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The purpose of this study was to determine if the leadership style behaviors of principals were related to the existence of effective schools. Leadership style behaviors of principals of Wisconsin public schools recognized as effective by the Blue Ribbon Schools Program were compared to a random sample of principals of Wisconsin public schools not identified as effective to determine if principals of effective schools demonstrated more democratic, participative leadership style behaviors. The relationship of elementary and secondary principals' leadership style behaviors to the existence of effective schools was also studied.

A Personal Data Sheet for demographic data and the Self-Scoring Survey of Educational Leadership by Nelson and Valenti (1993) were completed. The demographic data included a comprehensive background of principals' school structure, enrollment, gender, principal experience, degree, and teaching experience. The ideal leadership style behavior was defined as the most ideal way for a principal to handle an educational situation. The actual behavior provided additional data and was defined as the behavior the leader expects from teachers in handling a situation. A t test for independent means with a one-tailed directional test was computed. An alpha level of .05 was used to test the
Analysis of the demographic data indicated that the two sample groups were similar. From the findings that resulted from testing the hypothesis, it can be concluded that Wisconsin principals of effective, recognized Blue Ribbon Schools prefer to practice a greater frequency of ideal democratic, participative leadership style behaviors than Wisconsin principals of nonrecognized schools. The second hypothesis involved elementary principals which resulted in the same conclusion. From the results of the first two hypotheses, it was concluded that there was a relationship of ideal leadership style behaviors of principals to the existence of effective schools. This third hypothesis involved secondary principals. No conclusion could be drawn. The three hypotheses were tested using actual leadership style behaviors. Again, no conclusions could be drawn. The frustration created as a result of practicing democratic, participative leadership style behaviors by both groups in an ideal way to handle a situation versus the actual, expected behaviors of teachers was compared.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Statement of the Problem

Concerns about the quality of education in the United States have been expressed by parents, politicians, business leaders, educators, and other interest groups. Reports such as the National Commission on Excellence in Education's (1983) *A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform* typify the desire to stress the need for educational leadership and effective schools. The principal as educational leader has been identified by many researchers as a key component in the development of effective schools.

The leadership style of the principal has been posited by some researchers to be an influential factor in the development of effective schools. Leadership styles vary and are sometimes classified in a range as divergent as bureaucratic to democratic, participative in nature. The dynamics of the various leadership styles has been debated by researchers. The purpose of this study was to determine if the leadership style behaviors of principals were related to the existence of effective schools. Leadership style behaviors of principals of effective schools were compared to principals of schools not identified as effective to determine if principals of effective schools demonstrated more democratic, participative leadership style behaviors. The relationship of elementary and secondary principals' leadership style behaviors to the existence of effective schools were also studied.

1
Need for the Study

The topic of leadership styles and the development of effective schools addresses key issues of public concern. Schools in the United States have been compared and contrasted to Japanese and German schools. The media has focused on school leadership and effective schools. The February 16, 1990, Governors' Meeting with the President of the United States established the National Goals for Education. Effective schools in this study consist of schools recognized by the United States Department of Education's Blue Ribbon School Program. A study of leadership styles of principals of effective schools would provide useful information to principals, universities with educational administration programs, state departments of public instruction, and the United States Department of Education.

Many researchers have studied managerial behavior and leadership styles. Theories of leadership style that have been studied include topics such as actual leadership abilities, specific styles, traits of leaders, and situational leadership. Mintzberg's (1973) research on managerial work behavior was a leader in studying the influence of style and situational variables of school principals. Results from this study revealed that style had more influence on manager work behavior than did situational variables. Mintzberg's study has been followed by similar research studies by Duignan, 1980; Kmetz and Willower, 1982; Martin and Willower, 1981; Sproull, 1981; A. R. Thomas, Willis, and Phillips, 1981; and Willis, 1980. Rutherford, Hall, and Hord (1983) concluded that the primary objective of these studies identified manager work behavior and studied
the variables that influence that behavior.

Rutherford et al. (1983) developed the following conclusions from their research:

(1) previously identified characteristics of managers' working behavior have been confirmed, but behaviors are clearly influenced by style; (2) style has greater influence on manager behavior than situational variables; (3) it is possible to identify district manager styles; and (4) style is very stable despite varying behaviors. (p. 1)

This present study focused on the relationship of leadership style behaviors of principals to the existence of effective schools.

This topic was of special interest to this researcher because his school was recognized by the United States Department of Education’s Blue Ribbon Schools Program for "Excellence In Education" in 1985. The effective schools program at the elementary and secondary levels promote excellence in education and call national attention to groups of unusually successful public and private schools. Schools honored are extremely good at educating the students they serve with available resources. All can point to examples of effective practice and are inspirations to other schools striving for excellence in education. (Crossley, 1990, p. 1)

Schools selected for the Blue Ribbon Schools "Excellence in Education" award in 1992 were used as sources of exemplary practices for the America 2000 Education Strategy revealed by President Bush in an effort to achieve the National Education Goals. Alexander (1992) demonstrated support for the Blue Ribbon Schools Program "because of the role that recognition of excellence plays as an incentive to improve schools and as a stimulus for greater community involvement in education" (p. 1). The selection criteria for this award specified conditions of effective schools including leadership behaviors.
Arter (1988) stated the significance of such a study as:

Thus, at this time, it has generally been established that leadership characteristics are important for success in educational settings. There is also a great deal of anecdotal and research information about successful approaches. However, there are no final answers about what characteristics are most important, what the relative impact of leadership is when compared to other school factors, or how the most effective leadership might vary between situations. These are sources of continuing research. (p. 2)

Research has been conducted that studies the characteristics or leadership behavior of effective principals. However, most of the research has been completed at the elementary level (Task Force on Leadership and Management, 1991). Cuban (1983) noted that at the secondary school level there has been little research that identifies leadership behaviors common to effective principals and their schools. This study has included principals' leadership style behavior at the elementary and secondary levels.

The principal has been identified as a key component of effective schools. Terry (1988) stated:

A number of schools have been identified as effective by various studies. Researchers have attempted to identify what makes these schools effective. The presence of an effective principal has been determined repeatedly to be the most important characteristic of an effective school. (p. 1)

Austin (1979), Dean (1989), Edmonds (1979), Finn (1983), Hord (1984), Mackenzie (1985), Rutherford et al. (1983), and Rutter (1979) concurred with this statement. Cuban (1983) noted that research that describes what makes principals effective is sparse, especially at the secondary level. The leadership style of principals has been identified as significant to effective principals and their schools. Dean (1989) stated that "since principals have been identified as the pivotal figures in
identified effective schools, it is important to further identify and clarify what information and actions they employ to facilitate student academic growth significantly above levels recorded in less effective schools" (p. 3).

Brookover and Lezotte (1979), Edmonds (1979), and Rutter (1979) conducted significant research that posited that schools did make a difference. Effective schools overcame variables such as race and poverty to provide a quality education for students. Effective schools research has become vital in the identification of common characteristics of effective schools. This study has accomplished a research need by studying the relationship of leadership style behaviors of principals to the existence of effective schools.

Summary

By identifying the leadership style behaviors of principals of effective schools, principals might want to further study and incorporate those leadership style behaviors to improve their administrative effectiveness. The United States Department of Education, state departments of public instruction, school principals, professors of educational administration, and in-service planners would benefit from the results of this study. A key educational thrust in Wisconsin is focused on site-based participatory management. The conclusions from this study could add to the data and information related to this topic.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

The literature reviewed in this chapter focuses on the purpose of this study to determine if the leadership style behaviors of principals is related to the existence of effective schools. Leadership style of principals and effective schools research frame the main content of this chapter. In this study leadership style behaviors of principals of effective schools were compared to principals of schools not identified as effective to determine if principals of effective schools demonstrated more democratic, participative leadership style behaviors. This conceptual approach was also analyzed at the elementary and secondary levels. Chapter II consists of the following major sections: historical perspectives of leadership; leadership style research; principal key to effective schools; shared, participative decision making and empowerment; effective schools research; blue ribbon schools program; and summary.

Sources of information used in this literature review included periodicals, books, letters of correspondence, government publications, dissertations, and other materials. The Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC), Educational Index, Readers Guide to Periodic Literature, and Dissertation Abstracts International provided valuable assistance in this study.
Historical Perspectives of Leadership Style Theory

Leadership has been defined by numerous researchers. Stogdill (1974) stated that "there are almost as many definitions of leadership as there are persons who have attempted to define the concept" (p. 259). Yukl (1989) noted that "leadership has been defined in terms of individual traits, behavior, influence over other people, interaction patterns, role relationships, occupation of an administrative position, and perception by others regarding legitimacy of others" (p. 2). A few samples of popular leadership definitions include: "Leadership may be viewed as a process through which others are influenced to achieve goals in a specific way" (Owens, 1987, p. 129). "I define leadership as leaders inducing followers to act for certain goals that represent the values and the motivations—the wants and needs, the aspirations and expectations—of both leaders and followers" (Burns, 1978, p. 19). "Leadership is the observed effort of one member to change other members' behavior by altering the motivation of the other members or by changing their habits" (Bass, 1960, p. 447).

Leadership is "causative," meaning that leadership can invent and create institutions that can empower employees to satisfy their needs. Leadership is morally purposeful and elevating, which means, if nothing else, that leaders can, through deploying their talents, choose purposes and visions that are based on the key values of the work force and create the social architecture that supports them. Finally, leadership can move followers to higher degrees of consciousness, such as liberty, freedom, justice, and self-actualization. (Bennis & Nanus, 1985, p. 9)

Leadership definitions found in the literature were diverse and plentiful. The main thrust of leadership behavior focused on the leader engaging followers to act in the interests of the organizations to achieve goals.
An understanding of leadership definitions is significant to the historical review of leadership style theory.

The review of literature indicated that the topic of leadership style theory received considerable attention. Mazzarella and Smith (1989) concluded that leadership research has changed significantly over the last 50 years. They noted that the early studies focused on what makes a good leader and the traits of a leader. The next phase included the identification of the best leadership style. Situation leadership styles were then introduced which emphasized that each situation required a unique leadership style. Researchers then created the theory that leadership is the behavior of leaders. The next historical phase concluded that leadership resulted from an interaction of behaviors and traits of the leader. Current research in leadership styles includes all of those facets in complex theoretical approaches.

The principal must have a basic understanding of leadership theory to be able to determine an effective style. The concepts of leadership versus management were reviewed in the literature. Muth (cited in Arter, 1988) believed that leadership demands gaining respect and loyalty by establishing vision, values, and charisma. Leadership influences the members of organizations in the establishment and revision of goals, climate, and structure. Management functions merely maintain and operate the organization based on its current rules of operation. Hersey and Blanchard (1977) defined management as working with and through individuals and groups to accomplish organizational goals.

McGregor's (1960) Theory X and Theory Y provided a two-sided approach to leadership style theory. Theory X posits that people are
basically lazy and need to be supervised closely. They are motivated by material or other forms of reward or punishment. Theory Y posits that people are self-motivated, enjoy accomplishment, and want to make contributions to the organization. Theory Y emphasizes a humanitarian, motivational approach to leadership style. Mazzarella and Smith (1989) stated that "McGregor's theories have made an important contribution toward making leadership more humanistic" (p. 31). The Theory Y approach provides a foundation for participative leadership style. Other theories that stressed the importance of human relationships to the success of organizations included Herzberg's (cited in Stevens, 1988/1989) Motivation Hygiene Theory and Ouchi's (1981) Theory Z.

The three most prominent leadership theories reviewed in the literature included Halpin's (1958a) Initiating Structure and Consideration, Blake and Mouton's (1964) Managerial Grid, and Hersey and Blanchard's (1977) Situational Leadership Theory. Blake and Mouton's (1964) Managerial Grid contains five management styles. Halpin's (1958a) and Hersey and Blanchard's (1977) theories have four quadrant leadership models based on the two dimensions of relationship-oriented versus task-oriented leadership style behavior. Leaders concerned with relationship/people focus on the individuals in the organization and their welfare. Leaders concerned with task/production emphasize a more directive leadership behavior. This present study focused on democratic, participative leadership style behavior which is relationship oriented. This leadership style requires the development and integration of the staff into an effective team. Other leadership style behaviors were analyzed in this study to provide additional information. Idiocratic
leadership style behaviors focused on the individual's needs while bureaucratic and technocratic leadership style behaviors were directive, task oriented. The two-dimensional leadership approach was enhanced by Hersey and Blanchard's (1977) Situational Leadership Theory. Further theory development was influenced by Fiedler and Chemers's (1974) and Reddin's (1970) concern for the effectiveness element of leadership. The Situational Leadership Theory posits that a leader must use the leadership style that is appropriate for the maturity level of the individual or group in a particular situation. Situational leadership stresses flexibility of leadership styles.

The early theories regarding leadership style emphasized what style was best. Three leadership style behaviors emerged in the form of democratic, autocratic, and laissez-faire. Democratic style emphasized delegation, sharing of leadership tasks. Autocratic style focused on a directive, closely supervised approach to leadership. Laissez-faire style leaders permitted followers to operate in the organization under its rules and regulations and intervened when the leader believed it was necessary. This present study also incorporated democratic and bureaucratic styles but did not consider laissez-faire style. Mazzarella and Smith (1989) concluded that "although democratic styles frequently appeared to be the most effective, the theory began to emerge that no style of leadership was best in all situations" (p. 29). Situational leadership theory then became popular in research studies. However, Terry (1988) posited that "researchers today still search for the keys to the 'best' or most 'effective' type(s) of leadership and its characteristics or behaviors" (p. 23). Leadership style behaviors was defined in this present
study as the principal's behaviors in promoting educational leadership in school.

This section of the review of literature provided a brief, historical perspective of leadership style theory. The theories reviewed have a direct association with the research completed in this study.

Leadership Style Research

The effects of leadership style have been studied by researchers. Rutherford et al. (1983) concluded that leadership style is a powerful factor in studying managers' work. They posited that leadership style has influenced manager behavior and has a greater influence on behavior than situational variables. Another conclusion reached in the study by Rutherford et al. included the point that leadership style is stable and identifiable.

Research reviewed contained studies stressing one form of leadership style over another. The concept of bureaucratic versus democratic, participative leadership styles was popular in current studies. Conrath (1987) posited that schools are charged with the tasks of promoting democratic values, traditions, and allegiances; but too many schools function with authoritarian principles and strategies. J. R. Weber (1987) concluded that effective leadership by a principal demands flexibility in sharing responsibilities and ensuring the compatibility of leadership duties of the person delegated to perform the duties. The definition for democratic, participative leadership style behaviors in this present study also included the development and integration of a functional team. Degner (1992) stressed the value of shared decision making through
Wisconsin Education Association Council's Project Excellence Through Cooperative Educational Leadership (EXCEL).

Bailey and Adams (1990) noted that effective principals have to make a conscious choice for leadership. They noted that techniques for developing nonbureaucratic leadership have to be identified and used on a daily basis to achieve a "higher level of educational excellence" (p. 28). Adams and Bailey (1989) referred to bureaucratic leadership as the old story and nonbureaucratic leadership as the new story. They contended that as nonbureaucratic leadership theory is understood and implemented, principals are adopting a "new definition of leadership" and developing the power to produce effective results (pp. 90-91).

The trend of leadership style in the literature reviewed accentuated the democratic approach. Pellicer, Anderson, Keefe, Kelley, and McCleary (1990) referred to the need for a strong, collaborative leadership practice linked to advisory groups. They referred to leadership in education as "a shared responsibility" (p. 21). Crandall (1984) concluded that through joint planning and decision-making processes, school and district goals could be cooperatively planned in creating effective schools. Democratic, participative leadership style through transformational leadership is a popular trend in the development of effective schools. A shared collaborative environment created by a democratic, participative leadership style has been promoted by researchers.

The effects of leadership style and structure of an organization or group has been studied. Shanahan (1987/1988) cited a study by Nightingale which noted that supervisory style and organizational structure have effects that are statistically significant regarding member
participation in shared decision-making groups. Shanahan (1987/1988) suggested that educational organizations should be structured to encourage the use of the members' experience, knowledge, and skills. Shanahan posited the following:

Schools should allow for a participative style of leadership because the rank and file employee has the ability to participate directly in the making of many decisions. When either the organizational structure or the supervisory style does not recognize and take advantage of this characteristic, the groups will not be as effective as possible. (p. 12)

Shanahan (1987/1988) reported that 97.4% of the principals of effective schools exhibited leadership Style 2, high relationship/high task, and Style 3, high relationship/low task. Landis (1989) concluded that high relationship/high task behavior was the most frequent leadership style of secondary school principals in exemplary schools in the nation and in Alabama. Kaiser (cited in V. Thomas & Ogletree, 1986) noted that a transition in school leadership from a Theory X style to a participative Theory Y style is a tedious one.

Grobman and Hines (1956) researched the correlation between the principal and leadership style. Eight principals were surveyed to determine how they functioned in 85 different school situations. A high correlation was found with effective administrative behavior and democratic leadership style. The relationship between democratic, participative leadership style and effective principals has been established. The principal's leadership behavior demonstrated a strong effect on student, teacher, and community attitudes regarding the school. However, it had no effect on student and teacher relationships.

Some researchers posited that leadership styles of principals are
situational rather than a definite trait of the leader. Fiedler (1967) supported matching leaders to situations that were adaptable to the leader's preferred, natural style. Hersey and Blanchard (1977) suggested that leaders change their style to adapt to the situation. V. Thomas and Ogletree (1986) concluded that leadership style and job performance relationships are too complex to be identified with one leadership style. Each situation requires an appropriate style.

The position taken by researchers differ regarding the leader's ability to change styles. Fiedler's (1967) Contingency Theory does not provide for flexibility in style change. Fiedler viewed leaders as task-motivated or relation-motivated. Fiedler acknowledged that neither style was right for all situations. The leader would have to alter the situation to one where the leader would be compatible. Mazzarella and Smith (1989) noted that Hersey and Blanchard's position was that "some leaders have the ability to be flexible in style and others are more rigid; the most flexible are the most likely to be effective in jobs that require a lot of adaptability" (p. 41). Mazzarella and Smith (1989) noted that Reddin also believed that some leaders can change style and others do not have the flexibility to change. Mazzarella and Smith summarized Reddin's three important abilities traits as:

The first is "situational sensitivity," which enables leaders to diagnose situations. The second is "style flexibility," which allows them to match their styles to the situation, and the third is "situational management skill," which helps them to change the situation to fit their styles. (p. 41)

From the literature reviewed it can be concluded that leadership style research has accomplished little in regard to understanding the leader's most effective behaviors in educational situations. This present research
study conceptually focused on whether Wisconsin principals of effective recognized schools demonstrated more democratic, participative leadership style behaviors than Wisconsin principals of nonrecognized schools. The study was framed in an educational environment.

Principal Key to Effective Schools

The literature identified the principal as a key component to effective schools. Hord (1984) hypothesized that the efforts in school improvement and the degree to which school improvement is implemented are related to the leadership of the principal. She stated that this belief provided the "cornerstone" for her study of principals. Hord accentuated the importance of the principal in school improvement by noting that principals are the "gate keepers to change" (p. 40). Hall, Rutherford, Hord, and Hurling (1984) researched principal behaviors to note the specific types and combinations of leadership behavior demonstrated in the process to improve schools. Researchers have posited that principals view their leadership role differently. Hall, Hord, and Griffin (1980) found that principals vary in perspectives on how they view their role as instructional leader.

Research conducted in the 1980s regarding principal leadership and related roles emphasized the vital role principals possess in the operation of schools. Blumberg and Greenfield (1986) noted that "the building principal is the most critical figure in the life of a school" (p. 4). The role of principal has changed from its inception as a principal teacher that assumed both roles in school operation. The principalship has been described by Lipham, Rankin, and Hoeh (1985) as a demanding role.
requiring strong leadership.

Pellicer et al. (1988) conducted a national survey in 1987 for the National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP) to analyze and describe high school leaders and their schools. Earlier studies were conducted in 1965 and 1977. These reports were compared to the 1987 study wherever possible to note differences in a longitudinal perspective in the roles of principals as school leaders. Pellicer et al. concluded that over time principals have accepted increased managerial and supervisory responsibilities. The roles of the principalship had changed significantly. The role of the principal as school leader in 1987 was more concerned with "new educational directions than day-to-day operations, personal initiative than outside influences, and collaborative rather than unilateral decision making" (Pellicer et al., 1988, p. 67). The role of the principalship has expanded and the principal as school leader had become more vital in school improvement than the past. Pellicer et al. noted two major changes how the high school principalship was perceived by researchers. Pellicer et al. concluded that their research supported that the principalship consistently had been linked to school effectiveness. Also, the principalship has more frequently been referred to as a collaborative responsibility in reference to an administrative team, especially at the secondary level. The role and collaborative leadership style of the principal and the development of school effectiveness were evident in the literature.

A study by the California State Legislature (1978) reported that in effective schools "principals provide strong leadership and support" (p. 4). The study also concluded that "the principal is the most effective
agent for bringing about educational improvement for effective schooling" (p. 8). This position was shared by Barth (1982), Director of the Principals' Center at Harvard. Barth stated that "study after study suggests that when a principal provides strong leadership a school is likely to be effective" (p. 8). Arter (1988) stated that "one of the areas emphasized in the effective schools literature is school leadership. Leadership is presented as being essential for school effectiveness and efficiency" (p. 1). Dean (1989) concluded that effective school research studies emphasized the significance of principals' leadership in successful schools. The principal was described as the key element in research studies. Examples of studies include Austin (1979, 1981), Blumberg and Greenfield (1986), Brookover and Lezotte (1979), Levine and Stark (1981), Lipham (1981), Lipham et al. (1985), Sweeney (1982), and G. Weber (1971). The literature supports the theory that strong leadership by the building principal has been linked to effective schools.

Shared Decision Making and Empowerment

Shared decision making (SDM) and the resulting empowerment of organizational members have received considerable attention in the literature reviewed. Lindelow, Coursen, Mazzarella, Heynderickz, and Smith (1989) stated:

In recent decades, a reform movement has been building momentum both in public education and in other sectors of society, notably business. This reform movement can be seen as a broad attempt to make organizations more "democratic" and less authoritarian in their operation. A cornerstone of this reform movement is participative decision making (PDM). (p. 152)
Shanahan (1987/1988) noted that while shared, participative decision making is not a panacea for management problems, it has caused organizations to be more effective. Escabi (1985/1988) concluded that principals who perceive themselves as participating leaders manage more effective schools. Shanahan (1987/1988) stated:

> Effective school research indicates that effective principals have supportive staffs, and they have faith in the competence of the members of that staff. All of the studies and research in the area of participative decision making or democratic style of leadership which were utilized in this study agreed that support for the leader and productivity of the group are enhanced at least a little when the group members have some part in making the decisions that affect them. (p. 2)

This section of the review of literature demonstrates the trend toward democratic, participative, shared decision making, the empowerment of followers, and their influence on the effectiveness of the organization. This process results in transformational leadership qualities for the organization. This study and Shanahan's (1987/1988) study used the terms participative, shared decision making and democratic leadership style behavior synonymously. Transforming leadership behaviors will also be reviewed.

Many researchers believe that the democratic, participative approach is more successful than an autocratic approach. Hindeman (1955) stated that "democracy may be a somewhat slow, at times even cumbersome process but, in the long run, it is infinitely more efficient than autocracy in dealing with people regardless of their age, social level, or economic condition" (p. 2). This democratic approach to leadership assumes that those persons affected by a decision should have input in the decision-making process. Hindeman (1955) further noted
that "the administrator's ultimate goal must be the participation of all group members in the formulation of decisions and policies" (p. 23). Bass (1981) posited that "available evidence supports the contention that participative leadership promotes acceptance of decisions and agreements to a greater extent than does directive leadership" (p. 319). Bass (1981) further noted that subordinates' satisfaction and levels of job involvement tend to be greater when leaders/superiors utilize participatory leadership styles.

The sharing of power in the decision-making process raises some interesting points. In the educational environment, the principal who believes in participatory decision making has the ability to share and delegate power. However, the principal must still assume the responsibility of the decision for the organization. The democratic process of shared decision-making mandates that the principal retains the authority and responsibility for all decisions made for the organization. Lindelow, Coursen, and Mazzarella (1981) also noted that the formal and legal power structure of school governance does not change significantly during the participative decision-making process. Nottingham (1985) and Hitt (1988) posited that it was necessary for a principal to share power in order to gain power. Sharing power in the decision-making process has significant implications for principals.

The literature also noted that some researchers posited the belief that participatory decision making is only one approach to the process. Some cases demand a more directive, autocratic approach to decision making. Lipham (1981) supported the balancing of participatory and directive decision-making strategies. Lipham stated that "excessive
involvement causes frustration, whereas under involvement creates hard feelings. The sensitive principal strives for a condition of equilibrium" (p. 11). Wadia (1980) noted that decision-making strategies are not applied as a philosophy, but instead instruments for action. Wadia reviewed his position in the following metaphor:

Participative management is but a tool in the management bag. An executive proclaiming to be a participative manager is tantamount to a carpenter proclaiming to be a "hammer." Obviously, a carpenter has and needs a variety of tools in achieving objectives. Similarly, a manager needs a variety of techniques to achieve goals. (p. 927)

These researchers posited that managers exerting leadership strategies use a variety of decision-making mechanisms.

Shanahan (1987/1988) emphasized the benefits of participatory decision making as he stated that "the advantages noted through actual experience are mentioned with enough frequency to convince a student of participation that this method of leadership has positive long-range effects on the members of the organization" (p. 17). Wolfe (1961) and Hersey and Blanchard (1977) noted that productivity increased, a greater feeling of ownership, better understanding and acceptance of organizational goals, and a sense of team spirit were promoted when participatory practices were used. Barnard (1968) found that when subordinates were involved in the decision-making process in appropriate situations, they were motivated to make better decisions for the organization. Naisbett (1984) posited that there is a trend for increased local control in government emphasizing the concepts of democracy and individual rights. The literature contains numerous studies supporting democratic, participative, shared decision making.
The disadvantages of democratic, participative, shared decision making were also noted. Powers and Powers (1983) and Burton and Powell (1984) posited that lower staff morale and poor decisions resulted because democratic, participative management was received as weak management that led to communication and implementation problems. Powers and Powers (1983), Burton and Powell (1984), and Hersey and Blanchard (1977) noted that the time consumption involved with participative management is a negative factor. Burton and Powell (1984) and Hersey and Blanchard (1977) noted that some people functioned poorly in environments not associated with autocratic leadership strategies. Some situations require modifications to democratic, participative leadership styles.

Transformational leadership and empowerment of followers in an organization are significant constructs. Burns (1978) described transformational leadership as "when one or more persons engage with others in such a way that leaders and followers raise one another to higher levels of motivation and morality" (p. 20). The effective principal uses transformational leadership strategies to motivate and empower all staff in the school organization. Empowerment of followers is the process of instilling a pride of ownership through involvement in the democratic, participative decision-making process.

Effective leadership requires empowerment of leaders and followers at all levels. Bennis and Nanus (1985) stated:

When individuals feel that they can make a difference and that they can improve the society in which they are living through their participation in an organization, then it is much more likely that they will bring vigor and enthusiasm to their tasks and that the results of their work will be mutually
reinforcing. Under these conditions, the human energies of the organization are aligned toward a common end, and a major precondition for success has been satisfied. (p. 91)

Empowerment of followers provides motivation and cohesion.

Transformational leadership involves creating a vision for an organization or group that embraces the values and motivations shared by leaders and followers. A key component of transformational leadership is the empowerment and motivation of followers in planning and implementing that vision. Transformational leadership involves earning the trust of followers while modeling the integrity and sense of purpose. The quality of personal interactions engaged in determines the success in understanding and collaboratively achieving the mission, beliefs, and goals of the organization.

Burns (1978) defined leadership as:

leaders inducing followers to act for certain goals that represent the values and the motivations--the wants and needs, the aspirations and expectations--of both leaders and followers. And the genius of leadership lies in the manner in which leaders see and act on their own and their followers' values and motivations. (p. 19)

This definition of leadership stresses that leaders must stimulate followers to work in a collaborative effort to achieve the shared goals. The concepts of followership and leadership become united.

There is a significant distinction between transformational and transactional leadership. Yukl (1989) noted that transactional leaders emphasize power, control, and respect for rules and tradition. This behavior represents an autocratic leadership style. They achieve goals by manipulating followers through techniques such as negative feedback and rewarding for compliance. Both transactional and transformational
leaders are interested in goal achievement. However, the process by which these goals are achieved is where the distinction is made. Transformational leaders embrace the values and motivations of both the leaders and followers. They encourage and empower followers to assume ownership and leadership in organizational vision and goals. They motivate followers to go beyond the definition of follower expectations.

An explanation for the shortage of effective leadership in the world today is related to the belief that leadership can no longer be associated with power-wielding managers or leaders who only use a transactional leadership style. Bennis and Nanus (1985) summarized this point as follows:

Through the years, our view of what leadership is and who can exercise it has changed considerably. Leadership competencies have remained constant, but our understanding of what it is, how it works, and the ways in which people learn to apply it has shifted. (p. 3)

This researcher believes that this shift includes the use of transformational leadership. Burns (1978) stated:

The transforming leader looks for potential motives in followers, seeks to satisfy higher needs and engages the full person of the follower. The result of transformational leadership is a relationship of mutual stimulation and elevation that converts followers into leaders and may convert leaders into moral agents. (p. 4)

Transformational leadership must be present if organizations and their members are to attain maximum success in achieving goals and maintaining a positive climate.

Burns (1978) indicated that transformational leadership is a process by which "leaders and followers raise one another to higher levels
of morality and motivation" (p. 20). Burns further noted that "their purposes, which might have started out as separate but related, as in the case of transactional leadership, become fused. Power bases are linked not as counterweights but as mutual support for common purpose" (p. 20). Interactions engaged in involve the understanding and achieving the mission, beliefs, and goals of the organization. Bass (1985) posited that transactional leaders clarify the rule and task requirements for subordinates and provide direction as well as contingent reinforcement to motivate the subordinates to accomplish desired goals. Whereas transformational leaders induce motivation to go beyond goals. Two factors related to transactional leadership include behavior contingent reward and management-by-exception. Bass related to the three dimensions of transformational leadership as charisma, individualized consideration, and intellectual stimulation. Hunt (1991) reinforced the fact that transformational leaders go beyond goals established by transactional leadership such as basic human emotions to ideals and moral values. This position also reinforces enabling followers to go beyond goals in reaching a higher level of motivation in leadership. The beliefs of the authorities cited demonstrate that defining leadership is a complex task encompassing the relationships between leaders and their followers. Specifically, the transforming of followers into leadership roles.

Definition of Empowerment

A key factor of effective transformational leadership is the empowerment of followers. Hitt (1988) stated:
As its principal means of motivation, transforming leadership relies on empowerment. With power being defined as the capability for doing or accomplishing something, "empowerment" means to give power to followers. Leaders empower their people by increasing their capability for doing or accomplishing something. (pp. 152-153)

Hitt (1988) further explained that "the superiority of empowerment is found in the way people are treated" (p. 154). He noted that transactional leadership treats people like pawns. Hitt stated: "But inasmuch as empowerment treats people as persons, they will put forth their best effort--go beyond what is expected of them, and this is what motivation is all about" (p. 154).

The purpose of transformational leadership is to develop vision and values for the organization and to stimulate change by empowering followers. Leadership provides direction for an organization in accomplishing its goals. Bennis and Nanus (1985) emphasized this point as they described leadership as the source of vision for an organization and the means to convert the vision into practical applications. Leaders who have not provided vision to an organization and fail to motivate and empower members will not be successful in creating change. Bennis and Nanus (1985) posited:

Leaders have failed to instill vision, meaning, and trust in their followers. They have failed to empower them. Regardless of whether we're looking at organizations, government agencies, institutions or small businesses, the key and pivotal factor needed to enhance human resources is leadership. (p.8)

Busch (1989) emphasized the need for organizational vision that is shared by all members. Busch stated:

If an organization has no clear vision, it has literally lost its basic reason for existence. A problem also can exist when an organization has a vision that is not shared by all
employees. It is obvious that employees share a vision when they consciously address the issues of how they want to work together and what they must do. (p. 7)

Transformational leaders incorporate democratic, participative leadership and go beyond transactional leadership when they assist in creating vision and empower followers in defining and implementing change for the organization.

The engagement of leaders and followers is a vital component to goal setting and attainment. Owens (1987) stated:

James MacGregor Burns, emphasizing the symbiotic relationship between leadership and followership, points out that, although they do exercise various kinds of power, leaders engage with followers in seeking to achieve not only their own goals but also significant goals of the followers. (pp. 157-158)

Organizational goals are successfully achieved when they are mutually established and worked on by leaders and engaged followers.

Organizational Climate

The organizational climate and related culture of an organization are key factors in the organization's success. Transformational leadership and empowerment of followers should produce a phenomena of a collegial, democratic, and participatory climate. Streshly (1992) endorsed this form of climate as he stated that "the shared attitudes and commitment to common values, which form the bases of strong cultures, can certainly be influenced (if not shaped) by staff involvement in the development of school missions, goals, values, and purposes" (p. 58). The followers in such an organizational climate support the purposes and values of the organization and also seek self-satisfaction.
through ownership in working toward these goals.

Teacher empowerment is in tune with restructuring efforts in the educational field. Kirby, Wimpelberg, and Keaster (1992) referred to the "second wave" of national education reform as "the strand that promotes school restructuring and teacher empowerment. Principals' development and teacher empowerment converge in these principal center programs that treat the school as a community of decision-makers" (p. 90). Democratic, participatory school climates encourage followers to assume ownership and pride in organizational missions and goals. Transformational leadership and empowerment of followers encourage this form of climate.

The impact of team leadership and team building play a significant role in defining current transformational leadership trends. Hitt (1988) stated that "teams are collections of people who must rely on group collaboration if each member is to experience the optimum of success and goal achievement" (p. 70). Collaboration requires that transformational leaders empower followers in the team process. Hitt (1988) identified four attributes of team leaders:

1. Team leaders place considerable emphasis on team building.
2. Team leaders understand that the whole is greater than the sum of its parts.
3. Team leaders realize that sharing power with their people will increase their own power.
4. Team leaders are not threatened by the sharing of power. (pp. 68-69)

The process of transforming and empowering followers in team building produces positive results for the individuals and their organizations.
In making reference to principals, Pellicer et al. (1990) posited that "effective principals develop strong, collaborative teams linked to advisory groups. The primary advisory groups are faculty committees, department chairpersons, student councils, and parent advisory boards" (p. 22). Transformational leadership lends itself to team leadership because of the empowerment granted to team members in the decision-making process.

Kelley (1992) noted that leaders can assist team building by becoming facilitators. Kelley cautioned that leaders need to help facilitate teams to "review past actions, . . . learn from their mistakes, practice together, set new goals, . . . and build team spirit" (p. 218) to be highly functioning teams. To simply assemble people into a team and expect collaboration and goal achievement is not a correct procedure.

**Site-Based Management**

The collegial, participatory phenomena achieved when transformational leadership and empowerment of followers occur has been demonstrated by site-based management programs. Education has recently received criticism regarding its structure and student test scores. This has resulted in numerous educational reforms attempting to restructure educational programs and establish democratic forms of management systems. Bacharach (cited in Streshly, 1992) believed that what has resulted from all of the controversy and change is the reaffirmation of the critical role of the school principal, the importance of staff empowerment, and the efficiency of site-based management. The end product of this commitment is a democratic, participatory school culture that
promotes ownership by leaders and followers. Streshly (1992) emphasized that school "administrators have noted the advantages gained through the 'ownership' that staff and community members feel when they are heavily involved in program development" (p. 59). This empowerment and involvement will obtain the same results in all phases of the educational setting.

The significance of a transformational leader in the empowerment of followers has been stressed. Bernd (1992) stated that "teacher empowerment loses its effectiveness if the teachers do not have an instructional leader to keep them on track, well-informed, and involved" (p. 64). The transformational leader empowers followers, provides resources, stays current on research and information, and facilitates the group to reach its mission and goals.

The theory grounded in transformational leadership and empowerment of followers appears to produce effective results. However, success from empowerment of followers just doesn't happen. A vital component to empowerment and site-based management involves training and staff development for everyone. Alvarez (1992) stated:

Training and staff development are necessary not only as a prerequisite step to shared decision-making situations. In particular, shared decision-making in itself does not build commitment or make schools better places to work and learn. Teachers must have previous experiences that stress personal validation, build collegiality, and provide opportunities for inquiry and reflection. (pp. 70-71)

Staff readiness to become involved in the decision-making process with site-based management is essential. Successful implementation of site-based management does reflect the phenomena which occurs when transformational leaders and empowerment of followers are engaged.
Effective Schools Research

The demand for quality schools and excellence in education is not a new idea. Each decade seemed to be labeled with an emphasis of alleged failure of the public schools. Dean (1989) stated:

Schools were cited for their program inadequacies in science and math in the 1950's when the Russians were first to launch a space satellite. In the 1960's they were faulted for their meager results in remedying societal problems addressed through the innovative programs of the Great Society. And in the 1970's they were criticized for their failure to maintain or improve basic literacy skills, as measured through achievement and other forms of standardized testing. (p. 1)

The National Commission on Excellence in Education's report in 1983 raised grave concerns over the state of public education in the United States.

The Coleman Report (cited in Dean, 1989) provided a stimulus for researchers to investigate what characteristics were present in effective schools. The Coleman Report suggested that schools could do relatively nothing to overcome the handicaps of race and poverty. Researchers such as Brookover and Lezotte (1979), Edmonds (1979), and Rutter (1979) refuted this position positing that schools did make a difference. Researchers have continued to study effective schools by comparing effective versus noneffective schools and noting the curricular programs, leadership factors, school climate, expectations and standards, etc. of effective schools.

Effective schools research conducted by Austin (1979) concluded that the principal was the most significant factor for achieving school effectiveness. Austin (1981) posited that key elements of exemplary
schools included the leadership style of the principal and related structures which focused on students' abilities in a positive manner. Edmonds (1979) cited strong building-level leadership as a key factor in effective schools. Rutter (1979) noted that there were high expectations for academic success and that students were responsible for personal behavior and school related duties. The principal must be responsible for providing the necessary leadership in establishing an effective school. Smith, Mazzarella, and Piele (1981) explained the importance of the principal to school effectiveness in this statement: "It is clear that no single person is more key to school effectiveness than the principal and that the deciding factor in determining this effectiveness is the leadership he or she brings to the school" (p. xvii). The relationship between principals' leadership and effective schools has been established.

The principal's leadership behavior has been emphasized by researchers. Terry (1988) stated that "many researchers have reported that the effective principal is normally assertive while being willing to listen to the problems and ideas of others. Here again the idea of shared power comes to the forefront" (p. 35). Nottingham (1985) noted that the principal's gain in power requires that power is shared.

Researchers have posited that effective schools have effective principals who are successful in their work. McKinney (1986) stated that successful principals demonstrate behaviors that are innovative, creative, enthusiastic, and knowledgeable. They nurture and provide encouragement for others to be leaders. These principals build trust with all stakeholders of the school. Finn (1983) noted that effective
schools have effective principals. One of the characteristics of effective schools identified by Finn was a team approach with shared objectives. Huddle (1984) stated that principals were more effective when they possessed the ability to manage by consensus. In an analysis of studies of the directive and supportive leadership behavior of principals, Lipham (1981) reported three descriptions of the leadership role of the principal as:

1. Strong leaders create successful schools.
2. A management team approach is far more effective than an autocratic style of leadership.
3. Many leadership studies indicate that principals hold fast to a particular style of leadership rather than shift as the circumstances warrant. (p. 6)

Effective schools research appears to recognize the importance of a successful principal and democratic, participative leadership style behaviors in the development of an effective school.

The need to conduct research related to principal leadership style behaviors and its impact on the development of effective schools was evident. The central conceptual hypothesis for this research study was: The leadership style behaviors of Wisconsin principals of effective schools recognized for "Excellence in Education" is more democratic, participative than the leadership style behaviors of Wisconsin principals of schools not recognized for "Excellence in Education." Mazzarella (1985) cited a review by Martinko, Yukl, and Marshall that stated that "there is a deficiency in the literature with respect to a review of effective principal behaviors in secondary schools" (p. 2). The review of literature indicated that most effective schools research was done at the
elementary level. Conklin (1990) and Dean (1989) conducted studies related to leadership behaviors of elementary principals in effective and distinguished schools compared to ineffective and nondistinguished schools. Two other hypotheses studied in this research included an analysis of the elementary and secondary levels using the central hypothesis. This additional research should be valuable in the analysis of effective schools and leadership style behaviors.

Blue Ribbon Schools Program

Many effective schools research studies used test score(s) as a method to identify such schools. Sudlow (1985) cited Lezotte's three criteria for effective schools including 95% of the students demonstrating academic mastery to advance to the next grade level in any school, no significant difference in academic mastery and socioeconomic groups, and maintaining the previous criteria for three consecutive years as being a precise definition. D'Amico (1982) noted that even influential studies conducted by Brookover and Lezotte (1979), Edmonds and Frederickson (1978), and Rutter (1979) differed in their definitions of effectiveness. D'Amico (1982) suggested that researchers should use caution in generalizing effective schools studies results and define effective schools to meet the needs of their particular research. This study used the Blue Ribbon Schools Program for "Excellence in Education" sponsored by the United States Department of Education as its definition of effective schools. R. L. Brown (1991/1992), Koger (1987/1988), Stevens (1988/1989), and Terry (1988) used schools selected for "Excellence in Education" by the Blue Ribbon Schools Program in fulfilling their
definition of effective, recognized schools. Principals of effective, recognized Blue Ribbon Schools comprised one group in this study to determine if there was a relationship of leadership style behaviors of principals to the existence of effective schools. The second group of principals represented schools not included in the Blue Ribbon Schools Program.

The Blue Ribbon Schools Program was created by former Secretary of Education, Terrance H. Bell, in 1982. The United States Department of Education recognized these schools as exemplary. The Blue Ribbon Schools Program was initially called the Secondary School Recognition Program and later expanded to include the Elementary School Recognition Program. Crossley (1990) noted that Blue Ribbon Schools promote excellence in education and call national attention to groups of unusually effective public and private schools. Schools honored are extremely good at educating the students they serve with available resources. All can point to examples of effective practice and are inspirations to other schools striving for excellence in education. (p. 1)

The concept of "Excellence in Education" is the key focus of the Blue Ribbon Schools Program. The intent of the program was never focused on a perfect or model school. These schools, however, did serve as examples of how schools could be effective regardless of the conditions in which they existed.

The Blue Ribbon Schools Program could be considered as a leader in promoting school reform. The United States Department of Education's (1991) Blue Ribbon Schools: A Profile of Principals noted:

By design, the Blue Ribbon Schools Program is closely aligned with the National Education Goals and America
Exemplary schools provide an example and motivation to others in promoting effective schools and "Excellence in Education." Outstanding academic accomplishments and school, community pride are traits of these schools. Former Secretary of Education William Bennett (cited in Glickman, 1987) stated that in exemplary schools "students are receiving a good education; teachers, principals, and staff are achieving the results every school strives to achieve; parents are involved in making a difference in their children's education; and communities enthusiastically provide strong support" (p. 1).

The Blue Ribbon Schools Program promoting "Excellence in Education" has been administered by the United States Secretary of Education's office in conjunction with each state's department of education. The program has two components: the Secondary School Recognition Program and the Elementary School Recognition Program. The secondary program was conducted in school years 1982-83, 1983-84, 1984-85, 1986-87, 1988-89, 1990-91, and 1992-93. The elementary program was conducted in school years 1985-86, 1987-88, 1989-90, and 1991-92. Nominations for this recognition are voluntary. Nominations are first submitted to the school's state department of education for review to determine if it meets the criteria and standards. Each state has a quota for the number of nominations permitted to be forwarded to Washington, DC. This quota is based on population and representation.
in Congress. State nominations for the Blue Ribbon Schools Program "Excellence in Education" award are submitted to the United States Department of Education in Washington, DC. There a National Review Panel scrutinizes each nomination form to determine if the criteria and standards for this honor have been attained. Schools that meet the criteria and standards are recommended for a 2-day site visit. The purpose of the site visit is to verify that the information submitted on the nomination form is accurate. The site visitor then completes a site visitor report that is reviewed in conjunction with the original nomination form by the National Review Panel. The National Review Panel has the authority to determine if a school is to be recognized.

Each school must demonstrate that it has achieved recognition status. The school's nomination must present clear evidence that students are developing a firm foundation of reading, writing, and mathematics skills in addition to being able to reason and problem solve. Evidence of high quality instruction in literature, history, geography, science, the arts, and other subjects mandated by the school district and state must be provided. Clear evidence must exist which demonstrates that school policies, programs, and practices promote the development of sound character, a sense of self-worth, democratic values, ethical judgment, and self-discipline. The school should have strong leadership and effective working relationships with all stakeholders in the educational process. Parental and community support for education are vital components. The nomination form includes seven conditions of effective schooling. They include leadership, teaching environment, curriculum and instruction, student environment, parental and
community support, indicators of success, and organizational vitality (United States Department of Education, 1992). Standards in each of these areas are not fixed. The school is judged in the context of how well it meets its goals in each of the areas in promoting quality education.

Certain characteristics were scrutinized in reviewing each nominated school. The 14 characteristics included:

1. clear academic goals; 2. high expectations for students, 3. order, discipline and freedom from abuse; 4. rewards and incentives for students; 5. regular and frequent monitoring of student progress; 6. development of good character and values; 7. teacher input and staff development; 8. rewards and incentives for teachers; 9. concentration on academic learning; 10. positive school climate; 11. administrative leadership; 12. well-articulated curriculum; (13) evaluation for instructional improvement; and (14) community support and involvement. (United States Department of Education, 1983, pp. 2-3.

These characteristics have been associated with school effectiveness in the literature reviewed. Student outcomes or evidence of student success were also reviewed. They included achievement tests, minimum competency tests, student success in high school or postsecondary education, school dropout rates, awards for outstanding school programs, and teaching (United States Department of Education, 1983). In 1983-84 two additional student outcomes were added including attendance rates and student awards in academic or vocational competition (United States Department of Education, 1983). Student outcomes have been a primary condition for most effective schools research.

The Blue Ribbon Schools Program operates the Secondary and Elementary School Recognition Programs on alternate years. The Elementary School Recognition Program consists of Grades K-8 and the
Secondary School Recognition Program, Grades 5-12. The middle grades have been included in each program to permit the local school district to determine how to classify the middle grades. Middle level schools must make the decision to participate in the elementary or secondary program. Middle level schools must limit their participation to only one program.

The Blue Ribbon Schools Program provides recognition to schools demonstrating "Excellence in Education." The program assesses school effectiveness in a comprehensive manner including characteristics and standards associated with effective schools research and student outcomes. This distinguished recognition demands that a school earns the distinction of being effective by demonstrating excellence in many categories of school qualities.

Summary

From the review of literature it can be concluded that democratic, participative leadership style behaviors were becoming more popular in educational organizations. Leadership style behavior was defined in this study as the principal's behaviors in promoting educational leadership in schools. Democratic, participative leadership style behaviors were defined as those which require the development and integration of the staff into an effective team with the source of authority being the codes, standards, and goals of the group. The concepts of democratic, participative team-oriented leadership style behaviors were stressed frequently in the literature. Leadership definitions found in the literature were diverse and plentiful. The main thrust of leadership behavior focused on
the leader engaging followers to act in the interests of the organization to achieve goals.

The phases of leadership style theory consisted of: (a) identification of the best leadership style, (b) situational leadership where each situation required a unique leadership style, (c) leadership is the behavior of leaders, (d) leadership resulted from an interaction of behaviors and traits of the leader, and (e) inclusion of all of these facets in complex theoretical approaches. The leadership styles identified with early studies included democratic, autocratic and laissez-faire. Laissez-faire leadership style was not included in this study. The democratic style appeared to be the most effective. However, the situational approach later became more popular. Key researchers who emphasized the importance of human relationships to the success of organizations include McGregor's (1960) Theory X and Theory Y, Herzberg's (cited in Stevens, 1988/1989) Motivation-Hygiene Theory, and Ouchi's (1981) Theory Z. The three prominent leadership theories reviewed in the literature included Halpin's (1958a) Initiating Structure and Consideration, Blake and Mouton's (1964) Managerial Grid, and Hersey and Blanchard's (1977) Situational Leadership Theory. These theories included four quadrant leadership models based on the two dimensions of task-oriented versus relationship-oriented leadership style behavior. Hersey and Blanchard's (1977) Situational Leadership Theory enhanced the two dimensions of task and relationship. Further theory development was influenced by Fiedler and Chemers's (1974) and Reddin's (1970) concern for the effectiveness element of leadership.
Leadership style research noted that leadership style is a significant concept in studying the work of leaders. Rutherford et al. (1983) concluded that leadership style is stable and identifiable. Research reviewed stressed one leadership style as more effective than another. Democratic, participative leadership style received considerable attention. Bailey and Adams (1990), Conrath (1987), Degner (1992), Pellicer et al. (1990), and Shanahan (1987/1988), to mention a few, all supported democratic, participative leadership style as the most effective for organizations. A shared, collaborative environment created by a democratic, participative leadership style has been promoted by researchers. Some studies searched the correlation between principal and leadership style. Grobman and Hines (1956) found a high correlation with effective administrative behavior and democratic leadership style. The relationship between democratic, participative leadership style and effective principals has been established. Others, such as Hersey and Blanchard (1977) examined the effects on situational styles rather than leader traits. The leader's ability to change styles was also researched.

The literature identified the principal as a critical component to effective schools. Principals were described by researchers such as Hord (1984) as the "gate keepers to change" (p. 40) and Blumberg and Greenfield (1986) as "the most critical figure in the life of a school" (p. 4). Pellicer et al. (1988) concluded that their research supported that the principalship consistently had been linked to school effectiveness. The building principal and related leadership was recognized as the key factor in effective school research. Researchers such as Arter (1988), Barth (1982), California State Legislature (1978), Dean (1989) and
Participative, shared decision making (SDM) and the resulting empowerment of followers received considerable attention in the review of literature. Democratic leadership practices in the form of participative decision making has been labeled by Lindelow et al. (1989) as the cornerstone of the educational reform movement. Escabi (1985/1988) concluded that principals who perceive themselves as participating leaders manage more effective schools. This present study and one completed by Shanahan (1987/1988) both defined participative, shared decision making and democratic leadership style synonymously. Researchers have conducted studies that have posited that the democratic, participative approach to leadership or power in this process does not, however, release the principal, as building leader, of being responsible for the decisions. Others posited that participative decision making is only one strategy in the management process. Wolfe (1961), Hersey and Blanchard (1977), and Barnard (1968) noted that the advantages of participative, shared decision making included factors such as increased productivity, improved decision making, feeling of ownership, and the pride in being a part of the team. Powers and Powers (1983), Burton and Powell (1984), and Hersey and Blanchard (1977) noted that disadvantages included the perception of weak management, lower staff morale, poor communication, time consumption, and followers not being able to cope with participative environments. The democratic, participative leadership environment results in transformational leadership. A key component of transformational leadership is the empowerment and motivation of followers in planning and implementing the vision of an
Transformational leadership is the trend in leader behavior. Key authorities of transformational leadership include Bass (1985), Bennis and Nanus (1985), Burns (1978), and Hunt (1991). Power wielding via authoritative strategies will not properly motivate followers and leaders of an organization to achieve the vision and goals. The transition in modern leadership to a democratic, participative organizational climate, team building, and site-based management approach is necessary in building effective schools.

Effective schools research was prompted by the demand for quality schools and excellence in education. Schools in the United States were criticized as early as the 1950s for inadequate science and math programs. The Coleman Report (cited in Dean, 1989) posited that schools could do little to overcome the handicaps of race and poverty. However, reports by Brookover and Lezotte (1979), Edmonds (1979), and Rutter (1979) refuted Coleman's position and suggested that schools did make a difference in student achievement. The significance of the building principal on school effectiveness was featured in the research. Austin (1979, 1981); Edmonds (1979); Finn (1983); Rutter (1979); Smith et al. (1981); Terry (1988); and others noted this point. The review of literature also noted the deficiency of research regarding effective secondary schools.

The United States Department of Education's Blue Ribbon Schools Program features a thrust towards "Excellence in Education." For the purpose of this study, an effective school was defined as a school designated as exemplary by the Blue Ribbon Schools Program. The program is administered by the United States Secretary of Education's
office in conjunction with each state's department of education. Schools must voluntarily nominate themselves on a form which includes seven conditions of effective schooling: (1) leadership, (2) teaching environment, (3) curriculum and instruction, (4) student environment, (5) parental and community support, (6) indicators of success, and (7) organizational vitality. The program assesses school effectiveness in a comprehensive manner including characteristics and standards associated with effective schools research and student outcomes. R. L. Brown (1991/1992), Landis (1989), Koger (1987/1988), Stevens (1988/1989), and Terry (1988) used the Blue Ribbon Schools Program to identify effective schools.

The review of literature indicated that democratic, participative leadership styles were being emphasized as successful. This present research study conceptually focused on whether Wisconsin principals of effective, recognized schools demonstrated more democratic, participative leadership style behaviors than Wisconsin principals of non-recognized schools. Two other hypotheses expanded on the central conceptual hypothesis as they focused on Wisconsin elementary and secondary principals' democratic, participative leadership style behaviors. Effective schools research promoted democratic, participative leadership style behaviors as a critical component. The literature tended to support the purpose of this study: to determine if the leadership style behaviors of principals is related to the existence of effective schools. This study focused on democratic, participative leadership style behaviors.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

The relationship of democratic, participative leadership style behaviors to the existence of effective schools was supported in the literature reviewed. For the purpose of this study the term leadership style was defined as the principals' behavior promoting educational leadership in schools. The term effective school was defined as a school that is designated as exemplary by the United States Department of Education's Blue Ribbon Schools Program for the "Excellence in Education" award.

As stated previously the purpose of this study was to determine if the leadership style behaviors of principals is related to the existence of effective schools. Leadership style behaviors of principals of effective schools were compared to principals of schools not identified as effective to determine if principals of effective schools demonstrate more democratic, participative leadership style behaviors. The difference in relationship of elementary and secondary principals' leadership style behaviors to the existence of effective schools were also studied. Chapter III consists of the following major sections: conceptual hypothesis, subjects, instrument, procedures for data collection, operational hypotheses, analysis of data, dissertation budget, dissertation time schedule, and summary.
Review of Conceptual Hypotheses

This research study contained three conceptual (Hc) hypotheses which focused on the main hypothesis: The leadership style behaviors of Wisconsin principals of effective schools recognized for "Excellence in Education" is more democratic, participative than the leadership style behaviors of Wisconsin principals of schools not recognized for "Excellence in Education." The two other conceptual hypotheses provided a more detailed approach by their focus on Wisconsin elementary and secondary principals' democratic, participative leadership style behaviors.

Subjects

The subjects for this study were composed of certified public schools principals (n = 72, 22 secondary and 10 elementary) from Wisconsin schools recognized for "Excellence in Education" by the United States Department of Education and a stratified random sample of Wisconsin principals (n = 32, 22 secondary and 10 elementary) of schools not recognized for "Excellence in Education." Surveys were mailed to the population of principals of recognized schools that included 43 subjects (32 secondary and 11 elementary) and the random sample of principals of schools not recognized that included 46 subjects (32 secondary and 14 elementary). The principals of recognized and non-recognized schools were paired according to district size according to the Wisconsin Interscholastic Athletic Association 1992-93 Directory of Member Schools (Chickering, 1991). The sample of principals of
recognized schools included those principals of schools recognized
during the time period of 1982-1993. The random sample of principals
of nonrecognized schools was selected from the 1992-93 Wisconsin
School Directory (Grover, 1992b). Certification standards were those
established by the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction.

The leadership style behaviors of Wisconsin principals were identi­
fied. The two target samples of principals include principals of effective
schools recognized by the United States Department of Education's Blue
Ribbon Schools Program for "Excellence in Education" and principals of
schools that have not been recognized for this distinction. Schools
became eligible for this award through a self-nomination process involv­
ing a comprehensive document. The nomination form includes seven
conditions of effective schooling including: (1) leadership, (2) teaching
environment, (3) curriculum and instruction, (4) student environment,
(5) parental and community support, (6) indicators of success, and
(7) organizational vitality (United States Department of Education,
1992). Crossley (1990) noted that each state department of public
instruction reviews the nominations. Specific characteristics used to
scrutinize each nominated school includes:

- clean academic goals; high expectations for students; order,
discipline and freedom from abuse; rewards and incentives
  for students; regular and frequent monitoring of student
  progress; development of good character and values; teacher
  input and staff development; rewards and incentives for
  teachers; concentration on academic learning; positive
  school climate; administrative leadership; well-articulated
curriculum; evaluation for instructional improvement; and
  community support and involvement. (United States De­
  partment of Education, 1992, pp. 2-3)

Chief state school officers then nominated public schools to the United
States Department of Education for further review by a panel and an on-site inspection by a qualified educator(s). The review panel then met again to discuss the on-site inspection. Schools then received or were denied the Blue Ribbon Schools "Excellence in Education" effective school distinction. High schools, junior high schools, and middle schools participated in the secondary school category with "Excellence in Education" programs conducted in school years 1982-83, 1983-84, 1984-85, 1986-87, 1988-89, 1990-91, and 1992-93. Elementary and middle schools participated in the elementary school category in "Excellence in Education" programs in school years 1985-86, 1987-88, 1989-90, and 1991-92. Principals of recognized schools at the time the "Excellence in Education" distinction was earned were included in the sample. This strategy ensured that the principal's perceived leadership style behaviors were in the same context as the school's at the time of the recognition.

Instrument

The Self-Scoring Survey of Educational Leadership Practices by Nelson and Valenti (1993) was used in this study. The instrument is framed in an educational environment with the roles of principal and classroom teacher in situational leadership capacities. The instrument provided an assessment of four leadership styles by having the respondent identify the most desirable, ideal way to handle a situation and the actual behavior of teachers. Nelson (1967) noted that "the ideal scores represent the goals or desires and values of the individual or group. Actual scores represent the skills and sanctions to accomplish the goals and desires of the individual or group" (p. 8). The leadership styles
included in this study were defined as follows:

1. Bureaucratic--the source of authority is in policies and regulations. The bureaucratic "leader depends upon his/her knowledge of the organization's policies and regulations or top management to solve problems and uses his/her official rank to direct activities of employees" (Nelson, 1967, p. 7).

2. Technocratic--the source of authority is in technical knowledge. The technocratic "leader depends upon his/her technical knowledge and ability to solve problems and gain respect and obedience of employees in carrying out his/her orders" (Nelson, 1967, p. 7).

3. Idiocratic--the source of authority is in individual personalities. The idiocratic "leader depends upon his/her knowledge of each individual's interests, needs, and abilities to stimulate, develop, and guide their activities" (Nelson, 1967, p. 7).

4. Democratic--the source of authority is in codes, standards, and goals of the group. The democratic, participative "leader depends upon his/her ability to develop and integrate the work group into an effective team whose codes, standards, and goals will stimulate and guide the individual members" (Nelson, 1967, p. 7).

The instrument identified perceived leadership style behaviors of principals of schools recognized for "Excellence in Education" and principals of schools not recognized for "Excellence in Education." The instrument is valid for measuring the leadership style behaviors as defined, framed in an educational environment. The instrument required approximately 35 minutes to complete. The reliabilities as measured by the Kuder-Richardson formula are (a) bureaucratic, .79; (b) technocratic, .74;
(c) idiocratic, .65; and (d) democratic, .87. These range from fair to good. Borg and Gall (1989) noted that the Kuder-Richardson formula is used to measure the internal consistency of an instrument through an analysis of the individual test items.

Development of the instrument was based on 35 years of applied research. Arter (1988) noted that the following validation activities were cited by the authors:

Leadership styles were derived from "situational attitudes" (not traits) presented by "paired comparison" developed by Dr. Guilford to measure subtle differences. Professional evaluation of items against concepts; test-retest for stability; validation against morale level; accident reactions to supervisors; projective analysis against leadership styles; and observations of leader behavior by superiors against leadership scores. (p. 34)

The measures of leadership styles were also validated with interviews that occurred over a 3-year period.

Procedures for Data Collection

A letter of transmittal, survey instrument, answer sheet, and personal data sheet were mailed to the entire Wisconsin population of 43 principals of recognized schools and a random sample of 46 principals of schools not recognized. A stamped, self-addressed envelope for return was enclosed. A follow-up letter, survey instrument, answer sheet, personal data sheet, and stamped, self-addressed envelope were sent out approximately 2 weeks after the initial mailing to those principals who did not respond. Telephone contacts were conducted when the follow-up mailing failed to produce desired results. The personal survey data and answer sheets were coded to assist the researcher in
identifying nonrespondents. Codes were removed from the personal survey data and answer sheets immediately after documenting their return. The researcher was the only person to have access to the codes.

Operational Hypotheses

The operational hypotheses (Ha) were:

1. The ideal mean score for the democratic, participative leadership style behaviors of Wisconsin principals of effective schools recognized for "Excellence in Education" will be greater than the ideal mean score for the democratic, participative leadership style behaviors of Wisconsin principals of schools not recognized for "Excellence in Education."

2. The ideal mean score for the democratic, participative leadership style behaviors of Wisconsin elementary principals of effective schools recognized for "Excellence in Education" will be greater than the ideal mean score for the democratic, participative leadership style behaviors of Wisconsin elementary principals not recognized for "Excellence in Education."

3. The ideal mean score for the democratic, participative leadership style behaviors of Wisconsin secondary principals of effective schools recognized for "Excellence in Education" will be greater than the ideal mean score for the democratic participative leadership style behaviors of Wisconsin secondary principals not recognized for "Excellence in Education."

The dependent variable was the leadership style behaviors of Wisconsin principals ranging from democratic, participative to
bureaucratic in nature. The independent variable was principals of Wisconsin schools that were or were not recognized for the Blue Ribbon Schools Program "Excellence in Education" distinction.

Analysis of Data

Inferential statistics were used in this study. Each leadership style behavior (dependent variable) received a value. The value was based on the link to effective schools as related to theory found in the literature reviewed. The difference was assessed by the mean of ideal, democratic, participative leadership style behaviors responses. To determine the relationships between the independent and dependent variables, t tests for independent means were used.

The Nelson and Valenti (1993) instrument was used to measure the leadership style behaviors of principals (n = 32) of effective schools recognized for "Excellence in Education" and principals (n = 32) of schools not recognized for "Excellence in Education." The scores were obtained from two equal size samples and were independently selected. The descriptive data included the ideal and actual mean scores and standard deviations of the four leadership style behaviors (bureaucratic; technocratic; idiocratic; and democratic, participative) of principals. Democratic, participative leadership style behaviors were analyzed in this study. The other three leadership style behaviors were reported. The ideal leadership style behavior is the most desirable method each principal selected to deal with each situation posed in the 50 questions. The actual leadership style behavior is the behavior the leader expects from teachers. A t test for independent means with a one-tailed
directional test was computed. An alpha level of .05 was used to test the hypotheses.

This researcher posited that principals of effective schools recognized for "Excellence in Education" will have a greater ideal mean score for democratic, participative leadership style behaviors than principals of schools that were not recognized for "Excellence in Education." A t test for independent means was used to test the existence of the relationship. The null hypotheses (Ho) were:

1. There will be no difference in the ideal mean scores for the democratic, participative leadership style behaviors of Wisconsin principals of effective schools recognized for "Excellence in Education" and the ideal mean scores for the democratic, participative leadership style behaviors of Wisconsin principals of schools not recognized for "Excellence in Education."

2. There will be no difference in the ideal mean scores for the democratic, participative leadership style behaviors of Wisconsin elementary principals of effective schools recognized for "Excellence in Education" and the ideal mean scores for the democratic, participative leadership style behaviors of Wisconsin elementary principals of schools not recognized for "Excellence in Education."

3. There will be no difference in the ideal mean scores for the democratic, participative leadership style behaviors of Wisconsin secondary principals of effective schools recognized for "Excellence in Education" and the ideal mean scores for the democratic, participative leadership style behaviors of Wisconsin secondary principals of schools not recognized for "Excellence in Education." Figure 1 presents an
example of how the mean scores, standard deviations, t values, and exact probabilities for each leadership style behavior of the two principal groups were displayed.

Sample Table

Mean Scores of Principals' Leadership Style Behaviors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Pooled variance estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of cases</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>1-tailed prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Mean scores were based on a 0-25 point scale for each leadership style behavior with 25 being the highest score. The alpha level used was .05.

Figure 1. Example of Tables Used to Display Data.

Dissertation Budget

Items for budget consideration included: postage, writing paper, envelopes, instrument purchase, copying and clerical costs, travel, and administration costs. An estimate of $1,175 was budgeted for this study.
Dissertation Time Schedule

The time allotment for conducting the research and completing the project was 18 months. Administration of the survey required six weeks. Preparation of the letter of transmittal, survey instrument, answer sheet, and personal data sheet for mailing began in May 1993. The subjects were given approximately 2 weeks to complete the survey and data sheet. The following time period was used to mail follow-up information to subjects who did not respond and to make the phone calls to nonrespondents.

Summary

The methodology described in this chapter explained the process of how data were obtained for this study. The purpose of this study was to determine if the leadership style behaviors of principals is related to the existence of effective schools. Leadership style behaviors of principals of effective schools were compared to principals of schools not identified as effective to determine if principals of effective, recognized schools demonstrate more democratic, participative leadership style behaviors. The differences in relationship of elementary and secondary principals' leadership style behaviors to the existence of effective schools were also studied. The subjects included two groups of certified public school principals from Wisconsin schools. The two groups of principals consisted of principals \( (n = 32, \ 22 \text{ secondary and } 10 \text{ elementary}) \) of Wisconsin schools recognized for the Blue Ribbon Schools Program "Excellence in Education" award and principals.
of Wisconsin schools not recognized for "Excellence in Education." The instrument used in this study, the Self-Scoring Survey of Educational Leadership Practices by Nelson and Valenti (1993), was used to measure the perceived leadership style behaviors of principals. The relationships between the independent and dependent variables were determined with the use of t tests for independent means. An alpha level of .05 was used to test the hypotheses.
CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

Introduction

The purpose of this research was to determine if the leadership style behaviors of principals were related to the existence of effective schools. Leadership style behaviors of principals of effective schools were compared to principals of schools not identified as effective to determine if principals of effective schools demonstrated more democratic, participative leadership style behaviors. The difference in relationship of elementary and secondary principals' leadership style behaviors to the existence of effective schools was also studied. The review of literature and trends in education reflected that democratic, participative leadership style behaviors tend to be encouraged for effective leadership and organizations.

The 89 subjects of the study who were mailed survey instruments were composed of and limited to certified public school principals from Wisconsin schools. The principals from effective schools (n = 43, 32 secondary and 11 elementary) made up one group. These principals' schools earned the distinction of "Excellence in Education" from the Blue Ribbon Schools Program sponsored by the United States Department of Education. This recognition process begins by submission of an application by the school's staff. The school must then be nominated by the state's department of education to the United States Department of
Education for selection or not for recognition as an exemplary school. They are categorized in this study as effective schools because of this distinction and the requirements needed to earn this honor. The population of principals of recognized schools included those principals of schools recognized during the time period of 1983-1993. The second group of Wisconsin principals (n = 46, 32 secondary and 14 elementary) were selected by a stratified random sample of schools not recognized for "Excellence in Education" by the Blue Ribbon Schools Program.

The rate of return of survey instruments resulted in the following totals. A total of 89 survey instruments were mailed. Forty-three were mailed to principals of recognized schools with 32 respondents for a 74% rate and 11 nonrespondents for a 26% rate. Twenty-two principals of recognized secondary schools responded out of a possible 32 for a return of 69%. Four of the subjects listed in the nonrespondents category had incomplete responses and two subjects were deceased. Ten principals of recognized elementary schools responded out of a possible 11 for a return rate of 91%. Forty-six survey instruments were mailed to the stratified random sample of principals of nonrecognized schools with 32 respondents for a 70% rate and 14 nonrespondents for a 30% rate. Twenty-two principals of nonrecognized schools responded out of a possible 32 for a return rate of 69%. Two of the subjects listed in the nonrespondent category had incomplete responses. Ten principals of nonrecognized elementary schools responded out of a possible 14 for a return rate of 72%. Each of the two groups of principals consisted of 32 subjects, 22 from secondary
schools and 10 from elementary schools.

The data were collected by mailing a letter of transmittal, survey instrument, answer sheet, and personal data sheet to all subjects. A stamped, self-addressed envelope for returning the answer sheet and personal data sheet was also enclosed. A follow-up letter and related materials were sent approximately 2 weeks later to those who did not initially respond. Telephone contacts were then conducted to non-respondents. This process was conducted from May through August of 1993.

The Self-Scoring Survey of Educational Leadership Practices by Nelson and Valenti (1993) was used in this study to gather the data. The survey instrument was used to measure the democratic, participative leadership style behaviors of principals (n = 32, 22 secondary and 10 elementary) of effective, recognized schools and principals (n = 32, 22 secondary and 10 elementary) of nonrecognized schools. A limitation to the study was that the leadership style identified for each principal was the principal’s perceived leadership style. Superordinates and subordinates of the principals were not involved in the process. For the purpose of this study, effective schools were defined as schools designated as exemplary by the United States Department of Education through the Blue Ribbon Schools Program for the "Excellence in Education" award. The ideal democratic, participative mean scores were measured. The ideal leadership behavior was defined as the most ideal way for a principal to handle an educational situation. The actual practice was measured to note the principal’s concept of the actual behavior of teachers in handling an educational situation. The greater the
frequency of an actual practice from an ideal way of handling a situation could denote frustration for the principals in the decision making process. Three other leadership styles (technocratic, idiocratic, and bureaucratic) were reported as supplemental data for information. The mean scores were obtained from two equal size samples and were independently selected. A t test for independent means with a one-tailed directional test was computed. Mean scores were based on a 0-25 point scale for each leadership style behavior with the frequency of 25 being the highest score. Democratic, participative and technocratic leadership style behaviors were paired in 25 questions of the survey and idiocratic and bureaucratic leadership style behaviors were paired in 25 questions of the survey. An alpha level of .05 was used to test the hypotheses.

This researcher posited that principals of effective schools recognized for "Excellence in Education" will have a greater ideal mean score for democratic leadership style behavior than principals of effective schools that were not recognized as effective and for "Excellence in Education." A t test for independent means was used to test the existence of the relationship between principals' use of democratic, participative leadership style behaviors and the existence of effective schools. The null hypotheses (Ho) were:

1. There will be no difference in the ideal mean scores for the democratic, participative leadership style behaviors of Wisconsin principals of effective schools recognized for "Excellence in Education" and the ideal mean score for the democratic, participative leadership style behaviors of Wisconsin principals of schools not recognized for "Excellence in Education."
2. There will be no difference in the ideal mean scores for the democratic, participative leadership style behaviors of Wisconsin elementary principals of effective schools recognized for "Excellence in Education" and the ideal mean scores for the democratic, participative leadership style behaviors of Wisconsin elementary principals of schools not recognized for "Excellence in Education."

3. There will be no difference in the ideal mean scores for the democratic, participative leadership style behaviors of Wisconsin secondary principals of effective schools recognized for "Excellence in Education" and the ideal mean scores for the democratic, participative leadership style behaviors of Wisconsin secondary principals of schools not recognized for "Excellence in Education."

Chapter IV consists of the following major sections: demographic characteristics of the sample, hypotheses testing, and summary.

Demographic Characteristics of the Sample

The Personal Data Sheet provided important demographic information for this study. The demographic data included a comprehensive background on the principals' school structure, enrollment, gender, principal experience, degree, and teaching experience. Tables with related, relevant data were also provided.

The principal participants in this study involved a total of 64 schools of which 32 represented effective recognized schools and 32 nonrecognized schools. There were 10 effective, recognized elementary and 22 secondary schools. The 22 effective, recognized secondary schools consisted of 5 middle level/junior high schools and 17 high
schools. There were 10 nonrecognized elementary and 22 secondary schools. The 22 nonrecognized secondary schools consisted of 7 middle level/junior high schools and 15 high schools. Table 1 includes information related to school structure.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School type</th>
<th>Elementary school</th>
<th>Middle school</th>
<th>High school</th>
<th>Total schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Effective, recognized schools</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonrecognized schools</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Elementary schools must be structured in some combination of pre-K-8 and secondary schools 6-12 based on the nominating school's mission and structure.

Gender of the principals involved in this study indicated a total of 9 females and 55 males. The greatest number of female principals were 4 at the nonrecognized elementary schools and 3 at the effective, recognized secondary schools. Refer to Table 2 for complete gender by school structure information including a breakdown of principals of high school and middle school gender data.

The frequency distribution of years of service at the principal's present school indicated that the greatest frequency was 20, or 31%, of the principals at 16+ years of experience. This consisted of 3 elementary and 7 secondary principals in both the effective, recognized schools.
Table 2
Frequency Distribution of Gender of Principals of Effective, Recognized and Nonrecognized Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender of principals</th>
<th>Principals of effective, recognized schools (n = 10)</th>
<th>Principals of nonrecognized schools (n = 10)</th>
<th>Principals of effective, recognized schools (n = 22)</th>
<th>Principals of nonrecognized schools (n = 22)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3 (2)</td>
<td>1 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19 (3)</td>
<td>21 (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total principals</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22 (5)</td>
<td>22 (7)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Numbers in parentheses denote middle level principals.

and nonrecognized school categories. Table 3 provides frequency of present school experience of principals of effective, recognized and nonrecognized elementary and secondary levels.

The frequency distribution of total years of service as principals indicated that the greatest frequency was 32, or 50%, of the principals at 16+ years of experience. This number was comprised of 5 elementary principals in both the effective, recognized schools and nonrecognized school categories and 12 secondary principals of effective, recognized schools and 10 secondary principals of nonrecognized schools. All of the principals had more than one year of service. Table 4 provides data for principals of effective, recognized and nonrecognized elementary and secondary schools related to total years of service.
### Table 3
Frequency Distribution of Years of Service at Present School of Principals of Effective, Recognized and Nonrecognized Elementary and Secondary Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of service</th>
<th>Elementary Principals of effective, recognized schools (n = 10)</th>
<th>Secondary Principals of effective, recognized schools (n = 22)</th>
<th>Principals of nonrecognized schools (n = 10)</th>
<th>Principals of nonrecognized schools (n = 22)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-5 years</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15 years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16+ years</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td><strong>22</strong></td>
<td><strong>22</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data related to highest degree held by principals in this study indicated that the lowest degree held was the master's and the highest degree held was the doctorate + credits. The largest frequency was 37, or 58%, of principals at the master's + degree level. This group was composed of 6 elementary and 9 secondary principals of effective, recognized schools and 9 elementary and 13 secondary principals of nonrecognized schools. The next highest frequency was 15, or 23%, of principals at the specialist's + degree level. This group included 1 elementary and 5 secondary principals of effective, recognized schools and 1 elementary and 8 secondary principals of nonrecognized...
Table 4

Frequency Distribution of Total Years of Service of Principals of Effective, Recognized and Nonrecognized Elementary and Secondary Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of service</th>
<th>Elementary Principals of effective, recognized schools (n = 10)</th>
<th>Elementary Principals of nonrecognized schools (n = 10)</th>
<th>Secondary Principals of effective, recognized schools (n = 22)</th>
<th>Secondary Principals of nonrecognized schools (n = 22)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-5 years</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15 years</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16+ years</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

schools. A significant point related to degree level was that 9 principals of effective, recognized schools and only 1 principal of a nonrecognized school possessed the doctorate degree. Table 5 illustrates data for principals of effective, recognized and nonrecognized elementary and secondary schools related to degrees held by principals.

The principals were requested to indicate total educational work experience to provide a thorough background. Teaching experience consisted of three categories: elementary, middle level/junior high, and high school. Principal experience categories included assistant elementary, elementary, assistant middle level/junior high, assistant high school,
Table 5
Frequency Distribution According to Highest Degree Held by Principals of Effective, Recognized and Nonrecognized Elementary and Secondary Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highest degree</th>
<th>Prinicipals of effective, recognized schools (n = 10)</th>
<th>Principals of nonrecognized schools (n = 10)</th>
<th>Principals of effective, recognized schools (n = 22)</th>
<th>Principals of nonrecognized schools (n = 22)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s +</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s +</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist’s</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist’s +</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate +</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

and high school. Participants were also requested to list other educational work experiences not listed previously. A brief review and related tables are summarized in this section. The years of experience for each category were generally divided into the following categories: 0, 1-5, 6-10, 11-15, and 16-20. In some cases, extra categories were included because of the range of experience.
The frequency distribution of elementary teaching experience indicated that 44 principals, or 68.8%, had no elementary teaching experience. None of the effective, recognized secondary principals had elementary teaching experience, while 2 of the nonrecognized secondary principals had 1-5 years of experience. Two nonrecognized principals had 16-20 years of elementary teaching experience, while no effective, recognized principals had this amount of experience. Table 6 contains data for principals of effective, recognized and nonrecognized elementary and secondary schools related to elementary teaching experience.

Table 6

Frequency Distribution According to Elementary Teaching Experience by Principals of Effective, Recognized and Nonrecognized Elementary and Secondary Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of elementary teaching experience</th>
<th>Elementary Principals of effective, recognized schools (n = 10)</th>
<th>Elementary Principals of nonrecognized schools (n = 10)</th>
<th>Secondary Principals of effective, recognized schools (n = 22)</th>
<th>Secondary Principals of nonrecognized schools (n = 22)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 years</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5 years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15 years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20 years</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Thirty-eight principals, or 59.4%, had no middle level/junior high teaching experience. Eight elementary principals of effective, recognized schools and 7 elementary principals of nonrecognized schools as compared to 10 secondary principals of effective, recognized and 14 secondary principals of nonrecognized schools had no teaching experience at this level. Table 7 presents data for principals of effective, recognized and nonrecognized elementary and secondary schools related to middle level/junior high teaching experience.

Table 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of middle level teaching experience</th>
<th>Elementary Principals of effective, recognized schools (n = 10)</th>
<th>Elementary Principals of nonrecognized schools (n = 10)</th>
<th>Secondary Principals of effective, recognized schools (n = 22)</th>
<th>Secondary Principals of nonrecognized schools (n = 22)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 years</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5 years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15 years</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20 years</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The frequency distribution of high school teaching experience illustrated that 30 principals, or 46.9%, had no high school teaching experience.
experience. The greatest frequency of experience for principals of effective, recognized schools was 7 in a range of 6-10 years, while principals of nonrecognized schools was 7 in a range of 11-15 years. Six principals of effective, recognized schools were in the range of 1-5 years, while only 1 principal of a nonrecognized school existed in this category. Table 8 contains data for principals of effective, recognized and nonrecognized elementary and secondary schools related to high school teaching experience.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of high school teaching experience</th>
<th>Elementary</th>
<th>Secondary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principals of effective, recognized schools (n = 10)</td>
<td>Principals of nonrecognized schools (n = 10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 years</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5 years</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15 years</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20 years</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-25 years</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Only one principal had experience as an assistant elementary school principal. A principal of an effective, recognized school had experience in the 1-5 year category as an assistant elementary school principal. No table was presented because of this simple statistic.

Forty-one principals, or 65.6%, did not have elementary principal experience. The range of experience was from 0 to 27 years. One principal of an effective, recognized secondary school had elementary principal experience in the 6-10 year category and 2 principals of nonrecognized secondary schools had elementary principal experience in the 1-5 year category. Six principals of nonrecognized elementary schools had between 1-5 and 6-10 years of experience, while only 2 principals of effective recognized schools were in those categories. Table 9 presents data for principals of effective, recognized and nonrecognized elementary and secondary schools related to elementary principal experience.

The frequency distribution of assistant middle level/junior high principal experience revealed that 47 principals, or 73.4%, had no experience in this area. Twelve of the 17 assistant middle school principals had 1-5 years of experience in this position. This included 2 elementary principals of effective, recognized schools and 1 elementary principal of a nonrecognized school and 6 secondary principals of effective, recognized schools and 3 secondary principals of nonrecognized schools. Table 10 presents data for principals of effective, recognized and nonrecognized elementary and secondary schools related to assistant middle level/junior high principal experience.
Table 9
Frequency Distribution According to Elementary School Principal Experience by Principals of Effective, Recognized and Nonrecognized Elementary and Secondary Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of Elementary School Principal Experience</th>
<th>Elementary</th>
<th>Secondary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principals of effective, recognized schools (n = 10)</td>
<td>Principals of nonrecognized schools (n = 10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Principals with no middle level/junior high school principal experience totals 47, or 73.4%. Eight of the 17 principals with experience at this level were in the 1-5 year experience category. This included 2 elementary principals of effective, recognized schools and 0 elementary principals of nonrecognized schools as compared to 3 secondary principals of effective, recognized schools and 3 secondary principals of nonrecognized schools. Table 11 contains data for principals of effective,
Table 10
Frequency Distribution According to Assistant Middle School Principal Experience by Principals of Effective, Recognized and Nonrecognized Elementary and Secondary Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of assistant middle school principal experience</th>
<th>Elementary</th>
<th>Secondary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principals of effective, recognized schools (n = 10)</td>
<td>Principals of nonrecognized schools (n = 10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

recognized and nonrecognized elementary and secondary schools related to middle level/junior high principal experience.

Forty-one, or 64.1%, of the principals indicated that they had no experience at the assistant high school principal position. Thirteen principals of effective, recognized schools had experience at this position, while 10 principals of nonrecognized schools reported this experience. Table 12 illustrates data for principals of effective, recognized and
Table 11
Frequency Distribution According to Middle School Principal Experience by Principals of Effective, Recognized and Nonrecognized Elementary and Secondary Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of middle school principal experience</th>
<th>Elementary Principals of effective, recognized schools (n = 10)</th>
<th>Elementary Principals of nonrecognized schools (n = 10)</th>
<th>Secondary Principals of effective, recognized schools (n = 22)</th>
<th>Secondary Principals of nonrecognized schools (n = 22)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

nonrecognized elementary and secondary schools related to assistant high school principal experience.

Only 28 of the 64 principals indicated that they did not have experience at the position of high school principal. This represented 43.8% of the sample. Eight principals of nonrecognized schools had only 1-5 years of experience compared to 1 principal of an effective, recognized school in this experience category. The range for this position was 0-29 years. Table 13 contains data for principals of effective,
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of assistant high school principal experience</th>
<th>Elementary</th>
<th>Secondary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principals of effective, recognized schools (n = 10)</td>
<td>Principals of nonrecognized schools (n = 10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

recognized and nonrecognized elementary and secondary schools related to high school principal experience.

Only 13 principals reported that they served in other administrative positions. Three elementary principals of effective, recognized schools served as superintendents 1-5 years, while 1 served in the 6-10 year category. Six secondary principals from effective, recognized schools served as superintendents from 1-5 years, while 1 served from 11-15 years. Only 1 secondary principal from a nonrecognized school served as a superintendent 1-5 years and 1 secondary principal served...
Table 13

Frequency Distribution According to High School Principal Experience by Principals of Effective, Recognized and Nonrecognized Elementary and Secondary Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of high school principal experience</th>
<th>Principals of effective, recognized schools (n = 10)</th>
<th>Principals of nonrecognized schools (n = 10)</th>
<th>Principals of effective, recognized schools (n = 22)</th>
<th>Principals of nonrecognized schools (n = 22)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

as a vocational director 11-15 years. This raises a question regarding the greater number of principals of effective, recognized schools serving in higher level administrative positions at some point in their careers versus the lesser number of principals of nonrecognized schools.

The participants in this study included principals of 64 schools of which 32 represented effective, recognized schools and 32 nonrecognized schools. The 32 effective, recognized and the 32 nonrecognized schools consisted of 10 elementary and 22 secondary schools.
The demographic data included the principal's school structure, enrollment, gender, principal experience, degree, and teaching experience. The size of the groups, school structure, and related demographic data indicated that the two sample groups were similar and did not affect hypotheses testing.

Hypotheses Testing

This study was conducted to determine if the leadership style behaviors of principals were related to the existence of effective schools. Leadership style behaviors of principals of effective, recognized schools with the distinction of "Excellence in Education" were compared to principals of schools not recognized as effective to determine if principals of effective schools demonstrated more democratic, participative leadership style behaviors. Hypothesis 1 related to all principals, Hypothesis 2 to elementary principals, and Hypothesis 3 to secondary principals. The hypotheses were analyzed by use of a pooled, one-tailed directional t test for independent means. An alpha level of .05 was used to determine significance.

Hypothesis 1

Operational Hypothesis 1 stated: The ideal mean score for the democratic, participative leadership style behaviors of Wisconsin principals of effective schools recognized for "Excellence in Education" will be greater than the ideal mean score for the democratic, participative leadership style behaviors of Wisconsin principals not recognized for "Excellence in Education." Data were analyzed by use of a pooled, one-tailed
directional $t$ test for independent means.

As indicated in Table 14, the difference between the democratic, participative leadership style behaviors mean score ($M = 20.00$) of principals of effective schools recognized for "Excellence in Education" and the ideal mean score ($M = 18.53$) of principals of schools not recognized for "Excellence in Education" was sufficiently large to reject the null hypothesis at the alpha level of $.05$.

Table 14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean Scores of Principals' Ideal Democratic Leadership Style Behaviors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pooled variance estimate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals of effective, recognized schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prinicipals of nonrecognized schools</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Mean scores were based on a 0-25 point scale for each leadership style behavior with 25 being the highest score. The alpha level used was $.05$.

Table 15 contains data from Hypothesis 2 with the exception being that actual rather than ideal leadership style behaviors were assessed. The difference between the sample means was not sufficiently
large to reject the null hypothesis at the .05 alpha level; therefore, there is no support for the hypothesis.

Table 15
Mean Scores of Principals' Actual Democratic Leadership Style Behaviors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>No. of cases</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>1-tailed prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principals of effective, recognized schools</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>15.09</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals of nonrecogonized schools</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>13.59</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Mean scores were based on a 0-25 point scale for each leadership style behavior with 25 being the highest score. The alpha level used was .05.

The greater the difference of ideal versus actual mean scores indicated a frustration in practicing democratic, participative leadership style behaviors. Principals of effective, recognized schools had a democratic, participative leadership style behavior ideal mean score of 20.00 and an actual mean score of 15.09. The difference was 4.91. The same comparison for principals of nonrecognized schools was an ideal mean score of 18.53 and the actual mean score of 13.59. The difference was 4.94. Both groups of principals scored approximately an
equivalent difference in mean scores in the ideal way to handle educational situations using democratic, participative leadership style behaviors versus the actual behavior they believed would be exhibited by teachers.

**Hypothesis 2**

Operational Hypothesis 2 stated: The ideal mean score for the democratic, participative leadership style behaviors of Wisconsin elementary principals of effective schools recognized for "Excellence in Education" will be greater than the ideal mean score for the democratic, participative leadership style behaviors of Wisconsin elementary principals not recognized for "Excellence in Education." Data were analyzed by use of a pooled, one-tailed directional t test for independent means.

As indicated in Table 16, the difference between the democratic, participative leadership style behaviors ideal mean score (M = 20.60) of elementary principals of effective schools recognized for "Excellence in Education" and the ideal mean score (M = 18.50) of elementary principals of schools not recognized "Excellence in Education" is sufficiently large to reject the null hypothesis at the alpha level of .05.

Table 17 contains data for Hypothesis 2 with the exception that actual rather than ideal leadership style behaviors were assessed. The difference between the sample means was not sufficiently large to reject the null hypothesis at the .05 alpha level; therefore, there is no support for the null hypothesis.

The greater the difference of ideal versus actual mean scores indicated a frustration in practicing democratic, participative leadership
Table 16
Mean Scores of Elementary Principals' Ideal Democratic Leadership Style Behaviors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>No. of cases</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>1-tailed prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principals of effective, recognized schools</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20.60</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>.041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals of nonrecognized schools</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18.50</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Mean scores were based on a 0-25 point scale for each leadership style behavior with 25 being the highest score. The alpha level used was .05.

Principals of effective, recognized elementary schools had a democratic, participative leadership style behaviors ideal mean score of 20.60 and an actual mean score of 15.70. The difference was 4.90. The same comparison for principals of nonrecognized elementary schools was an ideal mean score of 18.50 and an actual mean score of 12.70. The difference was 5.80. Principals of nonrecognized elementary schools had a greater ideal versus actual mean score margin of 0.90 than principals of effective, recognized elementary schools. Principals of nonrecognized elementary schools had a greater ideal versus actual mean score difference which indicated more frustration in practicing
Table 17
Mean Scores of Elementary Principals' Actual Democratic Leadership Style Behaviors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>No. of cases</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>1-tailed prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principals of effective, recognized schools</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15.70</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>.064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals of nonrecognized schools</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12.70</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Mean scores were based on a 0-25 point scale for each leadership style behavior with 25 being the highest score. The alpha level used was .05.

democratic, participative leadership style behaviors in the ideal way to handle a situation versus the actual behavior of teachers.

Hypothesis 3

Operational Hypothesis 3 stated: The ideal mean score for the democratic, participative leadership style behaviors of Wisconsin secondary principals of effective schools recognized for "Excellence in Education" will be greater than the ideal mean score for the democratic, participative leadership style behaviors of Wisconsin secondary principals not recognized for "Excellence in Education." Data were analyzed by use of a pooled, one-tailed directional $t$ test for independent means.
As indicated in Table 18, the difference between the democratic, participative leadership style behaviors ideal mean score ($M = 19.73$) of principals of effective secondary schools recognized for "Excellence in Education" and the ideal mean score ($M = 18.55$) of principals of secondary schools not recognized for "Excellence in Education" was not sufficiently large to reject the null hypothesis at the .05 alpha level; therefore, there is no support for the hypothesis.

Table 18
Mean Scores of Secondary Principals' Ideal Democratic Leadership Style Behaviors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>No. of cases</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>$t$ value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>1-tailed prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principals of effective, recognized</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19.73</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>.064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals of nonrecognized schools</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18.55</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Mean scores were based on a 0-25 point scale for each leadership style behavior with 25 being the highest score. The alpha level used was .05.

Table 19 contains data for Hypothesis 3 with the exception that actual rather than ideal democratic, participative leadership behaviors were analyzed. The difference between the sample means was not
sufficiently large to reject the null hypothesis at the .05 alpha level; therefore, there is no support for the hypothesis.

Table 19
Mean Scores of Secondary Principals' Actual Democratic Leadership Style Behaviors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>No. of cases</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>1-tailed prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principals of effective, recognized schools</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>14.82</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>.248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals of nonrecognized schools</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Mean scores were based on a 0-25 point scale for each leadership style behavior with 25 being the highest score. The alpha level used was .05.

The greater the difference of ideal versus actual mean scores indicated a frustration in practicing democratic, participative leadership style behaviors. Principals of effective, recognized secondary schools had a democratic, participative leadership style behavior ideal mean score of 19.73 and an actual mean score of 14.82. The difference was 4.51. The same comparison for principals of nonrecognized secondary schools was an ideal mean score of 18.55 and an actual mean score of 14.00. The difference was 4.55. Both groups of principals scored...
approximately an equivalent difference in the ideal way to handle educa-
tional situations using democratic, participative leadership style be-
haviors versus actual behaviors they believed would be exhibited by teachers.

Leadership Styles Comparative Data

The purpose of this research study was to determine if the leader-
ship style behaviors of principals were related to the existence of effec-
tive schools. Democratic, participative leadership style behaviors were
analyzed in this study. This section reviews supplemental leadership
style behaviors. Leadership style behaviors included ideal and actual
behaviors for technocratic, idiocratic, and bureaucratic leadership styles.
Democratic, participative leadership style behaviors were also provided.
Tables include mean scores, standard deviations, t values, degrees of
freedom, and one-tailed probabilities.

Table 20 includes ideal and Table 21 actual leadership style
behaviors data for principals of effective, recognized schools and non-
recognized schools. Principals of effective recognized schools had
greater ideal and actual mean scores for the participative, relationship
oriented democratic and idiocratic leadership style behaviors. Principals
of nonrecognized schools scored greater ideal and actual mean scores for
the more autocratic task-oriented technocratic and bureaucratic leader-
ship style behaviors. The same trend occurred for principals of effective,
recognized and nonrecognized elementary schools (Table 22 includes
ideal and Table 23 includes actual) and secondary schools (Table 24
includes ideal and Table 25 includes actual). The consistency of this
pattern indicated that principals of effective, recognized schools, including elementary and secondary levels, identified a preference for greater ideal and actual mean scores in participative, relationship-oriented leadership style behaviors (democratic, participative and idiosyncratic) than principals of nonrecognized schools.

Table 20

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership style behaviors</th>
<th>Principals of effective recognized schools (n = 32)</th>
<th>Principals of nonrecognized schools (n = 32)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>2.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technocratic</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>2.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idiosyncratic</td>
<td>20.34</td>
<td>2.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bureaucratic</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>2.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Mean scores were based on a 0-25 point scale for each leadership style behavior with 25 being the highest score. The alpha level used was .05.

Summary

Chapter IV included the presentation and analysis of data. A brief summary of the purpose of the study, subjects, instrument, collection of data procedures, and statement of the null hypotheses were presented in the introduction. Demographic data derived from the Personal Data...
Table 21
Mean Scores of Principals' Expected, Actual Leadership Style Behaviors of Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership style behaviors</th>
<th>Principals of effective recognized schools (n = 32)</th>
<th>Principals of nonrecognized schools (n = 32)</th>
<th>t value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>Mean 15.09 SD 4.37</td>
<td>Mean 13.59 SD 3.57</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>.069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technocratic</td>
<td>Mean 9.84 SD 4.39</td>
<td>Mean 11.41 SD 3.56</td>
<td>-1.56</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>.062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idiocratic</td>
<td>Mean 13.91 SD 4.55</td>
<td>Mean 12.84 SD 2.63</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>.129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bureaucratic</td>
<td>Mean 11.09 SD 4.55</td>
<td>Mean 12.16 SD 2.63</td>
<td>-1.14</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>.129</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Mean scores were based on a 0-25 point scale for each leadership style behavior with 25 being the highest score. The alpha level used was .05.

Sheet included information regarding school structure; enrollment; gender; principal tenure at the present school and total tenure; degree; and educational experience at the elementary, middle level/junior high, and high school as a teacher and principal, and other related educational jobs. The demographic data illustrated that the two groups of principals were similar and should not affect hypotheses testing. The data related to Hypothesis 1 demonstrated that there was a relationship in ideal democratic, participative leadership style behaviors of principals and the existence of effective, recognized schools. Hypothesis 2 included principals of elementary schools and resulted in the rejection of the null hypotheses; and therefore, support for the relationship in democratic,
Table 22
Mean Scores of Elementary Principals' Ideal Leadership Style Behaviors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership style behaviors</th>
<th>Principals of effective recognized schools (n = 10)</th>
<th>Principals of nonrecognized schools (n = 10)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>20.60</td>
<td>2.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technocratic</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>2.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idiocratic</td>
<td>21.10</td>
<td>2.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bureaucratic</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>2.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Mean scores were based on a 0-25 point scale for each leadership style behavior with 25 being the highest score. The alpha level used was .05.

participative leadership style behaviors of principals and the existence of effective, recognized elementary schools. Hypothesis 3 included principals of secondary schools. The null hypothesis failed to be rejected; therefore, there was no support for the hypothesis. There was no support for the three hypotheses when actual democratic, participative leadership style behaviors were analyzed. Leadership styles comparative data related to democratic participative, technocratic, idiocratic, and bureaucratic leadership style behaviors indicated that principals of effective, recognized schools, including elementary and secondary levels, identified a preference for greater ideal and actual mean scores in
### Table 23
Mean Scores of Elementary Principals' Expected Actual Leadership Style Behaviors of Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership style behaviors</th>
<th>Principals of effective recognized schools (n = 10)</th>
<th>Principals of nonrecognized schools (n = 10)</th>
<th>t value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>15.70 ± 4.57</td>
<td>12.70 ± 3.77</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>.064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technocratic</td>
<td>9.30 ± 4.57</td>
<td>12.30 ± 3.77</td>
<td>-1.60</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>.064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idiocratic</td>
<td>14.40 ± 4.40</td>
<td>12.80 ± 3.26</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>.184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bureaucratic</td>
<td>10.60 ± 4.40</td>
<td>12.20 ± 3.26</td>
<td>-0.92</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>.184</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Mean scores were based on a 0-25 point scale for each leadership style behavior with 25 being the highest score. The alpha level used was .05.

...participative, relationship-oriented leadership style behaviors (democratic, participative and idiocratic) than principals of nonrecognized schools.
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Table 24
Mean Scores of Secondary Principals' Ideal Leadership Style Behaviors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership style behaviors</th>
<th>Principals of effective recognized schools (n = 22)</th>
<th>Principals of nonrecognized schools (n = 22)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>19.73</td>
<td>2.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technocratic</td>
<td>5.09</td>
<td>2.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idiocratic</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>2.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bureaucratic</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>2.42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Mean scores were based on a 0-25 point scale for each leadership style behavior with 25 being the highest score. The alpha level used was .05.
Table 25
Mean Scores of Secondary Principals’ Expected Actual
Leadership Style Behaviors of Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership style behaviors</th>
<th>Principals of effective recognized schools (n = 22)</th>
<th>Principals of nonrecognized schools (n = 22)</th>
<th>t value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>Mean 14.82 SD 4.35</td>
<td>Mean 14.00 SD 3.48</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>.248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technocratic</td>
<td>Mean 10.09 SD 4.40</td>
<td>Mean 11.00 SD 3.48</td>
<td>-0.76</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>.226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idiocratic</td>
<td>Mean 13.68 SD 4.69</td>
<td>Mean 12.86 SD 2.38</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>.235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bureaucratic</td>
<td>Mean 11.32 SD 4.69</td>
<td>Mean 12.14 SD 2.38</td>
<td>-0.73</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>.235</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Mean scores were based on a 0-25 point scale for each leadership style behavior with 25 being the highest score. The alpha level used was .05.
CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Conclusions

The quality of education in the United States has been a concern of an ever increasing number of people. The National Commission on Excellence in Education's (1983) A Nation at Risk and the National Goals for Education (1990) serve as examples of the growing concern for improved educational leadership and the need to develop effective schools. The principal has been identified as a key component of effective schools.

The leadership style of the principal has been posited by some researchers to be an influential factor in the development of effective schools. Leadership styles vary and are sometimes classified in a range as divergent as bureaucratic to democratic, participative in nature. The dynamics of the various leadership styles has been debated by researchers. The purpose of this study was to determine if the leadership style behaviors of principals were related to the existence of effective schools. Leadership style behaviors of principals of effective schools were compared to principals of schools not identified as effective to determine if principals of effective schools demonstrated more democratic, participative leadership style behaviors. The difference in relationship of elementary and secondary principals' leadership style behaviors to the existence of effective schools was also studied.
From the review of literature it can be concluded that democratic, participative leadership style behaviors were being emphasized as successful. The role of the principal in practicing strong leadership and a participative, team-oriented environment were noted in effective schools. Schools become effective in achieving organizational goals when the goals are mutually established and worked on by leaders that engage and empower followers by implementing democratic, participative leadership style behaviors. Effective schools literature promoted participative leadership style behaviors as a critical component.

The subjects of this study consisted of principals from Wisconsin public schools (n = 32, 22 secondary and 10 elementary) recognized as effective by the United States Department of Education's Blue Ribbon Schools Program for "Excellence in Education" and a stratified random sample of Wisconsin public schools (n = 32, 22 secondary and 10 elementary) not recognized for "Excellence in Education." They completed a Personal Data Sheet for demographic data and the Self-Scoring Survey of Educational Leadership Practices by Nelson and Valenti (1993). Ideal democratic, participative leadership style behaviors were analyzed in the hypotheses. The ideal leadership style behavior was defined as the most ideal way for a principal to handle an educational situation. The actual behavior provided additional data and was defined as the behavior a leader expects from teachers in handling a situation. Technocratic, idiocratic, and bureaucratic leadership style behaviors were also measured to provide additional comparative data to the study. A t test for independent means with a one-tailed directional test was computed. An alpha level of .05 was used to test the hypotheses.
This research study conceptually focused on whether Wisconsin principals of effective, recognized schools demonstrated more democratic, participative leadership style behaviors than Wisconsin principals of nonrecognized schools. The study was framed in an educational environment. The following conclusions derived from this research were based upon the results of the findings and may be applicable to principals of schools similar to those included in this study.

The demographic data included a comprehensive background of the principals' school structure, enrollment, gender, principal experience, degree, and teaching experience. From the size of the groups, school structure, and related demographic data, it can be concluded that the two sample groups are similar and did not affect hypotheses testing. The only dissimilar demographic was the one independent variable of effective, recognized schools. Specific demographic data which follow provide similarities and differences; however, the differences are not large enough to be significant to the groups being compared. The greatest number of female principals included the categories of secondary effective, recognized schools and elementary nonrecognized schools. The greatest frequency of principals' years of service in the present school and total years of service was in the category of the greatest number of years served and was evenly distributed between effective, recognized and nonrecognized elementary and secondary schools. The master's + degree had the greatest frequency for principals of both effective, recognized and nonrecognized schools. Principals of effective, recognized schools had the greatest frequency of doctorate and doctorate + degrees. More secondary principals served as superintendents
than elementary principals. From the demographic data it can be concluded that the two sample groups are similar.

From the findings that resulted from testing the first hypothesis it can be concluded that Wisconsin principals of effective, recognized Blue Ribbon Schools prefer to practice a greater frequency of ideal democratic, participative leadership style behaviors than Wisconsin principals of nonrecognized schools. These results indicated that there was a relationship between ideal democratic, participative leadership style behaviors and effective schools. The literature emphasized the importance of strong leadership by the principal and stressed that use of democratic, participative leadership style behaviors was related to effective results for organizations. These points are noted in the following brief literature review.

The literature provided evidence that the principals' strong leadership was important. For example, Terry (1988) stated:

A number of schools have been identified as effective by various studies. Researchers have attempted to identify what makes these schools effective. The presence of an effective principal has been determined repeatedly to be the most important characteristic of an effective school. (p. 1)

Dean (1989) stated that "since principals have been identified as the pivotal figures in identified effective schools, it is important to further identify and clarify what information and actions they employ to facilitate student academic growth significantly above levels recorded in less effective schools" (p. 3). Smith et al. (1981) summarized the importance of the principal to school effectiveness when they stated that "it is clear that no single person is more key to school effectiveness than the principal and that the deciding factor in determining this effectiveness is
the leadership he or she brings to the school" (p. xvii).

The leadership style behaviors of principals have been identified as significant to effective principals and their schools. The review of literature provided evidence that principals' leadership style has been studied by researchers. Rutherford et al. (1983) concluded that leadership style is a powerful factor in studying managers' work. Austin (1979) concluded that the principal was the most significant factor for achieving school effectiveness. Austin (1981) posited that key elements of exemplary schools included the leadership style of the principal and related structures that focused on students' abilities in a positive manner. Grobman and Hines (1956) researched the correlation between the principal and leadership style. A high correlation was found with effective administrative behavior and democratic leadership style. Shanahan (1987/1988) stated:

Effective school research indicates that effective principals have supportive staffs, and they have faith in the competence of the members of that staff. All of the studies and research in the area of participative decision making or democratic style of leadership which was utilized in this study agreed that support for the leader and productivity of the group are enhanced at least a little when the group members have some part in making the decisions that affect them. (p. 2)

Finn (1983) noted that a characteristic of effective schools was a team approach with shared objectives. Lipham (1981) identified three descriptions of the leadership role of the principal as:

1. Strong leaders create successful schools.
2. A management team approach is far more effective than an autocratic style of leadership.
3. Many leadership studies indicate that principals hold fast to a particular style of leadership rather than shift as the circumstances warrant. (p. 6)

Lindelow et al. (1981) summarized the trend toward democratic, participative leadership style as they noted:

In recent decades, a reform movement has been building momentum both in public education and in other sectors of society, notably business. This reform movement can be seen as a broad attempt to make organizations more "democratic" and less authoritarian in their operation. A cornerstone of this reform movement is participative decision making. (p. 152)

The review of literature supported the position that democratic, participative leadership style behaviors had a relationship to the organization.

The first hypothesis was tested again using actual rather than ideal leadership style behaviors. Actual leadership style behaviors were the principals' perception of the actual behavior of teachers in an educational setting. No conclusions could be drawn.

A comparison of the frequency of ideal versus actual leadership style behaviors from the data associated with the first hypothesis was analyzed. The results indicated that Wisconsin principals of effective, recognized Blue Ribbon Schools demonstrated approximately the same amount of frustration as a result of practicing democratic, participative leadership style behaviors in the ideal way to handle a situation versus the actual, expected behaviors of teachers. The greater the difference in ideal versus actual leadership style behaviors, the greater the level of frustration experienced by principals in attempting to achieve the goals of the school.

The second central hypothesis focused conceptually on whether Wisconsin elementary principals of effective, recognized schools
demonstrated more democratic, participative leadership style behaviors than Wisconsin elementary principals of nonrecognized schools. From the findings that resulted from testing the second hypothesis it can be concluded that Wisconsin elementary principals of effective, recognized Blue Ribbon Schools prefer to practice a greater frequency of ideal democratic, participative leadership style behaviors than Wisconsin elementary principals of nonrecognized schools. Research conducted as early as Grobman and Hines's (1956) concluded that a high correlation was found with effective elementary school administrative behavior and democratic leadership style. The conclusion from this current study indicated that a relationship exists between Wisconsin elementary principals' ideal democratic, participative leadership style behaviors and effective schools. The second hypothesis was tested again using actual rather than ideal leadership style behaviors. No conclusions could be drawn.

A comparison of the frequency of ideal versus actual leadership style behaviors was conducted. From the results it can be concluded that Wisconsin elementary principals of effective, recognized Blue Ribbon Schools indicated less frustration as a result of practicing democratic, participative leadership style behaviors in an ideal way to handle a situation versus the actual, expected behaviors of teachers. These results indicated that principals of effective, recognized schools have a more comparable perceived ideal and actual leadership style behaviors in working toward the goals of the school.

The third central hypothesis focused conceptually on whether Wisconsin secondary principals of effective, recognized schools
demonstrated more democratic, participative leadership style behaviors than Wisconsin secondary principals of nonrecognized schools. From the findings that resulted from testing the third hypothesis no conclusions could be drawn. The third hypothesis was tested again using actual rather than ideal leadership style behaviors. Once again, no conclusions could be drawn. Cuban (1983) noted that at the secondary school level there has been little research that identified leadership behaviors common to effective principals and their schools. Because no relationship was established between leadership style behaviors of secondary principals to the existence of effective schools, additional research at the secondary level seems appropriate.

The frequency of ideal versus actual leadership style behaviors was compared. From the results it can be concluded that Wisconsin secondary principals of effective, recognized Blue Ribbon Schools indicated approximately the same amount of frustration as a result of practicing democratic, participative leadership style behaviors in the ideal way to handle a situation versus the actual, expected behaviors of teachers. From these results it can be concluded that principals of effective, recognized and nonrecognized schools experience the same level of frustration in practicing leadership style behaviors in attempting to meet the goals of the school.

This study also provided leadership styles comparative data using democratic, participative and idiocratic leadership styles to represent participative, relationship-oriented behaviors and technocratic and bureaucratic leadership styles to represent autocratic, task-oriented behaviors. From an analysis of the results of the data, it can be concluded
that Wisconsin principals of effective, recognized Blue Ribbon Schools prefer to practice ideal and identify actual participative, relationship-oriented democratic and idiocratic leadership style behaviors than principals of nonrecognized schools. Principals at elementary and secondary levels have the same preferences. Wisconsin principals of nonrecognized schools prefer to practice ideal and identify actual autocratic, task-oriented technocratic and bureaucratic leadership style behaviors than principals of effective, recognized schools. These conclusions are compatible with the information in the literature that posited that democratic, participative leadership style behaviors are relationship/people oriented and have a relationship with effective administrative behavior and schools.

Recommendations

Additional research would enhance the conclusions derived from this study. Recommendations for further research and related information are reviewed in this section. The first recommendation is that this study should be replicated to include a larger geographic area, such as the Midwest, South, etc., or on the national level. This study was limited to respondents of the Wisconsin population of principals of effective schools recognized by the Blue Ribbon Schools Program and an equal number of principals from a random sample of nonrecognized schools. By expanding the study geographically researchers could determine if there were any variations related to geographic area.

The leadership style behaviors identified for each principal were the principals' perceived leadership style behaviors. Subordinates and
superordinates of the principals were not involved in the analysis of the principals' leadership style behaviors. Therefore, no data were available to confirm or disagree with the principals' perception of their leadership style behaviors. This study should be restructured to include the teachers and possibly the superintendents of the principals to obtain their perception of principals' leadership style behaviors.

Because this study was quantitative in nature, the study should be replicated and expanded to include the methodologies of the present study in addition to the collection and analysis of qualitative data. The interviews and observations to collect the qualitative data should focus on the structure and dynamics of the team approach to practicing democratic, participative leadership style by the principal and staff in effective, recognized and nonrecognized schools. These data could be especially significant at the secondary level. No conclusions could be drawn at the secondary level in this present study.

This study should be expanded to determine the differences and similarities of additional demographic characteristics in relationship to leadership style behaviors and effective, recognized and nonrecognized schools. Stevens (1988/1989) completed a study which focused on demographic data and its relationship to exemplary and regular schools. This expanded study should include the methodology of the present study and also analyze the relationship to effective, recognized and nonrecognized schools. The number of demographic variables should be expanded from those included in this present study to include the principals' age, graduate and undergraduate majors, and career goals, to name a few. Data derived from this expanded study would provide a
comprehensive analysis of the relationship of principals' leadership style behaviors and demographic variables to effective, recognized and non-recognized schools.

Wisconsin's initiative toward shared decision making (SDM) and site-based management (SBM) began during the 1992-93 school year. The present study enhanced by the recommendations in this section would provide valuable data if it were replicated immediately and then again in 3 years to note any changes in democratic, participative/shared decision making leadership style practices. Analysis of these comparable data could assist in determining the trend in participative, shared decision making.

Further research should be conducted to determine if there are any differences between leadership style behaviors of principals of effective, recognized schools and principals of schools which have been identified as less effective rather than simply nonrecognized. Nonrecognized schools could likely include effective schools that have not yet been recognized as exemplary using the definition of effective, recognized schools of this present study. The use of less effective schools with a definition to include schools with low Gateway Assessment scores and other possible characteristics such as dropout date, percentage of students planning to attend institutions of higher education, etc. The approach to recognized versus less effective schools could provide unique data for comparison.
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(Signature of Current Principal Investigator)  
(Signature of Faculty Advisor)  
(Signature of HSIRB Chair)

If this form is not returned within 30 days, the research will be coded as completed by changing the end day you initially submitted to the HSIRB.

**RECEIVED**

APR 19 1994
H.S.I.R.B.
Appendix B

Cover Letter to Principals
Dear Colleague:

I am a doctoral student enrolled in an Educational Leadership Program at Western Michigan University and currently working on my dissertation. I have selected a topic that will provide valuable data in the development of quality leadership for our Wisconsin schools. The Association of Wisconsin School Administrators (AWSA) has endorsed this study. The topic of this study deals with leadership style behaviors of school principals.

Your valued assistance is needed in this research study. Enclosed please find a personal data sheet, survey of Educational Leadership Practices and an answer sheet that I would like you to complete. The survey should take approximately 35 minutes. The confidentiality of all participants will be assured. Personal survey data and answer sheets are coded for the purpose of follow-up to possible non-respondents. The coding will be removed when the data and answer sheets are returned. You have been selected by random sample with only a limited number of participants. Therefore, a response at your earliest possible convenience is vital to this research study. Please return the personal survey data and answer sheets to me in the enclosed self-addressed, stamped envelope.

As Principal of Merrill Senior High School, I understand your busy schedule and can appreciate that you do not need another task to complete. However, I respect you as an educational leader and hope you will assist me in this very important research. Thank you in advance for your professional input and time.

Sincerely,

Lanny J. Tibaldo, Principal
Merrill Senior High School

Charles R. Hilston, Executive Director
AWSA

LJT/az
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Appendix C

Follow-up Letter to Principals
Dear Colleague:

A few weeks ago you should have received a survey of Educational Leadership Practices and personal data sheet from me. As of this date, I have not yet received your completed survey and data sheets.

Your valued assistance in this research study will be greatly appreciated. Charles R. Hilston and AWSA have supported this study because of its significance in leadership research. For your convenience, enclosed please find the survey and survey/data sheets. Please take the time from your busy schedule to complete the survey and data information sheets and return it to me at your earliest convenience in the envelope provided. Due to the small number of educators involved in the survey, your response is critical to the success of this study! The confidentiality of all participants will be assured.

Once again, thank you for your valued time and effort! Best wishes for a relaxing summer.

Sincerely,

Lanny J. Tibaldo, Principal
Graduate Student
Western Michigan University

LJT/az
Appendix D

Letter Granting Permission to Use the Survey Instrument
Lanny J. Tibaldo  
1804 E. 6th Street  
Merrill, Wisconsin 54452

Dear Mr. Tibaldo:

As a doctoral student at Western Michigan University, you have my permission to use the Self-Scoring Survey of Educational Leadership Practices revised edition in your dissertation research project.

Sincerely,

Charles W. Nelson, Ph.D.
Executive Director
Management Research Associates
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