (3)

THE PRINCIPAL’S RELATION WITH STUDENTS

1. I give top priority to students’ problems.
   (5) always (4) often (3) sometimes (2) seldom (1) never

2. I view each student as an individual and special person.
   (5) always (4) often (3) sometimes (2) seldom (1) never

3. I strive to know all the individual differences among students in my school.
   (5) always (4) often (3) sometimes (2) seldom (1) never

4. I ensure class trips for each grade level throughout the school year.
   (5) always (4) often (3) sometimes (2) seldom (1) never

5. I visit students at home when it is necessary to do so.
   (5) always (4) often (3) sometimes (2) seldom (1) never

6. I help to resolve students’ problems even for situations not directly connected with the school.
   (5) always (4) often (3) sometimes (2) seldom (1) never

7. I acknowledge distinguished students in ways beyond my acknowledgement of their peers.
   (1) always (2) often (3) sometimes (4) seldom (5) never
8. I instruct the school administration to acknowledge honor students in ways beyond the acknowledgment of their peers.
   (1) always (2) often (3) sometimes (4) seldom (5) never

9. I instruct the school administration to acknowledge students active in extra curricular programs beyond acknowledgement of their peers.
   (1) always (2) often (3) sometimes (4) seldom (5) never

10. I deal with students in a fatherly way, as if they were my own children.
    (5) always (4) often (3) sometimes (2) seldom (1) never

11. I allow students to leave school only for situations which abide by all school rules and regulations.
    (1) always (2) often (3) sometimes (4) seldom (5) never

12. I supervise students during extra-curricular school activities.
    (5) always (4) often (3) sometimes (2) seldom (1) never

SECTION (4)

THE PRINCIPAL'S RELATIONSHIP WITH THE SCHOOL ENVIRONMENT, PARENTS, AND SOCIETY

1. I strive to keep the educational process in school closely related to life in the society.
   (5) always (4) often (3) sometimes (2) seldom (1) never

2. I emphasize important social events and activities outside the school as essential to the total educational process.
   (5) always (4) often (3) sometimes (2) seldom (1) never

3. I strive to keep all parents and care-givers of students well informed concerning all school matters.
   (5) always (4) often (3) sometimes (2) seldom (1) never

4. I accept parents and care-givers involvement with school affairs.
   (5) always (4) often (3) sometimes (2) seldom (1) never

5. I require that parents and care-givers stay in touch with the school.
   (5) always (4) often (3) sometimes (2) seldom (1) never

6. I actively solicit information and informed opinion from parents and care-givers concerning the school.
(5) always (4) often (3) sometimes  (2) seldom (1) never

7. I keep parents and care-givers informed as to everything related to their children in school.
   (5) always (4) often (3) sometimes  (2) seldom (1) never

8. I require regular meetings with the students' parents and care-givers.
   (1) always (2) often (3) sometimes  (4) seldom (5) never

9. I suggest that parents and care-givers communicate directly with the school faculty without school administration involved.
   (5) always (4) often (3) sometimes  (2) seldom (1) never

10. I suggest that the parents and care-givers should be present to participate in resolving student problems.
    (5) always (4) often (3) sometimes  (2) seldom (1) never

11. I actively solicit parents and care-givers participation in school functions.
    (5) always (4) often (3) sometimes  (2) seldom (1) never

12. I hold the position that school is part of the social system and cannot be isolated from it.
    (5) always (4) often (3) sometimes  (2) seldom (1) never

SECTION (5)
THE PRINCIPAL'S RELATION TO SCHOOL CURRICULA

1. I attempt to correlate my own views concerning the school curricula with those of the teachers, since they are the direct practitioners concerning subject matter.
   (5) always (4) often (3) sometimes  (2) seldom (1) never

2. I work to know the opinions of the teachers concerning applicability of the schools' curricula.
   (5) always (4) often (3) sometimes  (2) seldom (1) never

3. I strive to incorporate the curriculum ideas of my school and teaching staff into national curriculum development.
   (5) always (4) often (3) sometimes  (2) seldom (1) never
4. I meet with all members of my teaching staff to thoroughly review curricula prior to implementation.
   (5) always (4) often (3) sometimes (2) seldom (1) never

5. I insist on a specific approach for both practice and assessment of school curricula.
   (1) always (2) often (3) sometimes (4) seldom (5) never

6. I daily see teachers' curricula notebook.
   (1) always (2) often (3) sometimes (4) seldom (5) never

7. I monitor teaching of the school curricula through regular classrooms visits.
   (1) always (2) often (3) sometimes (4) seldom (5) never

8. I require that the school administration support implementation of the accepted curricula, but not interfere with it in any way.
   (1) always (2) often (3) sometimes (4) seldom (5) never

9. I encourage using audiovisual approaches for teaching school curricula.
   (5) always (4) often (3) sometimes (2) seldom (1) never

10. I meet regularly with my teaching staff to improve their classroom performance.
    (5) always (4) often (3) sometimes (2) seldom (1) never

11. I support outside of school visits for classes to enrich their learning experience.
    (5) always (4) often (3) sometimes (2) seldom (1) never

12. I communicate through official channels my concerns related to my school curricula.
    (5) always (4) often (3) sometimes (2) seldom (1) never

In addition to information provided in response to the foregoing questions, please use the space below to add other information concerning your school and your role in which you find appropriate.
Appendix F

Human Subjects Institutional Review Board Approval
Date: January 30, 1995
To: Hamad AlKherb
From: Richard Wright, Interim Chair
Re: HSIRB Project Number 95-01-15

This letter will serve as confirmation that your research project entitled "The relationship between principals' length of administrative experience and organizational leadership behavior in selected boys' elementary schools of Qassim region in Saudi Arabia" has been approved under the exempt category of review by the Human Subjects Institutional Review Board. The conditions and duration of this approval are specified in the Policies of Western Michigan University. You may now begin to implement the research as described in the application.

Please note that you must seek specific approval for any changes in this design. You must also seek reapproval if the project extends beyond the termination date. In addition if there are any unanticipated adverse or unanticipated events associated with the conduct of this research, you should immediately suspend the project and contact the Chair of the HSIRB for consultation.

The Board wishes you success in the pursuit of your research goals.

Approval Termination: January 30, 1996

xc: Cowden, EDLD
Appendix G

Cover Letter of the Pilot Study
بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم

أخي الفاضل

السلام عليكم ورحمة الله وبركاته

هذه الاستباقية ليست الأجزاء من متطلبات إكمال درجة الدكتوراة في تخصص الإدارة التربوية من جامعة غرب متنين بالولايات المتحدة الأمريكية لأخيك/ حمد بن عبد العزيز الخرب، المبتعث من قبل جامعة الإمام محمد بن سعود الإسلامية - (فرع القصيم).

والهدف من هذه الدراسة معرفة العلاقة بين مدى خبرة مدير المدرسة الإبتدائية وصرفاته الإدارية والتربوية في المدرسة.

أخي الفاضل، أولاً أتمنى لك خالص شكري وتقديري على الجهد والوقت الذي سوف تقدمه وتبذله في تعبئة هذه الاستباقية، مع علمي بضيق الوقت لديك في وقت عملك اليومي حيث تأتي في شكل تواصل مع مدرستك وخاصة هذه الأيام، ولكن مع ذلك أمل منك ان تكون بما لديك من وقت بسير لمساعدتني في تعبئة هذه الاستباقية ثم إعادتها في أقرب وقت ممكن.

إجمال أخى الفاضل أن صدق ووضوعية نتائج هذا البحث يرتقي على دقة وأمانة الإجابة، ولذلك أمل منك الحرص في إجبارك، وإن تكون عنينا لي بعد الله في إكمال هذه الدرجة العلمية، كما أحب أن أضيف أن اجبارك أن تستخدم إلا لغرض البحث العلمي فقط، مع العلم أن الباحث ليس في حاجة لذكر اسم أو عنوان أو رقم الهاتف في الإجابة حتى لا تعرف شخصية المجيب، أمل منك أخى الفاضل قراءة الأسئلة بنفث احترام الإجابة المناسبة على هذه الاستباقية.

ولك جزيل الشكر والتقدير على تعاونك ووفقك.

أخوك المخلص
حمد بن عبد العزيز الخرب
BIBLIOGRAPHY


Ministry of Information (1993). *This is our country*. Jeddah, Saudi Arabia. P.O. Box 4797.


