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ABSTRACT

This research sought to answer the following questions: 1) What is the relationship between the teachers' perceptions of urban elementary principal leadership behavior and teacher morale? 2) Do relationships exist among factors of principal leadership behaviors and factors of teacher morale? 3) Is there a difference between special education and general education teacher morale? The sample consisted of 278 teachers from nineteen elementary schools in the Hampton City Schools district in Hampton, Virginia. Forty three special education teachers and 122 general education teachers comprised the actual respondents (n=165).

An ex post facto research design was used for the study since the variables under study were the perception of leadership behavior of elementary principals as reported by the elementary teachers. The independent variable of the study was leader behavior, as measured by the Excellent Principal Inventory (EPI). The dependent variable was teacher morale, as measured by the Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire (PTO).

The findings indicated that there was a significant positive relationship between urban elementary leadership behavior and teacher morale in Hampton City Schools. Results indicated that the only relationships among the factors of leadership behavior, as measured by the EPI, and the factors of teacher morale, as measured by the PTO, was between Commitment to Student Success (leadership behavior factor) and Teacher Rapport With Principal (teacher morale factor). This supports the notion that morale is unidimensional versus multidimensional. No significant differences were noted between the morale of general education teachers and the morale of special education teachers.
A STUDY OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ELEMENTARY PRINCIPAL LEADERSHIP BEHAVIOR AND TEACHER MORALE
Chapter 1
Introduction

The American public school teachers of the contemporary reform movement are confronted with some of the most difficult problems to ever emerge in the educational arena. School violence, high school drop out rates, drug and alcohol usage in schools, and less than impressive comparative, standardized test scores are a few of the problems encountered day to day. Teaching is and always will be a rather stressful occupation, but initiatives such as *America 2000: An Education Strategy* (1991), one of many initiatives launched in follow up to Terrell Bell's 1983 *A Nation At Risk* report, adds pressure to the teacher's job and calls for greater accountability. Implicit in the *Nation At Risk* report was the general thought that teachers were not doing a good job of educating students. In effect, teacher morale has suffered to some extent throughout the country (Blase & Blase, 1994; Potter, 1995).

Teacher morale is one of the major concerns today among educators because of feelings of alienation within the profession (Cooley & Yovananoff, 1996; Irwin, 1996; Lamb, 1995; Livingston, 1994). Morale may be defined as the professional interest and enthusiasm that a person displays toward the achievement of individual and group goals in a given job situation (Bentley & Rempel, 1980). This definition recognizes the satisfaction of both individual and group needs and their effective harmonization as a basis for morale.
Bentley and Rempel indicated that high morale is evident when there is interest in and enthusiasm for the job and that what is important in morale is what the person believes, rather than the conditions that may exist as perceived by others. Low morale has occurred as a result of public criticism of schools and teacher performance, unrealistic teacher evaluation practices, low pay by comparison to factory workers and unskilled workers, increasing caseloads, lack of administrative support, collegial isolation, role conflict, lack of visible student progress, challenging student behaviors, and increased talk about teacher incompetence and plans to remedy this through staff development, inservice and suggested early retirement programs (Billingsley, 1993; Blase & Blase, 1994; Churchill & Williamson, 1995; Veenman & Raemaekers, 1995). Consequently, potentially good teachers are not entering the profession and many good teachers are leaving at a time when our public schools can least afford the loss (Cooley & Yovanoff, 1996). A study by Harris and Associates (1995) estimated that about 1 million public school teachers left the profession between 1984 and 1995 - the majority of whom were sincerely dedicated to teaching.

The Impact of the Principal's Leadership Behavior on Teacher Morale

How is it that principals impact the morale of schools? The literature clearly supports the belief that principals do indeed exert influence over factors which motivate teachers and yield job satisfaction (Billingsley & Cross, 1992; Blase & Kirby, 1992; Cooley & Yovanoff, 1996; Herzberg, Mausner & Synderman, 1959; Sergiovanni, 1984b). However, this does not suggest that the leadership of a school resides or should reside solely within the principal. This author defines leadership as the “process” of providing
influential direction for the sake of achieving organizational goals and objectives. The principal is obviously a key player in this process, but leadership is an energy that exists in collaborative relationships which have the power to influence organizational/community action and outcomes. To paraphrase Margaret Wheatley (1992), no one person is smart enough or has enough resources to do what needs to be done in schools. Wheatley suggested that the real power in an organization is in information and in the relationships that enable us to take in, process, and use information. The leader then is the individual who can organize the experience of the organization and thus get the full power of the group (Follett, 1960). In distinguishing the leader from the total body of leadership, Follett indicated that the leader is the individual that has the ability to create a group power rather than express a personal power. The most effective principal/leader is the individual with the capacity to facilitate the school’s creation of a vision of what it wants to become (Barth, 1990; Starratt, 1995).

The degree to which principals succeed at the task of influencing teacher behavior is linked to the “level” of teacher satisfaction and commitment in their respective schools (Cooley & Yovanoff, 1996; Davidson & Dell, 1996; Zigarelli, 1996). It is not clear whether enhanced job satisfaction leads to commitment, or whether increased commitment leads to greater job satisfaction (Billingsley & Cross, 1992). However, “principals who promote a supportive environment among teachers, who effectively monitor the nature of the curriculum, who define their goals, and who carefully supervise teachers will promote an environment conducive to teachers who are satisfied and committed” (Anderman, Belzer, and Smith, 1991, p. 21). In this same vein, Rosenholtz (1991) noted that a
potential strategy for increasing job satisfaction among teachers is for principals to engage in a variety of support behaviors that include feedback / effective communication, encouragement, acknowledgement, use of participative decision making, and collaborative problem solving.

Research has also suggested that the principal’s perceived behavior and impact on teacher morale is arguably related to student achievement (Hughes, 1991). The general assertion is that if schools have strong leadership, characterized by supportive and conducive working environments for teachers, better student achievement will be the result (Hughes, 1991). White and Stevens (1988) reported that 804 teachers’ attitudes toward classroom evaluation systems as well as their perceptions of the functional behavior of the principal were the strongest predictors of students’ achievement in reading. Teachers that were not motivated and lacked enthusiasm typically had students that were low achievers. Similarly, more recent findings have shown that in schools where the principal is perceived by teachers as frequently performing important functions in the school, teachers’ attitudes toward work-related dimensions were found to be positive and showed strong relationships to student outcomes (Hughes, 1995; Davidson and Dell, 1996; Currall, 1996).

The Morale of General Education Teachers Versus Special Education Teachers

Teacher morale, as an issue, impacts general education and special education teachers. Mcternan (1983) explored differences in morale between the two groups in a doctoral dissertation. The findings revealed that morale was not significantly different between the groups, that principals were more strongly identified with regular education
teachers than with special education teachers, and that special education teachers
expressed stronger feelings of satisfaction overall. When studying the impacts of low
morale on retention of teachers, Billingsley (1995) reported attrition rates of 5.8 percent
to 7.9 percent per year for special educators and 4.6 percent to 5.8 percent for general
educators. In deciding to leave, 51.5 percent of special education exiters and 23.2 percent
of general education exiters gave dissatisfaction with assignment as an important reason
for leaving. A questionnaire completed by 463 special educators and 493 general
educators in Virginia indicated that “work related variables, such as leadership support,
role conflict, role ambiguity, and stress are better predictors of commitment and job
satisfaction than are demographic variables” (Billingsley & Cross, 1992, p. 453).

The recent implementation of the Individuals With Disability Act Amendments
(IDEA) of 1997 represents current legislation that will likely impact the morale of special
and general education teachers (Razeghi, 1997). The amendments call for greater teacher
accountability which translates into more individualized education program (IEP)
paperwork. Excessive paperwork, we already know, contributes to low morale (Churchill
& Williamson, 1995; Davidson & Dell, 1996; Porter, 1995; Veenman & Raemaekers,
1995). Similarly, the approved 1997 revisions of the Standards of Accreditation (SOA)
and Standards of Learning (SOL) in the Commonwealth of Virginia add to the
responsibilities of special and general education teachers. Paired with the responsibility of
implementing the 1997 IDEA Amendments, the new SOA and SOL instructional
requirements present an overwhelming task for teachers. Such conditions provide fertile
soil for the growth and advancement of dissatisfaction. Feeling overwhelmed,
unsupported, unprepared, disempowered, and victimized result in low teacher morale if not treated properly (Brownell, 1995; Brownell & Smith, 1992).

**Teacher Morale and School Success**

High morale is vital to the optimal success of any organization (Davidson & Dell, 1996; Frasier, 1991; McManus, 1996; Roberts & Dungan, 1994). Miles (1965) indicated that morale is one of the requisites for a “healthy” school. According to Miles, positive organizational health/climate is characterized by a sense of togetherness that bonds people together (cohesiveness), a feeling of well-being among the staff (morale), self-renewing properties (innovativeness), and an active response to its environment (autonomy and adaptation). Moreover, the healthy school is one that communicates well with all constituents, shares power, and focuses on organizational goals. It is safe to say that the lack of high morale will adversely impact the goals and objectives of the organization.

McManus (1996) stated:

How we feel about ourselves and our work affects our motivation and perception: these will be high and positive where morale is high; and they will be low and pessimistic where morale is low. Teachers who have high morale will tend to be more effective in their teaching, have better relationships with their pupils, and be more cooperative and trusting with others in the education system. Teachers with low morale will be more likely to show a high degree of failure and frustration, be abrasive and confrontational, and suspicious of colleagues, parents and policy-makers. (pg. 118)

Supporting this general notion is research that argues that teacher morale is a vital
factor in student achievement in schools. For example, Nwanko (1979) found a strong, relationship between teacher morale and student conflict in secondary schools in Nigeria. Nidch (1985) found significant correlations between teacher morale and student pro-social behavior norms in Philippine secondary schools. Andrew, Parks, Nelson & Phi Delta Kappa Commission (1985) indicated that there is a high correlation between high student achievement and high teacher morale, but caution that one cannot assume a direct cause and effect relationship with such findings. Similarly, in a study on shared decision making, teacher morale, and pupil performance, Silva (1995) found positive correlations between teacher morale and student achievement in the areas of reading and mathematics. In a comparative study of 33 high achieving schools and 33 low achieving schools, Hughes (1995) concluded that schools demonstrating high student achievement are characterized as having high teacher morale. Conversely, low achieving schools typically have low morale. An abundance of other research share findings that make a connection between morale and student achievement (e.g., Agne, 1992; Hancock, 1996; Veenman & Raemaekers, 1995).

Of critical importance is the fact that students, just like teachers, need recognition, stimulation and a conducive work/learning environment. Without a healthy learning environment, students too are at risk of failing or simply not working up to their full potentials. Thus, the combined effects of low teacher morale in schools and the negative attitudes of the public can erode the overall climate of the educational system (Miller, 1986). If this statement holds true, the future of high quality education is indeed at stake. It is, then, incumbent upon school principals to foster school environments that promote
positive school climates, strong cultures and high morale if their schools are to be effective (Bossert, Dwyer, Rown, & Lee, 1982; Heck, Larsen & Marcoulides, 1990; Irwin, 1996; Hipp, 1996; Stoll & Fink, 1996).

Theoretical Rationale

The theoretical rationale of this study is founded in motivation theory. The investigation explored the relationship between the leadership behavior of elementary principals and teacher morale - or simply, the professional interest and enthusiasm that a person displays toward the achievement of individual and group goals in a job situation. Motivation theories are modes of analysis that can help one to understand issues and to develop practices, but they cannot provide universal prescriptions applicable to everyone and in every situation (Sergiovanni, 1988).

Russell and Black (1981) defined motivation as a continuous process of interaction between needs within the individual and the environment. It is a state of being that is essentially transient in nature. Russell and Black contended that all motivation is essentially self-motivated because our actions depend upon our perceptions of a situation and perception is an internal process unique to each individual. As human beings, we must deal with a constantly shifting combination of needs (e.g., biological, emotional, ego, and social needs) that tend to move us in many and often conflicting directions. How well we satisfy our strong desires for inclusion, control, affection, and self-actualizing shapes the direction of our growth as a unique individual. Motivation within an organization, then, depends upon the objectives of the employee (Ackerman & Grunenwald, 1986).

"Consequently, management should look at motivation from the employee's perspective:
Understanding the complexity of the theories of motivation may be facilitated with a comprehension of social system theory. Social system theory plays a vital role in motivation theory in that it focuses on psycho-social entities in the environment that influence human behavior within an organization. A social system is a model of organization that possesses a distinctive total unity (creativity) beyond its component parts; it is distinguished from its environment by a clearly defined boundary; it is composed of subunits, elements, and subsystems that are at least interrelated within relatively stable patterns (Olsen, 1968). Getzel and Guba's (1957) social systems model included two elements: the institutional element and the individual element. The institutional element refers to those patterns of behavior that establish the structures needed to accomplish the global tasks (goals and objectives) of a system. The individual element refers to the personalities and needs of the role players within the organization. Getzel and Guba explained that it is the blending of these two elements that determines the psycho-social behavior of individuals within the system. Environmental inputs from the larger system (outside of the school) impacts the individual and the institution. The key to the understanding of social system theory and its role in motivation is the awareness that if the needs and interests (motivational factors) of the individuals are not in agreement with goals and objectives of the system/organization, productivity and satisfaction may be adversely impacted (Biddean, 1980; Giddeons, 1979; Hoy & Miskel, 1982). For example, if a school district proposes implementing inclusionary practices at all schools during a given fiscal year as a major goal and the teachers feel that empowering teachers in the
decision making process should be a major goal, the district may experience difficulty in
the successful attainment of its goal because it is not congruent with the teachers’ interest.

Content Theories of Motivation

There are several theories of motivation. Campbell, Dunnette, Lawlor and Weick
(1970) group the theories into two categories: content and process theories. Content
theories of motivation (see, for example, Herzberg, 1959; Maslow, 1953; McClelland,
Atkinson, Clark, and Lowell, 1953; and McGregor, 1960) focus on the specific identity of
what it is within a person or his environment that energizes and sustains behavior
(Campbell, et. al., 1970). Theoretically, people have such fundamental needs such as food,
elimination of body waste, security, belonging, and achievement. Content theories identify
and define these needs in terms of such variables as salary, friendships on the job, and
other types of reward systems.

The most influential of the content theories of motivation is arguably Maslow’s
(1953) hierarchy of needs theory of motivation. Maslow proposed a hierarchy of needs
consisting of five levels: physiological needs (lowest level), safety needs, social needs, ego
needs, and self-fulfillment needs. In brief, Maslow contended that:

Human needs arrange themselves in hierarchies of prepotency.
That is to say, the appearance of one need usually rests on the
prior satisfaction of another, more prepotent need. Man is a
perceptually wanting animal. Also no need or drive can be
treated as if it were isolated or discrete; every drive is related
to the state of satisfaction or dissatisfaction of other drives. (p. 85)
Another major content theory is the Existence, Relatedness, and Growth (ERG) theory formulated by Alderfer (1972). Alderfer's theory was grounded in Maslow's and he indicated that there were three human needs: existence, relatedness, and growth. Existence needs refer to all forms of material and physiological factors necessary to sustain human existence. This need encompassed Maslow's physiological and safety needs. Relatedness needs refer to all socially oriented needs which include Maslow's social needs and parts of the safety and esteem needs. Growth needs are those related to the development of human potential which includes Maslow's self-actualization plus the internally based portion of self-esteem needs. One of the biggest differences between Alderfer's theory and Maslow's theory is that Alderfer does not require the needs to be strictly "ordered".

A third content theory is Herzberg's (1959) motivation-hygiene theory. This theory stipulates that employees have two distinct sets of needs. One set of needs is best met by hygienic factors. In exchange for these factors, one is prepared to make the participatory investment - to give a fair day's work. If hygienic factors are neglected, dissatisfaction occurs, and one's performance on the job decreases to a level below the acceptable. Another set of needs is best met by the motivational factors that are not automatically part of the job but that can be built into most jobs. In return for the motivational factors, one is prepared to make the performance investment, to exceed the limits of the traditional work relationship. If the motivational factors are neglected, Herzberg posits that one does not become dissatisfied, but one's performance does not exceed that typically described as a fair day's work for a fair day's pay.
Process Theories of Motivation

Process theories (see, for example, Adams, 1965; Lawler & Porter, 1975; Steers & Porter, 1975; Vroom, 1964) attempt to explain and describe the process of energizing, directing, sustaining, and stopping of behavior. After first defining the major classes of variables needed to explain motivated behavior, those using a process framework attempt to specify how these variables interact to produce a certain type of behavior" (Campbell, et. al. 1970).

Two of the major process theories are equity theory and expectancy / valence theory. Adams (1965) explained that in equity theory, individuals either singularly or collectively perceive an exchange (i.e., employee exchanging his services for pay) to be inequitable. When two individuals exchange anything, the possibility exists that either one or both of them will feel that the exchange is inequitable. Adam contended that the employee sees such things as his job expertise, experience, educational training, and intelligence as his contribution to the work exchange. The employee’s expectation is that his return (i.e., pay, respect, and access to decision making) in the exchange should be a “fair” one. The feeling of inequity develops when the employee feels that the exchange is not fair. This perception, right or wrong, leads to dissatisfaction and motivates individuals to attempt to reduce the inequity. The strength of the individual’s motivation is proportional to the perceived inequity. In other words, if the individual feels that his/her work productivity exceeds the amount of pay received, the individual will reduce his productivity to the level at which he/she perceives the exchange to be equitable.

Valence / expectancy theory is comprised of three basic components: performance
- outcome expectancy, valence, and effort - performance expectancy. Performance -
outcome expectancy contends that every behavior has associated with it, in an individual’s
mind, certain outcomes (e.g., rewards or punishments) (Lawler & Porter; 1975; Steers and
Porter, 1975; Vroom, 1964). In other words, the individual believes or “expects” that if
he or she behaves in a certain way, he or she will get certain things.

Each performance of behavior has a certain “valence” (i.e., value, worth,
attractiveness) to a certain individual. Outcomes have different valences for different
individuals. This comes about because valences result from individual needs and
perceptions, which differ because they in turn reflect other factors in the individual’s life (Lawyer & Porter, 1975). Thus, if a given behavior has no significant value to a person, he
will not be motivated.

Effort - performance expectancy indicates that each behavior has associated with it
in the individual’s mind a certain expectancy or probability of success. This expectancy
represents the individual’s perception of how hard it will be to achieve such behavior and
the probability of his or her successful achievement of that behavior (Lawler & Porter,
1975).

When the concepts are applied as a whole, the end result is behavior that is
reflective of the individual’s beliefs. For example, a teacher is considering the pursuit of
an advanced degree in school administration. This degree will possibly enable him/her to
get a job as a principal. The job as a principal is the outcome expectancy. The teacher
will then assess the valence of this potential job opportunity. If this assessment yields
adequate worth and attractiveness, the valence will be considered high. But if the
individual does not feel that the probability of success (i.e., effort-performance expectancy) is likely, he/she may not pursue the advanced degree. On the other hand, if the individual feels that the level of difficulty is manageable and that the possibility of success/achievement is high, he/she will be motivated to engage in the behavior (Lawler & Porter, 1975; Steers & Porter, 1975; Vroom, 1964).

Whereas the philosophical premise of these and other theories of motivation may vary to some extent and may even appear conflicting, it is of paramount importance that educational leaders develop a conceptual framework of motivation. This conceptual framework will help guide leaders in their approach to understanding the needs of teachers and precisely what it takes for the organization to satisfy and sustain those needs.

The theory of motivation that will guide the present study is grounded primarily in valence/expectancy theory. Motivation is viewed as a continuous process of interaction between needs within the individual and the environment. Moreover, as Russell and Black (1981) contended, all motivation is viewed as being self-motivated because our actions depend upon our perceptions of a situation and perception is an internal process unique to each individual. Whereas there is some merit to all of the various theories, valence/expectancy theory provides the most comprehensive explanation of human motivation. Thus, the motives of teachers' behavior and the transient nature of their satisfaction are explainable within the context of this theory.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to determine if the teacher morale in urban elementary schools is significantly related to the teachers' perceptions of the principal's leadership.
behavior and ability and to determine if there is a difference between the morale of
general education teachers and special education teachers. This research is an extension of
a study conducted by Zbikowski (1992) in which the relationship between elementary
principal leadership behavior and teacher morale in suburban elementary schools was
studied. The present study expands upon the research in two ways: 1) by examining the
relationship in an urban school district, in which the environment tends to reflect high
levels of stress and 2) by exploring differences between general education and special
education teacher morale.

Research Questions

1. Is there a significant relationship between teachers’ perceptions of urban elementary
   principals’ leadership behavior and teacher morale?

2. Do significant relationships exist among factors of principal leadership behaviors and
   teacher morale?

3. Is there a significant difference between special education and general education
   teacher morale?

Significance of the Study

This study will examine the relationship between the leadership behavior of
elementary principals and teacher morale in an urban school division. The overall findings
should prove to be significant for five main reasons. First, the findings will serve as a
guide to educators concerned with improving leadership in schools. The Excellent
Principal Inventory that is utilized in the study is an assessment model which attempts to
identify an individual’s mode of behavior in leadership roles. The design of the study
highlights the teachers’ perceived leadership practices. Second, leadership behaviors identified through the use of the Excellent Principal Inventory can help school divisions address needs of principals through planned professional development programs. Third, where findings indicate a relationship between specific leadership behaviors and specific aspects of teacher morale, administrative action can guide efforts to improve staff morale. Fourth, the study will determine if there are any significant differences between the morale of general education and special education teachers. This information may help guide principals in their approach when addressing any unique needs/interests of general education versus special education teachers. Fifth, the results can be used by colleges and universities that train students in the area of educational leadership. By placing the appropriate amount of emphasis on morale during instruction and during internships, student administrators may be more conscientious of the necessity of addressing teacher morale in an effective manner.

Operational Definitions

**Principal behavior**: The leadership behavior of elementary principals as measured by the Excellent Principal Inventory.

**Motivation**: The continuous process of interaction between needs within the individual and the environment (Russell & Black, 1981); motivation is equal to expectancy times value - meaning that for an individual to be “motivated”, a given behavior must reflect a desired outcome/expectancy and the outcome must be of sufficient value/importance before the individual will engage in the behavior (Vroom, 1964).

**Teacher morale**: the professional interest and enthusiasm that a person displays
toward the achievement of individual and group goals in a job situation as measured by the Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire.

Limitations of the Study

The limitation of this study was that it was based on 19 public elementary schools in Hampton, Virginia. Thus, the findings may not necessarily be generalizable to other school districts due to differences in size, geographical location, student composition, and faculty composition. With respect to the instruments, a limitation of the Excellent Principal Inventory is that it has not been tested for reliability and validity; a limitation of the Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire is that its validity testing was based on the responses of high school teachers - not elementary school teachers. Furthermore, principal leader behavior and teacher morale are based on perceptions of the respondents as indicated on the Excellent Principal Inventory and the Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire respectively.

Assumptions of the Study

1. Both questionnaires reflect opinion based responses - as opposed to factually based responses.

2. The responses on the questionnaires used are valid indicators of leadership and morale.

3. The Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire will measure elementary teacher morale.

4. The Excellent Principal Inventory will measure principal leadership behavior.

5. The motivation and honesty of the respondents may influence the results obtained.

6. Teacher morale may be dependent upon factors not measured by the test instruments.

7. Leadership styles may be dependent upon factors not measured by the test instrument.
Chapter 2
Review of the Literature

This chapter presents a review of the literature on the topics of teacher morale and leadership behavior. The review consists of six sections which are related to the rationale for studying the relationship between elementary principal leadership behavior and teacher morale. The sections are:

1) Leadership Behavior

2) Teacher Morale

3) The Relationship Between Teacher Morale and Productivity

4) The Relationship Between Teacher Morale and Student Achievement

5) The Morale of General Education Teachers vrs. Special Education Teachers

6) The Relationship Between Leadership Behavior and Teacher Morale

Leadership Behavior

Leadership is what Bass (1990, p. 3) described as “one of the world’s oldest preoccupations.” It is, indeed, as old as civilization itself. Famed leaders can be traced back to the ancient times of prophets, chiefs, disciples, and kings. It is the behavior of leaders that has intrigued scholars for hundreds of years and that has prompted extensive studies about such topics as the importance of leadership, the ingredients of a good leader, typologies of leaders, and how to become an effective leader (Short & Greer, 1997).

There is no universal definition of leadership. The popularized study of leadership
has evoked a multitude of perspectives on its meaning. Many of these definitions are quite similar, while others are vastly different. As defined in chapter one, leadership may be viewed as the process of providing influential direction for the sake of achieving established goals and objectives. Leadership focuses on newness, change, and a cutting edge visionary perspective (Starratt, 1995). Regardless of the type of business or endeavor, leadership, when present, will generally reflect these characteristics (Starratt, 1995).

From a broad perspective, most leadership theories can be grouped into one of four categories. These are: 1) Great Man Theories, 2) Trait Theories, 3) Behavioral Theories, and 4) Contingency Theories (Rudnitski, 1996). Evolving as a fifth category is what is referred to as chaos theory, or what Margaret Wheatley (1992) essentially described as the new scientific approach to organizational leadership.

**Great Man Theories**

The great man theories of leadership focus on the analysis of the behavior of outstanding leaders (Rudnitski, 1996). These are probably the oldest of leadership theories - dating back to the observation of such great biblical leaders as Moses. The basic contention of the theory is that leaders possess one-way, directive behaviors which influence others to behave in accordance with their wishes (Short & Greer, 1997). The authors of great man studies believed that if one studied the leadership behaviors of “great” men, one could identify universal personality qualities. These individuals were thought to have innate talents and skills. The followers of leaders were not believed to have any impact on the effectiveness of leadership. Some of the individuals professed by
many to be “great” leaders are John F. Kennedy, Martin Luther King, and Douglas MacArthur (Bass, 1990). “The great-man theory of leadership is currently espoused by those who show how faltering business corporations are turned around by transformational leaders, such as Lee Iacocca” (Bass, 1990, p. 38).

**Trait Theories**

Trait theories, like great man theories, conceptualize a one-way directive process (Rudnitski, 1996). The trait approach was derived to provide a more precise method of identifying the essential characteristics of leaders (Bird, 1940). Proponents contend that the leader is able to attain the required behavior of followers because of personality traits that distinguish him/her from them. Stogdill (1948) reviewed 124 studies on traits and reported that the leader exceeded the average member of the group in five categories of leadership traits:

1. Capacity (intelligence, alertness, verbal facility, originality, and judgement),
2. Achievement (scholarship, knowledge, and athletic achievement),
3. Responsibility (dependability, initiative, persistence, aggressiveness, self-confidence, and desire to excel),
4. Participation (activity, sociability, cooperation, adaptability, and humor), and
5. Status (socio-economic, position, and popularity).

Despite these distinctions portrayed by leaders, Stogdill argued that one could not establish any consistent, universal leader behaviors by observing traits alone. In summary, Stogdill concluded that: (a) attempts to select leaders in terms of traits had little success, (b) numerous traits differentiated leaders from followers, (c) the traits demanded of a
leader varied from one situation to another, and (d) the trait approach ignored the interaction between the leader and his or her group.

**Behavioral Theories**

The behavioral approach focuses on the description of the behaviors of leaders as they relate/interact with organizational constituents. Thus, the behavioral approach embraces both a psychological and a sociological perspective. Hemphill (1949) initiated studies at the University of Maryland and at Ohio State University that described leadership behavior. Hemphill and his associates identified two dimensions of leadership in their studies. These two components were consideration and initiating structure. Consideration refers to the extent to which a leader exhibits concern for the welfare of other members of the organization. Consideration has to do with such things as the leader's sense of appreciation of the efforts of subordinates, equity in the workplace, the staff's self-esteem, and job satisfaction. Initiating structure focuses on the extent to which the leader initiates activity in the group, organizes the work, and determines the procedural directives for accomplishing tasks. The initiating dimension looks strictly at accomplishing the goals and objectives in the workplace.

In 1950 Hemphill devised the Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ) at Ohio State University. This instrument looked specifically at leader behaviors as they relate to the initiating and consideration dimensions. Hemphill and Coons (1957) refined the instrument. When completing a LBDQ, respondents rate a leader using five alternatives to indicate the frequency or amount certain behaviors are observed. Many studies were conducted using the LBDQ. Fleishman (1973) reviewed the history of the
LBDQ and presented a general conclusion out of the preponderance of findings. He concluded that the numerous findings seem to indicate that the high-structure / high consideration pattern appear to be the most desirable - whereas the low-consideration / low-structure pattern more often appears the least desirable.

Fleishman’s (1973) findings regarding the initiating structure and consideration dimensions of leadership behavior reflect theoretical thought and practices that have evolved from different philosophies dating back to the early 1900s. Most of the behavioral theories of leadership that have been developed can be classified as having their origins in one or more of the following: (a) scientific management, (b) human relations management, and (c) human resource management.

**Scientific management theories and leadership.** During the early part of the twentieth century, organization behavior theory was dominated by the scientific management movement (Sergiovanni & Starrant, 1988). Traditional scientific management emerged from the thinking and work of Frederick Taylor (1911) and his followers during the early 1900s. In observing certain inefficiencies in the way work was performed at steel companies, Taylor devised techniques for increasing the workers’ productivity. To employ a scientific approach, Taylor used task analysis to assess the loading of pig iron onto railroad cars at the Bethlehem steel plant. In order to optimize work productivity, Taylor gave specific directions to workers and prohibited them from deviating from their instructions. If they did, penalties and other disciplinary actions were taken against them in order to bring them into compliance. Control, accountability, and efficiency are the three driving forces behind scientific management. “These ideas carry
over to school supervision when teachers are viewed as implementers of highly refined
curriculum and teaching systems and where close supervision is practiced to ensure that
they are teaching in the way in which they are supposed to and that they are following
approved guidelines and teaching protocols” (Sergiovanni, 1988, p. 9).

Human relations theories and leadership. Although some of the basic tenets of
scientific management have proven to be effective in establishing and maintaining a sense
of structure in the workplace, as a whole its practices have not been received well
(Gallmeir, 1992). The human relations approach to management was in essence a strong
reaction against the tenets of scientific management. This theory of management was
advanced during the early 1930's by Elton Mayo, a social philosopher and industrial
psychologist at Harvard University (Sergiovanni, 1988), and by such distinguished
administrators as Mary Parker Follett (1941). Unlike scientific management, the human
relations leader presents behavior that is characterized by concern for the feelings of
workers, concern for group cohesiveness, interest in supportive relationships, and a need
to develop social and emotional relationships with staff members (Bass, 1990; Curral,
1996; Fleishman, 1973). When applying the practice of human relations to schooling,
Sergiovanni (1988) noted that teachers are viewed as “whole persons, in their own right
rather than as packages of needed energy, skills, and aptitudes to be used by
administrators and supervisors” (Sergiovanni, 1988, p. 9). Additionally, as Follett (1960)
asserted, leadership should be concerned with the leader’s ability to grasp the “total
situation”, which is inclusive of facts (present and potential), aims, purposes, and the
individuals within the organization. “Out of a welter of facts, experience, desires, and
aims, the leader must find the unifying thread. He must see the relationship between all the different factors in a situation" (p. 299). Follett eloquently stated:

The leader then is one who can organize the experience of the group and thus get the full power of the group. The leader makes the team. This is preeminently the leadership quality - the ability to organize all the forces there are in an enterprise and make them serve a common purpose. Men with this ability create a group power rather than express a personal power. They penetrate to the subtlest connections of the forces at their command, and make all these forces available and most effectively available for the accomplishment of their purposes (pp. 299-300).

Human resources theories and leadership. The human resources theory evolved in the early 1960s and was based primarily on the work of Douglas McGregor (1960), Warren Bennis (1961), Chris Argyris (1957); and Rensis Likert (1961). The human resource theory of management was an effort to combine emphasis on the task dimension (initiating structure) of work and the human dimension (consideration) (Gallmeir, 1992). The basic premise of the theory was that manipulation of individuals’ behavior and efforts to keep people happy on the job was not an effective means of increasing worker productivity. Argyris (1964) indicated that individual competence, commitment, self-responsibility, fully functioning individuals, and viable, vital organizations are the keys to greater success. The belief is that access to decision making will lead to an increase in employee productivity, which in turn leads to employee satisfaction (Anderman, 1991; Thomas, 1997). Conversely, human relations supervision supports the notion that access to decision making leads to an increase in employee satisfaction, which results in an
increase in employee productivity.

McGregor’s (1960) theoretical contribution to human resource management contrasts administrative styles in his Theory X and Theory Y perspectives. Theory X assumes that the workers lack ambition, have a natural dislike for work, and must be coerced into working through punishments and rewards. Theory Y, on the other hand, assumes that work is a natural condition for adults and they will work hard toward objectives to which they are committed. Sergiovanni (1975) claimed that most teachers will make a “performance investment” if they are allowed full participation in the organization. He maintained that a performance investment is a type of motivation in which teachers exceed the limits of the traditional legal work relationship by giving more to the organization than can be reasonably expected.

Contingency/Situational Theories

Situational theories contend that designated leaders evolve out of situational demands. The situationalist advanced the view that the emergence of a great leader is a result of time, place, and circumstance (Bass, 1990). These theories advanced the notion that although one individual may demonstrate the essential leadership behaviors in a given environment, he or she may not emerge as a good leader in another situation because of the unique differences between the two. The traits, then, required of the leaders would arguably vary. In effect, the leadership behavior adopted is considered to be contingent in nature.

The framework for contingency theories can be traced back to Barnard (1948) who posited that leadership depends on at least three factors: (a) the individual, (b) the
followers, and (c) the environmental conditions embracing both the leader and his subordinates. The contingency theorist explains that leadership depends on variables such as situation favorableness, task specificity, leader-member relations, leader personality, and group maturity (Fiedler, 1969; Hersey, Blanchard, & Natemeyer, 1979; House & Mitchell, 1974; Tannenbaum & Schmidt, 1973). The basic philosophy is that no one leadership style works in all situations. Contingency theory suggests that both task-oriented (initiating) and relationship-oriented (consideration) leaders are able to perform effectively. As Gallmeier (1992) and Stogdill (1974) indicated, the leadership style asserted must be appropriate for the type of individuals with whom one is working with and the overall situational factors (e.g., degree of staff motivation, morale, organizational climate and culture). The implication here is that there is no one “best” leadership style. Thus, there is no one “best” approach to attaining high morale within an organization.

The importance of both forms of leader behavior, initiating structure and consideration, is emphasized by Cartwright and Zander (1953) in their delineation of the two fundamental objectives of all groups: (a) the achievement of some specific group goal, and (b) the maintenance or strengthening of the group itself. They indicated that both group forms of leader behavior are required to fulfill these two group objectives. Halpin (1954) examined the effects of initiating structure and consideration behavior of aircraft commanders on crew member satisfaction and performance. Results revealed a positive correlation between the satisfaction level of crew members and the consideration factor of leadership characterized by the commander. A positive correlation was noted for initiating structure when the commander was evaluated by his superiors. Halpin’s conclusion that
both dimensions are important and that the degree of emphasis is contingent upon the nature of the task at hand. Halpin (1953) also presented evidence which indicated that the most effective commanders are those who score high on both dimensions of leader behavior. Similar findings were made by Hemphill (1955) in a study of twenty-two departments in a liberal arts college. He found that the departments that were renowned for being well administered were those whose leaders were described as above the average on both consideration and initiating structure behaviors.

Korman (1966) and Fleishman (1973) conducted literature reviews of empirical studies that investigated the relationships between consideration and initiating structure. These reviews revealed that leader consideration appears to be a consistent, reliable predictor of subordinate satisfaction and the behavioral consequences of job satisfaction. Fleishman and Harris (1962) reported the results of a study conducted in the factories of a farm equipment manufacturer. The findings indicated that the rates of subordinate turnover and officially processed grievances accelerated as the leader's consideration scores declined. Grievances and turnover changed very little as the level of initiating structure moved from low to moderate, but at very high degrees of initiating structure, grievances and turnover again accelerated markedly. Fleishman and Harris further indicated that while high consideration seemed to offset the otherwise negative effect of high initiating structure, the reverse was not true: low consideration, even when coupled with low initiating structure, led to dissatisfaction and low morale. They stated that even though consideration generally correlates positively with subordinate job satisfaction, the magnitude of the relationship varies from situation to situation based upon the level of the
job, the nature of the task, and the characteristics of the subordinates.

The more recent studies continue to support these findings. Namishan (1989) studied the leadership behavior of elementary and secondary principals in Nigeria. When considering initiating structure and consideration, higher satisfaction levels were exhibited by teachers who had principals that practiced more consideration leadership. Higher levels of dissatisfaction were reported for principals that emphasized deadlines, pushed teachers to work to their capacity, and asked teachers to follow strict rules and regulations. Whereas other research (e.g., Anderman, 1991; Blase & Blase, 1994; Davidson & Dell, 1996; Johnsrud, 1996) reflect similar findings, optimal performance tends to be best achieved when leaders establish a good sense of balance between the two factors of initiating and consideration leadership.

This effort to establish this sense of balance in management is the basic premise of transformational and transactional leadership models of leadership (Bass, 1985; Bass, Avolio, & Goodheim, 1987; Burns, 1978). The transformational leader is one who pursuades followers to perform above expectations. The behavioral factors critical to effective transformational leadership are:

1. Charisma / inspiration - the degree to which the leader creates enthusiasm in followers, sees what is really important, and transmits a sense of mission to the organization.

2. Intellectual stimulation - the degree to which the leader provides intellectual and problem-oriented guidance. The leader arouses followers to think in new ways.

3. Individual consideration - the degree to which the leader is concerned with the
individual needs of followers. (Bass, 1985).

Conversely, the transactional leader is one who motivates followers to perform at levels of expectation and to achieve satisfaction of basic needs. The two behavioral factors of transactional leadership are:

1. Contingent reward - which is the degree to which the leader makes clear what the follower must accomplish in order to be rewarded.

2. Management by exception - which is the degree to which the leader provides negative feedback for failure to meet agreed upon standards (Bass, 1985).

Bass contended that most leaders assert both transformational and transactional leadership to various degrees. “Transformational leadership augments transactional leadership by focusing on the development of followers as well as addressing the goals of the leader, follower, group, and organization” (Thomas, 1997, p. 22). Davidson and Dell (1996) found that a principal using a transformational approach was the preferred leadership style of teachers. Teachers in this study were exposed to a principal using a transactional type of approach part of the school year and to a principal asserting a transformational approach part of the school year. When working under the transformational principal, teachers reported that they felt empowered, enthusiastic, in control of their workplace, and encouraged to be creative. Conversely, under the leader who used the transactional approach, teachers felt isolated, helpless, and a sense of apathy about their work.

Waldman, Bass, and Einstein (1987) showed that the performance appraisals of subordinates were higher if their leaders had been described as transformational.
Similarly, Yammarino and Bass (1989) demonstrated that those leaders who were described as transformational rather than transactional by their subordinates were judged to have a much higher leadership potential. Other researchers have reported highly positive effects of transformational leadership styles (Leithwood, 1992; Rogers, 1992), whereas pure transactional approaches are not well received by employees.

**Chaos Theory**

The essential foundation of chaos theory is grounded partly in human resource theory and the transformational theory of approaching leadership. Chaos theory, too, embraces the principles of participatory decision making and empowerment within organizations. However, chaos theory goes beyond traditional and even many contemporary philosophies that are sensitive to the human needs of organizations. It cuts across the grain of these theories by advancing the belief that chaos within an organization is not only beneficial, but essential for optimal success (Williams, 1997). Chaos theory adheres to the principles of what Wheatley (1992) refers to as the new science. The new science involves metaphorical links between certain scientific perspectives and organizational phenomena. More specifically, “In new science, the underlying currents are a movement toward holism, toward understanding the systems as a system and giving primary value to the relationships that exist among seemingly discreet parts” (Wheatley, 1992, p. 9). It is stronge collaborative relationships among the various constituents within the system that establish the true power bases. As was directed by Tom Peters (1987) in his book *Thriving on Chaos*, it is important to “Involve everyone in everything” (p. 285). It was part of the prescription for what Peters described as “a world turned upside down.”
Peters specified five areas of management that constitute the essence of proactive performance in a chaotic world:

1. An obsession with responsiveness to customers.

2. Constant innovation in all areas of the firm.

3. Partnership - the wholesome participation of and gain sharing with all people connected with the organization.

4. Leadership that loves change (instead of fighting it) and instills and shares an inspiring vision.

5. Control by means of simple support systems aimed at measuring the “right stuff” for today’s environment (p. 36).

In chaos theory, disorder is viewed as playing a critical role in giving birth to new, higher forms of order (Wheatley, 1992). A system is defined as chaotic when it becomes impossible to know where it will be next. Wheatley indicated that change and disorder are now understood as mirror images, one containing the other, a continual process where a system can leap into chaos and unpredictability, yet within that state be held within parameters that are well-ordered and predictable. As organizational systems, we create order when we invite conflicts and contradictions to rise to the surface, when we search them out, highlight them, even allowing them to grow large and worrisome. The key to success is the organizations’ support of employee contributions and involvement at all levels of decision making. Principals and other designated leaders function merely as facilitators of disorder. “We stir things up and roil the pot, looking always for those disturbances that challenge and disrupt until, finally, things become so jumbled that we
organize work at a new level of efficacy.” (Wheatley, 1992, p. 116). The organization, in effect, self-organizes and continually renews itself as dictated by environmental issues and information. If school leaders seek to control or create conditions that do not reflect the perspectives of the community constituents, the system stalls and will ultimately fail to thrive (Cartwright, 1991).

Teacher Morale

Definition of Morale

Efforts to define morale have produced a diverse set of conceptual descriptions that have both served to clarify its meaning and to further befuddle those seeking to understand it. Therefore, it is important to review some of the many definitions that have been derived in order that one may note the conceptual similarities and distinctions in the meaning of morale.

*Webster’s New World Dictionary* (1994) defined morale as “the moral or mental condition with respect to courage, discipline, confidence, enthusiasm, willingness to endure hardship, etc., within a group, in relation to a group, or within an individual.” This definition emphasizes the multi-dimensional aspects of the concept. It also includes the idea of willingness to endure hardship. “While this idea is not foreign to many school administrators and teachers, it is generally not included in the literature on morale, except from authors writing on military morale and leadership, who recognize that this “willingness” is one, if not the major, criterion for assessing morale” (Andrew, Parks, Nelson, & the Phi Delta Kappa Commission on Teacher Faculty Morale, 1985, p. 7).

While studying motivation and morale, Viteles (1953) emphasized willingness as a crucial
component of morale. Vitles defined morale as "the willingness to strive for the goals of a particular group" (p. 12). It is the consequence of an employee's willingness on a job, or lack thereof, that is associated with commitment and satisfaction (Dinham & Scott, 1996; Wentworth, 1990).

Other definitions focus on the individual's state of mind. Bentley and Rempel (1980) defined morale as "the professional interest and enthusiasm that a person displays toward the achievement of individual and group goals in a job situation" (p. 2). Smith's (1966) definition noted that it is "a forward-looking and confident state of mind relevant to a shared and vital purpose" (p. 145). The next subsection provides a theoretical framework that formulates the foundation for teacher morale and its established research.

**Theoretical Foundation of Morale: Motivation Theory**

The term motivation is derived from the word motive, which is any condition within a person that affects his/her readiness to initiate or continue any activity or sequence of activities - as for example, experiencing a need to work to care for one's family may be the motive for obtaining and keeping a job (Towns, 1996). When a person accomplishes an objective, learns a new skill, or succeeds in a task, the person is often said to be motivated (Schunk, 1996). When the same person gives up on an objective, is unable to learn a new skill, or fails in a task, the person is often labeled unmotivated. Schunk argued that although it seems as if motivation is the direct cause of all behavior, it is not. It is simply a concept that is used, often with great difficulty, to explain why human behavior occurs. As defined by most psychologists and educators, Schunk postulated that motivation is used to describe those processes that can: (a) arouse and
instigate behavior, (b) give direction or purpose to behavior, (c) continue to allow behavior to persist, and (d) lead to choosing or preferring a particular behavior.

In efforts to explain precisely what moves people to act, Atkinson (1957) defined motivation as a voluntary, goal-directed disposition to strive for a certain kind of satisfaction. Accordingly, achieving a preferred goal or avoiding an unattractive situation produces satisfaction. To some, motivation means “an inner state that energizes, activates, or moves, and that directs or channels behavior toward goals” (Berelson & Steiner, 1964, p. 240). Beck (1978) suggested that motivation is broadly concerned with the contemporary determinants of choice (direction), persistence, and vigor of goal-directed behavior. Finally, Russell and Black (1981) viewed motivation as a continuous process of interaction between needs within the individual and the environment. This definition incorporates the combination of needs (e.g., biological, emotional, ego, and social/environmental needs) that tend to move individuals in many and often conflicting directions.

The Role of Social System Theory in Motivation. To understand motivation in the workplace is to understand the complex dynamics of an organization as a social system. As discussed above, motivation is concerned with personal goal attainment and ultimately some level of personal satisfaction. An individual’s effort to accomplish goals, to sustain energy in the pursuit of goals, and to be satisfied in the work place is impacted tremendously by one’s relationships and interactions within the organization as a whole - or simply, within the system to which one works. A social system may be defined as a model of organization that possesses a distinctive total unity (creativity) beyond its
component parts; it is distinguished from its environment by a clearly defined boundary; it is composed of subunits, elements, and subsystems that are at least interrelated within relatively stable patterns (equilibria) of social order (Olsen, 1968).

Getzel and Guba (1957) specified two major elements/subsystems in their social systems model: the institutional element and the individual element. The institutional element refers to those patterns of routine behavior that establish the structures needed to accomplish the global tasks (goals and objectives) of a system. These behaviors are regulated by clearly defined roles and expectations. Roles are defined in terms of expectations or the normative rights and duties of the position. This refers to the appropriate behavior for a specific position.

The individual element refers to the "personalities" and needs of the role players within the organization. Getzels and Guba (1957) defined personality as the dynamic organization within an individual containing need dispositions that govern idiosyncratic reactions to the environment. Personality, in this sense, is viewed as being dynamic because it is constantly changing, self-regulating, and interacting with its environment (Hoy & Miskel, 1982). As individuals with unique personalities, the respective organizational members' behavior will reflect their underlying need structures. Their needs will motivate them to behave in certain ways. “Needs refer to internal forces that determine the direction and goals of behavior. The needs for achievement, security, acceptance, and expression strongly affect behavior” (Hoy & Miskel, 1982, p. 60). Furthermore, the needs not only affect the goals that an individual will attempt to achieve but also the way an individual perceives the environment.
It is the blending of the institutional element and the individual element of
Getzels and Guba's social systems model that establishes the psycho-social basis for
behavior. The behavioral outcome is the product of the interaction between the two. The
important fact is that the social system is a part of a larger environment. The inputs from
the external environment affect both the institution and the individual. In effect, the
environment influences behavior within the system, which in turn contributes to system
outcomes. If the needs and interests (motivational factors) of the individual are not
congruent with the goals and objectives of the system, productivity breaks down.
"Systems, and hence organizations, are thus involved in a never-ending exchange process
with their environment" (Bedeian, 1980, p. 6).

Theories of Motivation. There are many theories of motivation. The list is
exhausting and an all inclusive review is beyond the scope of this discussion; however, the
author will employ a conceptual framework that categorizes major theories into two
categories (see, for example, Campbell, Dunnette, Lawlor & Weick, 1970) into two
categories; content theories and process theories. Content theories of motivation describe
those psychological factors within an individual or his environment that energize and
sustain behavior (Campbell, et. al., 1970). In other words, content theories examine the
specific things inside individuals that motivate them. Thus, when need deficiencies exist,
individuals are motivated to action to satisfy them.

"Process theories, on the other hand, attempt to explain and describe the process
of energizing, directing, sustaining, and stopping of behavior. After first defining the
major classes of variables needed to explain motivated behavior, those using a process
framework attempt to specify how these variables interact to produce a certain type of behavior" (Campbell et al., 1970, p. 341).

Before discussing the respective theories of motivation, it is this author's opinion that establishing a clear distinction between what we commonly refer to as internal and external motivation is essential. An individual is said to be interested or intrinsically motivated when he/she recognizes the value that is inherent in a particular activity in and of itself. The activity is automatically self-rewarding. A person acts because of motives from within when he derives pleasure or some sort of satisfaction from the very process of engaging in the activity (Kolesnik, 1978). Thus, the intrinsically motivated person does not need any external pressures or inducements, promises or threats to behave as he/she does.

Extrinsic motivation, on the other hand, pertains to activity engagement that is prompted by external environmental incentives. Examples of external motivation include monetary incentives, recognition, praise, grades, rewards, and punishment. Although different, the two types of motivation do overlap and making a distinction is often a matter of degree of relative emphasis (Norris, 1996; Pardee, 1990; Renchler, 1992). A good example of such an overlap is school principals who enjoy their work because of the personal satisfaction the job brings and who also pursued principalships because the salaries were significantly higher than their jobs as a teachers. Thus, these principals' motives are arguably two-fold.
Content Theories

Hierarchy of Needs Theory

Maslow’s hierarchy of needs theory of motivation is one of the most influential of the content theories of motivation. Maslow (1943) posited that human behavior could be explained in terms of a hierarchy of five general needs. The “ordering” of these needs included physiological needs (the lowest level of basic needs), safety and security needs, social needs, ego and esteem, and self-actualization (highest level of needs).

Physiological needs refer to such basic human necessities as food, water, sex, and sleep. Safety and security needs refer to the desire for security, stability, dependency, protection, freedom from fear and anxiety, and a need for structure, order, and law. The threat to one’s physical well-being and general sense of security will yield behaviors that seek to eliminate these threats. Social needs refer the needs for love, affection and belongingness. More specifically, they focus on the social-emotional necessities of relationships with family, friends, and peers. Ego and esteem needs refer to the desire for self-esteem, self-respect, prestige, status, and the esteem of others. These needs may be internally or externally driven. For example, internal aspects may focus on a desire for achievement, personal satisfaction with accomplishments, confidence, and independence. The external focus will consist of such things as a good reputation, prestige, fame, and recognition. Lastly, self-actualization refers to developing our true potential as individuals. It focuses on becoming all that one can become. It is important to note that self-actualization is a process - not an end state. The self-actualized individual is continually in the process of growing, advancing, and becoming more and more.
major accomplishment becomes the springboard to even greater successes.

Maslow indicated that these five needs are arranged in a hierarchy of importance which he called prepotency. The basic theoretical contention is that the higher order needs are not important until the lower order needs are satisfied. Satisfaction of a lower order need gives rise to needs at a higher level. The levels of the need hierarchy are not rigidly separated but overlap to some extent. From a supervisory standpoint, Maslow’s theory underscores the importance of understanding the complex needs of employees. According to Maslow, having insight to what it takes to satisfy an employee can only be accomplished when one knows where the individual is within the hierarchy.

Existence, Relatedness, and Growth Theory

Clayton Alderfer (1972) supported and extended Maslow’s theory by condensing the hierarchy to three basic needs. This theory is referred to as the Existence, Relatedness, and Growth (ERG) theory. Existence needs refer to all forms of material and physiological factors necessary to sustain human existence. This includes Maslow’s physiological and safety needs. Relatedness needs refer to all social interactions with family, supervisors, work peers, friends, etc. This encompasses Maslow’s social needs and to some extent safety and esteem needs. Growth needs refer to optimizing one’s overall potential. This need is inclusive of what Maslow referred to as self-actualization and the internally driven portion of self-esteem.

Besides the difference in hierarchies, Alderfer’s theory also differed from Maslow’s in that his theory did not posit that one level of needs had to be satisfied before the next level would emerge. Rather, Alderfer posited that all the needs could be active at the
same time. Additionally, whereas Maslow believed that a satisfied need was not a good motivator of behavior, Alderfer believed that a satisfied need could motivate behavior while working towards satisfaction of another need.

Learned Needs Theory

McClelland, Atkinson, Clark, & Lowell (1953) developed the Learned Needs theory. Like Alderfer’s theory, McClelland and his associates’ theory had some foundation in Maslow’s theory, but focused more specifically on learning theory. McClelland and his associates believed that needs were learned or acquired by the kinds of events people experienced in their culture. In other words, McClelland and his associates believed that the attached values that individuals place on experiences/things determine what they will ultimately desire or need. These learned needs formulate behavioral dispositions that influence the way individuals perceive situations and what motivates them to pursue a particular goal.

McClelland and his associates specified the needs of achievement, affiliation, and power as the factors that influence behavior. They defined the need for achievement as behavior directed toward competition with a standard of excellence. The need for affiliation is defined as a desire to establish and maintain friendly and warm relations with other individuals (similar to Maslow’s social needs). The need for power is defined as the need to control others, to influence their behavior, and to be responsible for them. A high need in one of the respective areas indicates that the factor is a strong motivator of behavior. For example, a high need achiever will possess a strong desire to assume responsibilities that challenge his/her ability to solve problems. The reward will be the
performance feedback upon completion. Conversely, an individual with a low need for achievement will not likely be inspired to seek out opportunities that lead to some type of significant accomplishment.

Motivation-hygiene Theory

Another significant content theory is Herzberg’s motivation-hygiene theory (1959). Herzberg based his theory on interviews with about 200 accountants and engineers from 11 industries in Pittsburg. The interviews functioned to identify those job experiences that resulted in employees being very happy and very unhappy. Herzberg argued that the factors leading to job satisfaction were separate and distinct from those producing job dissatisfaction. The factors associated with satisfaction, but not dissatisfaction, are called motivators because of their ability to stimulate performance. The factors associated with dissatisfaction, but not satisfaction, are called hygienic because of their ability to cause trouble if neglected. Hygienic factors include such things as work conditions, money, benefits, fair supervision, and a feeling of belonging. Herzberg contended that increasing the hygiene factors does not result in increased motivation. Motivators include such things as personal achievement, recognition, advancement, and the work itself. The significance of motivators is that they are associated with the performance investment in work. Although employees may not be dissatisfied when motivational factors are absent, optimal work performance / productivity is not likely to occur if they are neglected.
Process Theories

Process theory is grounded in the belief that individuals engage in some form of conscious behavior related to the performance of tasks. Proponents of process theory hold that people are seen as being reasoning, thinking individuals who often consider the anticipated consequences of their actions at work (Steers & Porter, 1991). This cognitive approach lends itself to a set of thought processes that people go through when deciding to participate and perform in the workplace. As with content theories, there is an abundance of theories which one can classify as process theories. For the purposes of this discussion, the author will review three that have been significantly influential in the field of leadership. These are: (a) equity theory, (b) expectancy theory, and (c) social learning theory.

Equity Theory

One of the prominent equity theories is Adams' (1965) theory of equity. Equity theory involves exchanges in the work environment. The components of Adam's equity theory are inputs and outcomes. Inputs (or investments) are those things a person contributes to the exchange. Outcomes are those things that result from the exchange. In the work situation, the most critical outcome is more than likely pay. Other factors often assessed when evaluating an exchange are job assignment, supervisory treatment, fringe benefits and status symbols. Adams indicated that people weigh inputs and outcomes on the basis of importance. In many ways, the determination of whether an exchange reflects equity or inequity is a matter of perception. The employee brings to the job his/her intelligence, experience, educational training, social background, general skills, etc. The
employee's perception of his/her credentials, along with his/her overall efforts, is what makes up the employee's contribution to the exchange. If the employee perceives the outcome (pay, experience and overall treatment) to be commensurate with the contributions, he/she will view the situation as equitable and will be satisfied. If the worker perceives the exchange as being unbalanced, he will become dissatisfied and this motivates the individual to take action to reduce or eliminate the inequity. Adam's obvious implication for the employer is that the resulting employee dissatisfaction will adversely impact work relations and ultimately productivity on the job.

**Expectancy Theory**

Expectancy theory evolved from the premise that the motivation to perform is a multiplicative function of the expectancies (beliefs) individuals have about future outcomes times the value placed on those outcomes (Steers and Porter, 1975). Vroom's (1964) expectancy theory views motivation as a response in a person's needs to a specific goal that person seeks. Sergiovanni & Starratt (1988) asserted that performance on the job, in Vroom's view, "...is a means by which the person can achieve a personal goal. This view is consistent with human resources supervision in that it assumes that performance is a means to satisfaction rather than satisfaction being viewed as a means to performance" (p. 150). In essence, expectancy theory considers an individual's perception of his performance as a key determinant in motivation. If an individual perceives that an increase in performance will result in outcomes/rewards which will enable him to attain personal goals, the individual will likely engage in the required behaviors.

The three mental components that are believed to instigate and direct behavior are:
(a) valence, (b) instrumentality, and (c) expectancy (Vroom, 1964). Proponents of expectancy theory refer to this as VIE theory (V for valence, I for instrumentality and E for expectancy). These factors constitute the multiplicative formula. Vroom used the term valence to refer to the affective (emotional) orientations people hold with regard to outcomes. An outcome is considered to be positively valent if an individual would prefer having it to not having it. The most important feature of people’s valences concerning work-related outcomes is that they refer to the level of satisfaction the person expects to receive from, not from the real value the person actually derives from them (Pinder, 1984). For example, an artist may be enrolled in a master’s degree program at the College of William and Mary because he/she expects that the outcomes to follow will be of value to him upon completion. However, the possibility remains that the degree may have little real value. The key point is that individuals apply either positive or negative preferences (or indifferent) to outcomes on the basis of the satisfaction or dissatisfaction they expect to receive from them.

Vroom refers to instrumentality as the probability belief linking one outcome (performance level) to other outcomes. This means that the attainment of the second outcome is almost certain if the first outcome is achieved. For example, if the art student in the above example believes that obtaining his master’s degree will lead to a high paying advertising job with a major company the outcome holds high instrumentality. Both the valence and the instrumentality are considered to be positive. If, on the other hand, attainment of the master’s degree is not thought to yield any significant job opportunities (or other desires), it is considered to have a negative instrumentality.
Vroom's concept of expectancy is defined as the strength of a person's belief about whether a particular outcome is possible. It refers to the perceived probability of one's successful achievement of a given outcome(s). In theory, the general conclusion is that a person will be motivated to behave a certain way if he believes the behavior will lead to a specific outcome. If the outcome is positively valent (leading to other desirable outcomes), then the individual will ask himself the question, “What is the probability or likelihood of my attaining the outcome?” Or, “Will I be able to do what is required if I try?” If the person believes strongly that he can perform the behaviors needed to attain the outcome(s), the individual will be highly motivated. The primary supervisory implication of expectancy theory is that supervisors need to consider the individualized needs and interests of employees. Additionally, expectancy theory adheres to the notion that job satisfaction is derived from performance.

Social Learning Theory

Social Learning theory, while acknowledging the internal aspects of motivation, looks beyond the complex internal causes of behavior such as needs, satisfaction, and expectations. Social learning refers to the fact that we acquire much of our behavior by observing and imitating others within a social context (Kreitner & Luthans, 1984). This is not a one-way flow of influence. Social learning theorists contend that people's behavior and the environment influence each other. Bandura (1986) proposed a model of social learning that embraced three major components: (a) vicarious learning, (b) self-control, and (c) symbolic process. It is the complex interaction of these components that determines the perception, behavioral choices, and attitudes in the social context.
Vicarious learning focuses on the modeling of behavior in the environment. The concept essentially supports the philosophy of operant conditioning in that the behavior of individuals is thought to be influenced and shaped by environmental reinforcement. Bandura posited that when an individual observes that a given behavior is rewarded with positive consequences, the person will more readily imitate the behavior.

Symbolic processes pertain to the values, goals, beliefs, and rules that are adopted by the individual within the social context. Bandura's perspective was that these processes are activated when one is determining whether to imitate a given behavior that is observed in the environment. Moreover, symbolic processing functions to influence the behavior of others. This constitutes acting on the environment. The role of self-control is to control behavior to the extent that one can rely on cognitive supports and manage relevant environmental cues and consequences. The three components are reciprocal determinants of behavior. It is the dynamic interaction of all three in the environment that lead to specific behaviors. In effect, people influence the environment, which in turn influences the way they think and behave. A primary implication of social learning theory for management is that providing a conducive work environment is critical to obtain productive behavior. Once these behaviors are attained, there must be contingent consequences that sustain and increase the resulting productive behaviors. In other words, "the contingent reward systems of the organization and of individual managers are critical to the performance of the people in the organization" (Kreitner & Luthans, 1984, p. 179).
The Relationship Between Morale and Productivity

A likely assumption when determining whether or not an organization has high morale is that if it does productivity will be enhanced. The review of the literature in this regard, however, demonstrates that this should not be an assumed conclusion. Likert (1961) established some parameters in reference to job satisfaction. He suggested that as tasks become more diverse and require greater training and skills, the relationship of the individual and his/her job appears to change progressively from the negative viewpoint to the positive viewpoint. On the other hand, Likert indicated that when jobs are exorbitantly routine, the monotony and loss of satisfaction by the individual with his/her work seem to adversely affect his/her productivity. In this regard, Likert tends to agree with the historical relationship between job satisfaction and productivity advanced by proponents of human relations management. According to human relations management, increases in the productivity level of workers follows job satisfaction (e.g., Mayo, 1933; Roethlisberger & Dickson, 1949). However, the intervening variables that evolve during observations tend to affect the relationship between satisfaction and productivity and cause it to become extremely complex (Vroom, 1964). Overall, the research has shown that satisfied and dissatisfied workers have been high, average, and low producers (Johnston & Germinario, 1985).

Establishing a relationship between morale and productivity is difficult to do with convincing clarity. For many years a supposed existence of a cause and effect relationship between job satisfaction and job performance was the principal argument used by social scientist to convince employers to institute changes beneficial to their employers (see, for
example, Quin, Staines, & McCullough, 1974). Vroom (1964) asserted that predicting a relationship between job satisfaction and performance is a complex problem. Correlations between these two variables are confounded by any effects of satisfaction on performance, any effects of performance on satisfaction, and by uncontrolled variables. This was evidenced by Shiffer (1994) who did not find a relationship between productivity and morale. Shiffer studied eight vocational rehabilitation agencies that employed a team modeled approach to management. Whereas employees reported an increase in their morale, productivity did not increase.

Although the relationship between morale and productivity is difficult to generalize to all situations, there have been studies where the two factors have been positively correlated with significant degrees of confidence. Cooper’s (1977) research reported findings of a positive relationship between job satisfaction and absenteeism and turnover. In addition, he found that the relationship between job satisfaction and performance became more positive as the skill requirements for the job increased. Steers (1975) described similar findings when looking at job attitudes and job performance. "The need for achievement does appear to represent an important variable in the job performance - job attitude relationship, assuming that the nature of the task is sufficiently challenging to cue the achievement motive" (p. 682). Such was supported by Griffin (1982) who found strong positive correlations among productivity, job satisfaction, and certain attributes. Griffin found a significant correlation among productivity and task variety, autonomy, and feedback. The strongest statistical relationships were found when productivity was correlated with autonomy and feedback. Griffin concluded that when the design of the
work is enhanced in such a way that personal and group goal achievement is allowed, job satisfaction and employee productivity might be increased.

Currall (1996) found a strong relationship between high teacher morale and productivity in school districts that utilize employee relations practices. Archival data on 180 public school districts in Pennsylvania, combined with survey data from 10,308 teachers were used to test the model. A number of variables confound a cause and effect relationship, but the findings present significant managerial implications for school administrators. Similarly, Maw (1995) highlighted managerial implications of healthcare organizations when reporting that productivity and morale were negatively impacted by the organizational change process or delays in change. “For practicing managers, effective management of delay in the change process necessitates clear and open communication regarding the causes and effects of delay. While executives may feel the pressure to respond to political challenges, they must address operational concerns for employees if they expect continued support and performance” (p. 16).

The Relationship Between Teacher Morale and Student Achievement

Student achievement is the primary interest of educational institutions. It is imbedded fundamentally in the goals and objectives that are developed and ultimately implemented. The success / achievement of a high school graduate in essence represents the “product” of a 12 year investment. The concern with teacher morale, then, and its impact on student achievement, has consequently long been of interest to researchers (see, for example, Anderson, 1953; Arnold, 1982; Blocker & Crockett, 1963; Miskel, et. al., 1979; Treacy, 1982). In a very early attempt to establish empirical evidence, Anderson
(1953) found that significant differences existed between the achievement of students in schools high in teacher morale and those schools with low teacher morale.

If teachers are dissatisfied with their work lives, not only will they suffer, but their students will suffer as well (Bryk & Driscoll, 1988; Cooley & Yovanoff, 1996; Schamer & Jackson, 1996; Zigarelli, 1996). As Lee, Dedrick, & Smith (1989) pointed out, it is difficult to imagine that teacher satisfaction would not somehow translate into important effects in the teaching/learning process. Indeed, teacher enthusiasm has in the past been used as an index of teaching effectiveness (Ashton & Webb, 1986; Blase & Blase, 1994; Zigarelli, 1996). Moreover, environmental factors that adversely impact teacher efficacy will consequently impact student achievement (Hipp, 1996; Hipp, 1997).

Despite these perspectives, some researchers contend that interventions which raise teachers’ morale and general career satisfaction do not necessarily lead to an increase in instructional effectiveness (Chapman, Synder, & Burchfield, 1991). Low satisfaction is often thought to work against recruitment and retention and too much satisfaction with their present circumstances can lead teachers to resist needed educational reform.

Chapman, et. al noted:

Hence, while teacher satisfaction may be an important consideration in a long-term strategy for upgrading the teaching force, it often contributes little to stimulate improved classroom performance in the short-term, and may even work against that end. Raising career satisfaction through the application of incentives, while a useful part of a larger strategy to improve education, is no panacea for enhancing...
instructional quality. (p. 20)

A larger body of research contradicts this paradoxical view of teacher morale in schools. Research has indicated that there is a positive correlation between high student achievement and high teacher morale (Andrew, et. al, 1985; Anderson, 1982). Andrew, et. al elaborated:

However, one cannot assume a direct cause-and-effect relationship from a positive correlation. Good morale may cause teachers to put more effort into their work, thereby producing high student achievement; or the high student achievement may cause teachers to feel good about themselves and their work, thereby producing high morale. Regardless of the direction of causality, administrators and teachers should strive to increase both student achievement and morale since both are highly desirable qualities in any school system. (p. 42)

Supporting Andrew, et. al.’s research are studies that have focused on teacher morale as a significant component of staff development and school improvement programs. White (1988) identified statistical relationships between teacher morale and student achievement test scores in reading. This study suggested that teachers’ attitudes toward classroom evaluation systems, as well as their perceptions of the functional behavior of principals, have shown to be the strongest predictors of student achievement in reading. Silva (1995) studied teacher morale, shared decision making and its potential impact on pupil performance. Results revealed positive improvements in students’ pre and
post standardized test scores in reading and math. Pupil attendance rates, when compared before and after the intervention of shared decision making, also improved.

A number of other researchers have studied various educational factors that impact student achievement. For example, Nwanko (1979) found a strong relationship between teacher morale and student conflict in Nigeria. Hopkins-Layton (1981) found a positive relationship between student achievement gains in the previous year and teacher attendance. Nidch (1985) found significant correlations between teacher morale and student pro-social behavior norms in Philippine secondary schools.

Other research findings have revealed positive correlations between the levels of student achievement and the corresponding levels of teacher morale (see, for example, Agne, 1992; Hancock, 1995; Hancock, 1996; Hughes, 1995; Veenman & Raemaekers, 1995). Although results are mixed to some degree, typically the level of student achievement is commensurate with the level of teacher morale. For example, if student achievement is assessed as being moderate in degree, then teacher morale is typically moderate (as opposed to low or high). Again, the findings do not establish a clear “causal” relationship, but do suggest a strong connection between the two variables. The arguable merit of Chapman, Synder and Burchfield’s (1991) contention is that any potential academic gains are contingent upon teachers buying into any form of reformation.

Overall, the research demonstrates a relatively solid relationship between teacher morale and student achievement. Whereas, a clear, causal relationship may not be established, one may conclude with confidence that a connection exists.
The Morale of General Education Teachers Versus Special Education Teachers

The present study examined the relationship between elementary principal leadership behavior and teacher morale. It also sought to specifically determine if there is a difference between the morale of special education and general education teachers. Differences between the morale of general education and special education teachers were explored in a doctoral dissertation by Mcternan (1983). The overall results revealed that morale was not found to be significantly different between the two groups of teachers. However, Mcternan noted that special education teachers expressed stronger feelings of satisfaction with teaching, teaching load, professional status, facilities and services than general education teachers.

Only a few related studies specifically comparing morale factors of special and general education teachers have been conducted in followup to Mcternan's research. When examining retention rates between the two groups as a factor relative to teacher morale, Billingsley (1995) reported attrition rates of 5.8 percent to 7.9 percent per year for special educators and 4.6 percent to 5.8 for general educators. In deciding to leave, 51.5 percent of special education exiters and 23.2 percent of general education exiters gave dissatisfaction with assignment as an important reason for leaving. A questionnaire completed by 463 special educators and 493 general educators in Virginia indicated that "work-related variables, such as leadership support, role conflict, role ambiguity, and stress are better predictors of commitment and job satisfaction than are demographic variables" (Billingsley & Cross, 1992, p. 453).

Recent changes in special education law may have the potential to significantly
impact the morale of special education and general education teachers. How much of an impact and the difference in impact on the two respective groups remains to be seen.

The changes in special education law occurred on June 5, 1997 when President William Clinton signed into law the Individuals With Disabilities Education Act Amendments of 1997. Whereas the amendments clearly seek to address the needs and interests of students with disabilities, implementation of the law calls for greater accountability on behalf of both general and special educators. Some of the major changes are:

1. IEP teams must include a regular education teacher if the child is or may be participating in regular education.

2. IEPs must outline how a child’s disability affects his performance in the general education curriculum, contain goals and short-term objectives that address the supports they need to succeed in regular education and include an explanation of the extent to which the child will not participate in general education.

3. School districts must give students with disabilities the opportunity to participate in state and districtwide assessments, or explain the reasoning behind exclusions.

4. School districts are prohibited from depriving students of a free and appropriate education even when a given infraction is not a manifestation of the disability. (There is some latitude in disciplining students, but an alternative educational placement must be provided for a student when he/she is suspended or expelled for more than 10 days).

A primary implication of all of these changes is that they, more expressly, involve
the general education teachers and require more IEP paperwork. Excessive paperwork, we already know, contributes to low morale (Churchill & Williamson, 1995; Porter, 1995; Davidson & Dell, 1996; Veenman & Raemaekers, 1995). Moreover, the frequent rush to implement state and federal mandates and reform in schools are generally accompanied by poorly developed staff development programs. The consequence is the strong likelihood of adversely impacting the morale of all teachers (Brown, 1992; Churchill & Williamson, 1995; Irwin, 1996).

Another specific concern relative to special and general education teachers in Virginia is the approved 1997 revisions of the Standards of Accreditation (SOA) and Standards of Learnings (SOL). Whereas these new standards advance high quality education and requirements for graduation, the new standards may impose serious limitations on students with disabilities. In addressing the Virginia State Board of Education at a 1997 public hearing on the new standards, Jane Razeghi, executive secretary of the Virginia Council of Administrators of Special Education (VCASE), expressed that the new SOA may "limit students by:

1. actually reducing the number of students with disabilities who receive high school diplomas,

2. increasing the number of students with disabilities who drop out of school,

3. eliminating the opportunity for students with disabilities to complete a vocational area,

4. increasing the number of referrals to special education for some students to receive accommodations on tests or to acquire a special education diploma" (Razeghi,
The summative effect of these requirements only serve to add to the existing challenge of obtaining the appropriate adaptations and accommodations for students attempting to meet their desired educational and career outcomes. Paired with the responsibility of implementing the 1997 IDEA Amendments, the new SOA and SOL present an overwhelming task for both special education and general education teachers. Such conditions provide fertile soil for the growth and advancement of dissatisfaction. Feeling overwhelmed, unsupported, unprepared, disempowered, and victimized results in low teacher morale and ultimate burnout if not treated properly (Brownell, 1995).

The Relationship Between Leadership Behavior and Teacher Morale

The complex dynamics of effective leadership necessitate a thorough understanding of human motivation. Atkinson and Feather (1957) posited that motivation is a voluntary, goal-directed disposition for a certain kind of satisfaction. Accordingly, achieving a preferred goal or avoiding an unattractive situation produces satisfaction. Of critical importance to the leader is having insight to the goals of the teachers within one's school. Access to this information will enable the leader to strategize the goal attainment of the school more appropriately. When the goals of the leader are not congruent with those of the teachers, the potential for success is minimal - if at all possible. As Russell and Black (1981) argued, motivation is a continuous process of interaction between needs within the individual and the environment. Thus, intrinsic and extrinsic factors must be taken into consideration.

Hogan, Curphy, & Hogan (1994) indicated that leadership involves persuading
other people to set aside for a period of time their individual concerns and to pursue a common goal that is important for the responsibilities and welfare of a group. Moreover, Hogan, et al. clarified that:

Leadership is persuasion, not domination; persons who can require others to do their bidding because of their power are not leaders. Leadership only occurs when others willingly adopt, for a period of time, the goals of a group as their own. Thus, leadership concerns building cohesive and goal-oriented teams; there is a causal and definitional link between leadership and team performance” (p. 493).

The leader’s assertion of power and ability to create a group power is fundamental to achieving goals and employee satisfaction (Follett, 1960; House, Spangler, & Woycke, 1991; House, 1991). A number of studies have been conducted to assess elementary and secondary school teachers’ satisfaction and performance with the various power typologies outlined by French and Raven (1968). Balderson (1975) noted that principals whose power was perceived to rest on relevant expertise received high scores for teacher morale and teacher satisfaction with the principal’s performance. From a general perspective, studies have shown that there is a positive relationship between teacher satisfaction and principals who exert referent and expert forms of power (Bachman, Smith, & Slesinger, 1968; Curphy, 1993; Guditus & Zirkel, 1979-80; Salancik & Pfeffer, 1991). Legitimate power tended to fall somewhat in the middle, with reward and coercive power being the least favorable forms of power. These studies also revealed that principals who
are interactive and delegate/share authority are more favorable to teachers. Related
studies focusing specifically on charismatic leaders versus noncharismatic leaders have
shown a positive correlation between charismatic leaders and employee satisfaction (Bass

The idea of “soliciting” teachers’ opinions, or more specifically, involving
teachers in the decision making process has long been a consideration of educational
leaders when examining role expectations of teachers as a factor of morale. Participative
decision making was extensively evaluated through the 1940s and 1950s. Frost, Wakely,
Ruh (1974), after reviewing such research, concluded that “participative decision-making
programs could result in greater organization effectiveness, individual performance, and
job satisfaction” (pg. 138). There were, however, several studies that failed to support
these findings and led Frost, et. al. to add a note of caution to their conclusions.

Leaders that use participatory decision making are practicing human resource
management (Silva, 1995). Inherent within this theory is the contention that giving
teachers access to decision making will lead to an increase in productivity and this will
yield teacher satisfaction. This is the essence of teacher empowerment. Lieberman (1989)
defined teacher empowerment as real participation by teachers reflecting “their” vision of
participation. Lagana (1989) clarified further in adding that it is a process in which a
person or persons are given the opportunity to take risks and to compete without
repercussions of failure. This results in satisfying work experiences and an employee that
feels good about himself/herself and the organization.

When specifically studying elementary schools, Zbikowski (1992) found a
significant relationship between elementary principal leadership behavior and each of the ten dimensions of the Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire. There were also significant relationships between teacher morale and all but one (production emphasis) dimension of the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire. Findings revealed that the behaviors which have the most positive impact on teacher morale are consideration, integration and tolerance of freedom. Elementary principals who demonstrate these three traits have strong tendencies to have high staff morale. Similarly, Houseknecht (1990) established a positive relationship between principals and teachers in elementary schools. Using the School Leadership Questionnaire, Houseknecht reported visible leadership, technical leadership, and human leadership to be positively correlated with teacher morale. These results essentially upheld an earlier study by Devault (1981), who studied the relationship between principal leadership styles and teacher morale in secondary schools, and Nomishan (1989) who looked specifically at the dimensions of initiating structure and consideration. Using the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire and the Porter Needs Satisfaction Questionnaire with administrators and teachers, Nomishan (1989) determined that teacher job satisfaction increased as teachers viewed the principal as exhibiting more consideration leadership. Teachers reported higher levels of dissatisfaction when they perceived the principal as emphasizing deadlines, seeing to it that teachers worked to capacity, and asked that teachers follow rules and regulations.

Centerbar (1995) studied factors in the relationship between school climate and leadership behaviors at two elementary schools. It was concluded that in school one there were no statistically significant relationships between the variables of school climate and
the variables of leadership behavior. However, in school two there were statistically significant relationships between (a) the control of the school principal and high morale, (b) decision making of the school principal and high morale, and (c) confidence and trust processes of the school principal and high morale. Cresswell’s (1996) investigation of associations between the learning environments of schools and the principal’s interpersonal behavior as perceived by teachers revealed similar findings. A positive relationship existed between the principal’s leadership behavior and teachers’ perceptions of the school as being innovative and empowering them in their working environments. In the assessment of their environment, teachers were least affected by their principal’s understanding and helpful behavior. They were most affected by the principal’s leadership behavior and whether they were granted independence to carry out their tasks. Principals with critical, admonishing, or uncertain interactive styles negatively affected teachers and general morale. Other research support these findings and the general indication that leadership styles significantly predict job satisfaction and teacher morale (e.g., Anderman, et. al, 1991; Davidson & Dell, 1996; Hipp, 1996; Wilcox, 1992; Silva, 1995).

Summary of the Literature Review

Leadership as defined by this author is the process of providing influential direction for the sake of achieving established organizational goals and objectives. In its most contemporary sense, it focuses on newness, change, and a cutting edge visionary perspective (Starratt, 1995). The review of the literature unveiled a vast number of leadership theories that, for the most part, can be grouped into five categories: 1) Great Man Theories, 2) Trait Theories, 3) Behavioral Theories, 4) Contingency/Situational
Theories and 5) Chaos Theories. The great man theories contend that leaders possess one-way directive behaviors that are influential enough to obtain the compliance of followers. Leaders are believed to have innate talents and skills. Trait theories, which are also one-way directive, contend that a good leader is able to attain the required behavior of followers because of unique personality traits that distinguish them from others. The various behavioral theories embrace both a psychological and a sociological perspective of leadership while underscoring the emphasis on the initiating and consideration structure. The initiating structure focuses on the leader's emphasis on the accomplishment of tasks in the workplace, whereas the consideration structure focuses on the appreciation, needs, and satisfaction of employees. Contingency theories posit that the appropriate leadership style asserted in a given situation is contingent upon a number of environmental variables. And finally, chaos theory pushes beyond some of the basic tenents of such practices as transformational leadership by advancing the belief that "disorder", thus chaos, within an organization is not only beneficial, but part of the equation for optimal success. An organization is believed to have the capacity to self-organize and to continually renew itself when confronted with environmental issues and information.

The general conclusion from the literature review on leadership is that there is no one leadership style that is effective in all situations. However, there is an abundance of support for the notion that leadership is an energy that exists in collaborative relationships which have the power to influence organizational/community action and outcomes. The leader is the individual who can get full power of the constituents, organize all the forces, and facilitate their work towards a common purpose. To quote Follett (1941):
The most successful leader of all is one who sees another picture not yet actualized. He sees the things which belong in his present picture but which are not yet there.... Above all, he should make his co-workers see that it is not his purpose which is to be achieved but a common purpose born of the desires and the activities of the group (p. 143).

Morale may be defined as the professional interest and enthusiasm that a person displays toward the achievement of individual and group goals in a given job situation (Bentley & Rempel, 1980). Little research comparing the morale of special education teachers and general education teachers has been conducted. However, there are several current special education issues that have the potential to impact the morale of both groups (i.e., the implementation of the Individuals With Disabilities Education Act Amendments of 1997). The literature review revealed that whereas there is some empirical evidence supporting a positive relationship between morale and productivity, one cannot assume that there is a cause and effect relationship. A stronger relationship between teacher morale and student achievement is evident, but a direct causal relationship is not established in the research. The establishment of this causal relationship is difficult because of the interference of concomitant environmental variables.

The review of the literature clearly indicated that leadership behavior impacts teacher morale. A positive relationship between leadership behavior and teacher morale is evident in several areas. These findings support the contention that the morale status of schools can be predicted on the basis of the leadership style asserted by the principal. Generally speaking, principals using a participatory style of leadership are likely to have
more satisfied and productive teachers than principals using an autocratic style of leadership.
Chapter 3
Methodology

The purpose of this study was to determine if teacher morale in urban elementary schools is significantly related to the teachers’ perceptions of the principal’s leadership behavior and ability and to determine if there was a difference between the morale of urban general education teachers and special education teachers.

Research Questions:
1. Is there a significant relationship between teachers’ perceptions of urban elementary principals’ leadership behavior and teacher morale?
2. Do significant relationships exist among factors of principal leadership behaviors and teacher morale?
3. Is there a significant difference between special education and general education teacher morale?

Independent and Dependent Variables

The independent variable of this study was leader behavior as reflected by the consideration and initiating structure factors of the Excellent Principal Inventory. The dependent variable, teacher morale, will be obtained using the Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire by having the teachers indicate their degree of satisfaction on ten different subscales.

The variables of this study were not susceptible to experimental control and
manipulation. In light of this, an ex post facto research design was used since the variables under study were the perception of leadership behavior of principals as reported by elementary teachers and teacher morale. Kerlinger (1973) defined ex post facto research as:

That research in which the researcher starts with the observation of a dependent variable or variables. He then studies the independent variables in retrospect for their possible relations to, and effects on, the dependent variable or variables. (p. 218)

Accordingly, since the teachers' perceptions of leader behavior and their expressions of morale were the variables under investigation, an ex post facto design was necessitated.

**The Setting for the Study**

The setting for this study was Hampton City Schools in Hampton, Virginia. Hampton is an urban city in eastern Virginia. The city stretches 52 square miles across a peninsula that is comprised of five other cities and townes. The population of Hampton is 133,793. The ethnic composition is 60% white, 38% black, and 2% Asian and other ethnic groups. Hampton is a highly populated military region with the presence of Langley Airforce Base and Fort Monroe Army Base. Fort Eutis Army Base is located in the adjacent city of Newport News, Virginia. The economic taxbase for Hampton is 80% residential, 18% industrial/commercial, and 2% retail. The mean income for its citizens is $30,144.

Hampton City Public Schools has 24 elementary schools, 5 middle schools, and 4 high schools. There are are about 23,000 students enrolled, with about 2,600 students
receiving special education instruction. The racial composition of the student body is 55% black, 41% white, and 4% Asian and other ethnic groups. Forty one percent of the students enrolled in Hampton City Public Schools qualify for the federal free and reduced lunch program.

Sample

The sample for this study consisted of the elementary school teachers at 19 public elementary schools in the city of Hampton. Hampton has 24 elementary schools in its division. To be eligible for participation, the principals had to have served a minimum 5 month tenure at their current schools. This disqualified 2 of the schools. Three principals declined the invitation to participate in the study. This resulted in the 19 participating schools, which represented 79% of the elementary schools.

The sample of teachers was comprised of 50% of the elementary school teachers in general education and 100% of the special education teachers at each of the respective elementary schools in Hampton. The sample of general education and special education teachers was 224 and 54 respectively. Thus, the total number of teachers solicited for participation was 278. The total number of eligible teachers at the 19 schools was 488. The 278 participants represented 57% of this group of individuals.

Very specific criteria guided the selection process. The general education teachers were defined as all classroom instructors of general education students enrolled in kindergarten through the fifth grade. General education teachers had to hold a Virginia teaching certificate in elementary education. Special education teachers were defined as all classroom teachers of students (i.e., grades preschool through the fifth grade) with
disabilities found eligible for special education in accordance with the Individuals With Disabilities Act (i.e., teachers of students with specific learning disabilities, hearing impairments, autism, etc.). Special education teachers had to hold a Virginia teaching certificate in special education. Only those special education teachers and general education teachers working under the direct supervision of building principals qualified as participants.

All participating teachers must have been employed at their assigned school for a minimum of five months and must have worked under the direct supervision of the principal during this five month tenure. This stipulation ensured that the teachers had adequate opportunity to interact and become acquainted with the principal, to interact with their colleagues, and to formulate some general impressions of the school environment.

A random sampling technique was utilized to select the participating general education teachers. The rationale for using this particular method was that it provided each eligible teacher with an equal and independent chance of being selected as a member of the sample. Accordingly, the names of the teachers were placed in a container and mixed. The researcher then drew the required number of participants (224). As indicated, the sample of special education teachers was comprised of the total number of eligible teachers (54) at the 19 respective schools.

Generalizability

The sample for this study is limited specifically to the elementary school teachers of Hampton City Public Schools. Therefore, the findings may not necessarily be
applicable to other urban school divisions. Whereas some degree of generalizations may be drawn when comparing to comparable settings with a similar demographic makeup, generalizability is essentially limited.

**Instrumentation**

Two survey instruments were used to conduct this study: The Purdue Teacher Opinionaire and The Excellent Principal Inventory. Data cards, which respondents were asked to complete, were used to collect demographic information.

**The Purdue Teacher Opinionaire.** The Purdue Teacher Opinionaire (PTO) was developed to provide a comprehensive measure of teacher morale. See appendix 1 for a copy of the opinionaire. The instrument not only yields a total score indicating teacher morale, but it also provides ten sub-scores which break down morale into ten corresponding dimensions. Efforts to measure morale from a unidimensional perspective is inadequate as a means of identifying and measuring morale (Bentley & Rempel, 1980). Morale is multidimensional in nature - meaning that it is comprised of a variety of factors. Thus, meaningful measurement of morale calls for a complex analysis of its pertinent components.

Bentley and Rempel (1980) defined morale as “the professional interest and enthusiasm that a person displays toward the achievement of individual and group goals in a given situation” (p. 2). Looking at morale in this broad sense, the instrument functions to have respondents make qualitative judgements about people and conditions in their environment which have been determined relevant to morale. These ten factors of morale are as follows:
Factor 1 - "Teacher Rapport with Principal" deals with the teacher's feelings about the principal - his/her professional competency, interest in teachers and their work, ability to communicate, and skill in human relations.

Factor 2 - "Satisfaction with Teaching" pertains to teacher relationships with students and feelings of satisfaction with teaching. According to this factor, the high morale teacher loves to teach, feels competent in his/her job, enjoys the students, and believes in the future of teaching as an occupation.

Factor 3 - "Rapport Among Teachers" focuses on teacher's relationships with other teachers. The items here solicit the teacher's opinion regarding the cooperation, preparation, ethics, influence, interests, and competency of his/her peers.

Factor 4 - "Teacher Salary" pertains primarily to the teacher's feelings about salary and salary policies. Are salaries based on teacher competency? Do they compare favorably with salaries in other school systems? Are salary policies administered fairly and justly, and do teachers participate in the development of these policies?

Factor 5 - "Teacher Load" deals with such matters as record-keeping, clerical work, "red tape," community demands on teacher time, extra-curricular load, and keeping up to date professionally.

Factor 6 - "Curriculum Issues" solicits teacher reactions to the adequacy of the school program in meeting student needs, in providing for individual differences, and in preparing students for effective citizenship.

Factor 7 - "Teacher Status" samples feelings about the prestige, security, and benefits afforded by teaching. Several of the items refer to the extent to which the teacher
feels he/she is an accepted member of the community.

Factor 8 - "Community Support of Education" deals with the extent to which the teacher feels the community understands and is willing to support a sound educational program.

Factor 9 - "School Facilities and Services" has to do with the adequacy of facilities, supplies and equipment, and the efficiency of the procedures for obtaining materials and services.

Factor 10 - "Community Pressures" gives special attention to community expectations with respect to the teacher's personal standards, his/her participation in outside-school activities, and his/her freedom to discuss controversial issues in the classroom (Bentley & Rempel, 1980, p. 4).

Administration of the PTO consists of having respondents complete a survey in which they make qualitative judgements about the various factors listed above. The opinionnaire is comprised of 100 items which are appropriately weighted on a scale of 1-4. The four choices for each item are: 1) Agree (A), 2) Probably Agree (PA), 3) Probably Disagree (PD), and 4) Disagree (D). The survey may be scored either by manual computation or by computer software data analysis. Bentley and Rempel specified that item responses are weighted for scoring in the following manner:

a. When "AGREE" (A) is the keyed response (positive item), the weights are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>PA</th>
<th>PD</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
b. When "DISAGREE" (D) is the keyed response (negative item), the weights are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>PA</th>
<th>PD</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The respective factor scores are computed by summing the weights which have been assigned to the items belonging to that factor. The total morale score is computed by summing the subscores on the ten morale factors. See Table 1 on the next page.

The reliability of the PTO was obtained by administering the survey to 3,023 high school teachers in Indiana and Oregon. Sixty Indiana schools and 16 Oregon schools were selected for participation. After the initial administration, Bentley and Rempel waited four weeks and readministered the opinionaire. The test and re-test correlations for total scores and factor scores are outlined in Table 2. Results indicated that the instrument's reliability is very strong, with a range of .62 - .88 for the various factors and a total score of .87.

The validity of the PTO was established by having the principals at the Indiana and Oregon schools report how they thought their respective staffs would respond to the various factors. Median scores were used to compare the teachers' responses with the responses of the principals. Results indicated that the scores were not significantly different (see Table 3). Bentley and Rempel (1980) noted:

There is no relevant criterion on which to judge the validity of an instrument of this nature, except, to some extent, the relative performance of teachers. Peer ratings, evaluations by administrators, etc., obviously have very limited relevance as a criterion of validity of
teacher morale. To the extent that teachers agree with one another, are self consistent in their ratings, and content validity is exhibited, at least adequate validity may be assumed (p. 7).

TABLE 1

Purdue Teacher Opinionaire
Morale Factor Scores and Total Morale Scores
(Bentley & Remple, 1980, p. 4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor Number</th>
<th>Number of Items</th>
<th>Factor Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Teacher Rapport With Principal</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Satisfaction With Teaching</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Rapport Among Teachers</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Teacher Salary</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Teacher Load</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Curriculum Issues</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Teacher Status</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Community Support of Education</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. School Facilities and Services</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Community Pressures</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total = 100 Total Morale Score = 400

*Factor scores are based on the maximum weight of 4 points per item.
TABLE 2. Test - Retest Correlations for the *Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire* - Factor and Total Scores (Bentley & Rempel, 1980, p. 5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor (N = 3,023)</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Rapport with Principal</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with Teaching</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapport Among Teachers</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Salary</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Load</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Issues</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Status</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Support of Education</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Facilities and Services</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Pressures</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Score</strong></td>
<td><strong>.87</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 3. **Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire** - Median Scores by Factor for Teachers and Principals in Indiana and Oregon (Bentley & Rempel, 1970, p. 7).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>Principals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>Oregon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**The Excellent Principal Inventory.** The second instrument used for this study was The Excellent Principal Inventory (EPI). See Appendix 2 for a copy of the inventory.

The EPI was developed under the leadership of Dr. Gerald Bogen, Professor Emeritus in the Department of Educational Policy and Management at the University of Oregon, in 1988. Graduate students at the university assisted Dr. Bogen with the development of the instrument. The EPI was developed under the sponsorship of the prominent consulting
firm of Keilty, Goldsmith, and Boone (later renamed Keilty, Goldsmith and Company), which is located in LaJolla, California. The funding for the EPI development was provided by BellSouth Corporation in Atlanta, Georgia.

Keilty, Goldsmith and Company specializes in developing training programs for corporate managers and for nonprofit organizations. Their clientele have included such companies as Weyerhaeuser, Control Data, IBM, Boeing International, and BellSouth Corporation. When the BellSouth Corporation managers received training in 1987, a portion of the training focused on the administrators’ self-assessment, peer/collegial assessment, and subordinate assessment of their leadership behaviors. This information was obtained by administering an inventory called the Excellent Manager Profile, which focused on the critical leadership skills of effective managers. These inventory results from peers/colleagues and subordinates served as staff development information. These profile data were used as part of a broad based management improvement program. The training took place over a course of three days.

Like the inventory used with the corporate managers, the EPI was designed as a mechanism to help principals assess their own leadership behaviors and to enlighten principals as to how their peers and subordinates perceive them. The items in the inventory were developed in a series of sessions involving principals from many locations working together with Dr. Bogen and his assistants, management consultants from Keilty, Goldsmith and Boone, and management personnel from BellSouth Corporation. Three forms of the inventory were developed to assess the principal’s behavior. The “self” version is to be completed by the principal. The “other” version is to be completed by
professional colleagues. The “classroom” teacher version is to be completed by the teachers supervised by the principal. All three versions contain the same questions. The major difference between the inventories developed for the business managers and the inventory for school principals is that the principals’ inventory is based on individually developed missions (called commitments) and values which are unique to schools. The EPI was developed from the literature and research on excellent schools and excellent school leaders. This instrument is generic in nature and is not based on a particular school.

The EPI contains questionnaire items reflecting the behaviors that constitute the values of effective leadership embodied in five key commitments that characterize the “excellent principal.” These commitments and their 13 corresponding subcomponents are as follows:

I. Commitment to Student Success
   A. Demonstrating Respect for Students
   B. Pursuing All-Around Excellence

II. Commitment to Teaching and Learning
   A. Promoting Teaching and Learning
   B. Supporting Continuous Learning as a Lifetime Goal

III. Commitment to the School Staff
   A. Demonstrating Respect for the School Staff
   B. Helping Individuals Improve
   C. Building a Collegial Staff

IV. Commitment to Innovation
A. Supporting Creativity

B. Supporting Upward Communication

V. Commitment to Leadership

A. Demonstrating Integrity

B. Presenting Ideas

C. Taking Responsibility

D. Relating to External Constituencies

For the purposes of this research, the “teacher” version was administered to the classroom instructors. The wording of the items in all three versions of the inventory are essentially the same. The administration time ranges from 25-30 minutes. Each inventory contains 89 Likert-scaled items. The score value of the responses range from 1 to 5, with 1 denoting Highly Dissatisfied, 4 Dissatisfied, 3 Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied, 4 Satisfied, and 5 Highly Satisfied. The questionnaire items include such statements as the principal:

- Genuinely cares for the students’ welfare.
- Is personally committed to the teaching and learning process.
- Demonstrates respect and concern for people as individuals.
- Facilitates changes required to implement new ideas.
- Keeps parents and the community informed about the school and its programs.

A total score and separate categorical scores are obtained for each of the five sections of the EPI. The highest possible total score on the EPI is 445. The statistical
analysis report from Keilty, Goldsmith and Company provides averages, database averages, and percentiles. The “Average Value” is the average value of the responses from other individuals on a particular item. The “Database Average” is the average score for each item of all people who have completed the EPI. “The Percentile” indicates how one compares to the database average. For example, if one receives a percentile rating of 60 on a particular item, this would mean that 40% of the individuals who have ever completed the EPI scored higher on this particular item.

The “other” and “teacher” versions of the questionnaire also have a section reserved for written comments about the principal. Thus, this provides a qualitative dimension to the instrument. Three, open-ended qualitative items are listed on the inventory (e.g., This individual is especially effective in ....). The written comment section was not included as part of this study.

No formal validity or reliability testing has been conducted on the EPI. In reviewing the contents of the inventory, it clearly has good face validity. The EPI has been administered to several school principals in various districts across the United States. The training evaluation feedback that Keilty, Goldsmith and Company has received reportedly has always been outstanding. The evaluations have been so outstanding that they led to training requests by other school district principals. It is the company’s assessment that the consistency in evaluation feedback, the lack of reported ambiguity of the individual items, and the reported improvement in the leadership skills of principals by its various trainees strongly suggest that the inventory is reliable and valid.

The EPI was selected as a measure of leadership behavior for four main reasons.
First, the instrument provides five critical categories (commitments) and thirteen subcomponents that assess the leadership behavior of principals. Second, the contents of the inventory are contemporary and aligned with research on excellent schools and excellent school leaders (e.g., Short & Greer, 1997; Starratt, 1995). Third, the information obtained from the EPI can be utilized in both a quantitative and qualitative format for research purposes in comparing data to other instruments. Fourth, whereas formal validity and reliability testing has not been conducted, the inventory has been widely used and assessed to be an effective tool in assessing leadership behavior.

Data Collection Procedures

A transmittal letter (see Appendix 1) and a copy of both the PTO and EPI (appendices 2 and 3) were mailed to the 278 special education and general education elementary school teachers who were selected to participate in the study. The transmittal letter explained the purpose and significance of the study and assured participants that all information would be held in the strictest confidence. For tracking purposes, each of the schools was assigned an identification number (1-19) and the respondents' surveys were coded with a three digit number. Both surveys had the same identification number. This was necessary for the statistical analysis of the data and for confidentiality. Although the principals had to grant the researcher permission for the teachers to be surveyed, the principals were not aware of the selected participants in their respective buildings and they were not involved in the distribution or collection of the surveys in any way.

The teachers were provided with a self addressed, stamped envelope for returning the surveys. A $100.00 cash certificate, bearing the respondent's corresponding survey identification number, was enclosed in each packet as an incentive for completion of the
surveys. Participants were informed that one individual would be randomly selected as the recipient of the $100.00 at the conclusion of the study. The respondents were instructed to return their cash certificate along with an attached six item demographic information card. The demographic card solicited data regarding the following: (1) teaching endorsement(s), (2) total years of teaching experience, (3) length of time working under their current principal, (4) age, (5) race, and (6) sex. One week after the due date for returning the surveys, a follow-up reminder was mailed to the individuals who did not respond.

Data Analysis

Both the EPI and PTO were scored in accordance with their respective administration manuals. The surveys were formatted with computerized bar coding and were scored with an IBM 4273 solar scan assessment system. The researcher used the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) to analyze all of the data collected.

Data for question one, "Is there a significant relationship between teachers’ perceptions of urban elementary principals’ leadership behavior and teacher morale?" was answered by computing Pearson Product-Moment correlation coefficients. Data for question two, "Do significant relationships exist among factors of principal leadership behaviors and factors of teacher?" was analyzed by using canonical correlations. Data for question three, "Is there a significant difference between special education and general education teacher morale?" was answered by computing t-tests. The t-test assessed the statistical significance of the two group means for all 10 factors of the PTO. Descriptive statistics was used to analyze the demographic information collected.
Chapter 4

Analysis of the Data

The analysis of the data are presented in chapter 4. This study investigated the relationship between urban elementary principal leadership behavior and teacher morale.

Demographics of the Sample

A total of 224 surveys were distributed to the general education teachers in the Hampton City Schools district. One hundred twenty two were returned. This represents a 54% response rate. Forty three of the 54 surveys distributed to the special education teachers were returned. This represents an 80% response rate for this group. The overall response rate for both groups of teachers was 59% (n=165 out of 278).

Ninety four percent (n=155) of the respondents were female and 6% (n=10) were male. One hundred twenty eight (78%) of the respondents were white, 33 (20%) were black, 2 (1%) were Asian, and 2 (1%) were of other ethnic orientations. Table 4 provides a summary of the ages of the participants in the study.
TABLE 4

Summary of Participants by Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Interval</th>
<th>Number of Teachers</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22 - 29 years</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 - 39 years</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 - 49 years</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 - 60 years</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total mean age of participants: 38 years

*Total Number of Participants = 165

One hundred twenty (72%) of the participants held endorsements in general education, 40 (24%) held endorsements in special education, and 5 (3%) held endorsements in both special education and general education. Three of the teachers that held dual endorsements were teaching special education and two were teaching general education. Table 5 provides a summary of the participants’ total number of years of teaching experience. The mean number of years of teaching experience of the participants was 10 years.
TABLE 5

Summary of Participants' Total Number of Years of Teaching Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Teachers</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - 5 years</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 10 years</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 15 years</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 - 20 years</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 - 25 years</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 - 30 years</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 - 35 years</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Overall mean number of years of teaching experiences for participants = 10 yrs.

*Total Number of Participants = 165

A summary of the length of service to which the teachers had worked under their current principals is shown in Table 6. The mean number of years was 4.37.
TABLE 6

Summary of Teachers’ Lengths of Service Under Current Principals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>1 - 5 years</th>
<th>6 - 10 years</th>
<th>10 - 15 years</th>
<th>16 - 20 years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>118 (72%)</td>
<td>42 (26%)</td>
<td>3 (1%)</td>
<td>2 (1%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Overall mean length of service under current principals = 4.37 years.

*Total Number of Participants = 165

Research Question One

Is there a significant relationship between teachers’ perceptions of urban elementary principals’ leadership behavior and teacher morale?

This question was answered by computing a Pearson product moment correlation coefficient. The test result indicated a Pearson r of .86. This was significant at the .001 level of confidence and indicates a very high positive correlation between elementary principal leadership behavior and teacher morale in Hampton City Schools. The general implication is that teachers’ perceptions of their principals’ leadership skills, as measured by the Excellent Principal Inventory (EPI), were consistent with their morale scores. For example, if teachers gave the principals high scores on the EPI, the teachers had corresponding high scores on the Purdue Teacher Opinionaire (PTO). Visa versa, if teachers gave principals low scores on leadership behavior, the teachers also had low morale scores. A summary of these findings is presented in Table 7.
TABLE 7
Pearson Correlations Between Factor Scores on the Excellent Principal Inventory and the Purdue Teacher Opinionaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purdue Teacher Opinionaire Factors</th>
<th>CSS</th>
<th>TAL</th>
<th>CSCS</th>
<th>CTI</th>
<th>CTL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TRWP</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2 tailed)</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWT</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2 tailed)</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAT</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2 tailed)</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAL</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2 tailed)</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TL</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2 tailed)</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CI</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2 tailed)</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2 tailed)</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSOE</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2 tailed)</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFS</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2 tailed)</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2 tailed)</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Total Number of Participants = 165
*Total PTO and EPI Pearson r = .86 (p < .001)
Legend for the Excellent Principal Inventory (EPI):

1) Commitment to Student Success (CSS)
2) Commitment to Teaching and Learning (TAL)
3) Commitment to School Staff (CSCS)
4) Commitment to Innovation (CTI)
5) Commitment to Leadership (CTL)

Legend for the Purdue Teacher Opinionaire (PTO):

1) Teacher Rapport with Principal (TRWP)
2) Satisfaction with Teaching (SWT)
3) Rapport among Teachers (RAT)
4) Teacher Salary (TSAL)
5) Teaching Load (TL)
6) Curriculum Issues (CI)
7) Teacher Status (TS)
8) Community Support of Education (CSOE)
9) School Facilities and Services (SFS)
10) Community Pressures (CP)
Research Question Two

Do significant relationships exist among factors of principal leadership behaviors and teacher morale?

This question was answered by computing canonical correlations. Canonical correlation is a multivariate correlation technique in which a combination of several predictor variables is used to predict a combination of several criterion variables. In the present study, the five components of the Excellent Principal Inventory (EPI) (independent variable) were the designated predictor variables. The ten factors of the Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire (PTO) (dependent variable) were the designated criterion variables. The underlying statistical inquiry was what set of predictor variables (factors of the EPI) best predicts what set of criterion variables (factors of PTO)? The results are summarized in Table 8 and Table 9.
### TABLE 8

**Excellent Principal Inventory: Factor Analysis**

**Initial Eigenvalues**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Eigenvalue</th>
<th>% of Variance</th>
<th>Cumulative %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*1</td>
<td>4.588</td>
<td>91.765</td>
<td>91.765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.216</td>
<td>4.318</td>
<td>96.083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.245E-02</td>
<td>1.849</td>
<td>97.933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.066E-02</td>
<td>1.213</td>
<td>99.146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.271E-02</td>
<td>.854</td>
<td>100.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Factor Loadings for the EPI for *Factor 1***:

1) Commitment to Student Success (.948)
2) Commitment to Teaching and Learning (.943)
3) Commitment to School Staff (.962)
4) Commitment to Innovation (.966)
5) Commitment to Leadership (.970)

*Retained Factor*
TABLE 9

Purdue Teacher Opinionaire: Factor Analysis

Initial Eigenvalues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Eigenvalue</th>
<th>% of Variance</th>
<th>Cumulative %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*1</td>
<td>5.824</td>
<td>58.236</td>
<td>58.236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.823</td>
<td>8.227</td>
<td>66.464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.679</td>
<td>6.792</td>
<td>73.256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.535</td>
<td>5.350</td>
<td>78.606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.526</td>
<td>5.260</td>
<td>83.866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.438</td>
<td>4.383</td>
<td>88.249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.370</td>
<td>3.698</td>
<td>91.947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>.317</td>
<td>3.174</td>
<td>95.122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>.255</td>
<td>2.551</td>
<td>97.673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>.233</td>
<td>2.327</td>
<td>100.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Factor Loadings for the PTO for *Factor 1: (*Retained factor)

1) Teacher Rapport with Principal (.791)
2) Satisfaction with Teaching (.777)
3) Rapport among Teachers (.845)
4) Teacher Salary (.657)
5) Teaching Load (.747)
6) Curriculum Issues (.773)
7) Teacher Status (.819)
8) Community Support of Education (.712)
9) School Facilities and Services (.743)
10) Community Pressures (.750)
To clarify the findings, note that the point value of any given eigenvalue ranges from 0.0 to 1.0. The closer that a value indicator is to 1.0, the more it contributes to the overall variance. Any factor with a eigenvalue greater than .400 may be interpreted as a significant contributor to the overall variance. When reviewing the various factors for both the EPI and the PTO and their respective eigenvalues, one will note that all of the factors contribute to the overall variance.

The results indicated that the composite variable representing Commitment to Student Success (leadership behavior) is a statistically significant predictor of the composite variable representing Teacher Rapport With Principal (teacher morale). No other canonical R values were found to be statistically significant for any of the variants. Only one component was extracted for the canonical analysis: 91.765% of variance was noted for the Commitment to Student Success component and 58.236% of variance was noted for the Teacher Rapport With Principal component.

Research Question Three

Is there a significant difference between special education and general education teacher morale?

This question was answered by computing a T-test. The results indicated that there is not a significant difference between the total mean scores of the two groups, where $t(164) = -1.405$, $p = .162$. Descriptive statistics are presented in Table 10.
TABLE 10

Descriptive Statistics for General Education and Special Education Teachers

Purdue Teacher Opinionaire Total Score Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>260.3</td>
<td>57.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Education</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>273.8</td>
<td>53.49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Highest total score possible = 400

When testing the respective group means of the 10 factor scores on the PTO, the results indicated that there were no significant differences on any of the factors. Table 11 provides a summary of the descriptive statistics for the two groups' factor scores and Table 12 summarizes the t-test results for the various factors.

With the exception of the Teacher Salary, the item means for the factors ranged from 2.1 to 3.0 (the Likert scale for the PTO ranges from 1 - 4). Teacher Salary means were 1.7 for special education teachers and 1.8 for general education teachers. See Table 13 in chapter 5 for a summary of these results. From a general perspective, the morale of the Hampton City Schools Elementary teachers essentially falls in the somewhat low (borderline positive) to the high range (positive).
### TABLE 11

**Descriptive Statistics for General Education and Special Education Teachers**

**On the Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire Factor Scores**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TRWP</td>
<td>Special Ed</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>46.8</td>
<td>19.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>General Ed</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>52.1</td>
<td>18.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWT</td>
<td>Special Ed</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>61.5</td>
<td>11.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>General Ed</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>64.9</td>
<td>11.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAT</td>
<td>Special Ed</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>41.6</td>
<td>8.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>General Ed</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>9.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSAL</td>
<td>Special Ed</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>4.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>General Ed</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>4.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TL</td>
<td>Special Ed</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>5.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>General Ed</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>6.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CI</td>
<td>Special Ed</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>3.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>General Ed</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>3.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS</td>
<td>Special Ed</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>6.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>General Ed</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>5.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSOE</td>
<td>Special Ed</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>3.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>General Ed</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>3.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFS</td>
<td>Special Ed</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>3.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>General Ed</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>3.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP</td>
<td>Special Ed</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>2.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>General Ed</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>2.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Total Number of Participants = 165*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>( t )</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TRWP</td>
<td>-1.592</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>.113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWT</td>
<td>-1.733</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>.085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAT</td>
<td>-.832</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>.406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSAL</td>
<td>-1.691</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>.093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TL</td>
<td>-.083</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>.934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CI</td>
<td>-.634</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>.527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS</td>
<td>-.208</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>.835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSOE</td>
<td>-.425</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>.671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFS</td>
<td>-.984</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>.326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP</td>
<td>-1.307</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>.193</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Equal variances assumed.
Summary

The data indicated that there is a strong correlation between urban elementary principal leadership behavior and teacher morale in Hampton City Schools. The data further indicated that the only relationship among the factors of leadership behavior as measured by the EPI and the factors of teacher morale as measured by the PTO was between Commitment to Student Success (leadership behavior factor) and Teacher Rapport With Principal (teacher morale factor). None of the other intra-factor relationships were statistically significant. When exploring differences between the morale of general education teachers and special education teachers in Hampton City Schools, the data revealed that there were no statistically significant differences among any of the ten morale factors of the PTO.
Chapter 5
Conclusions

The purpose of this study was to determine if the teacher morale in urban elementary schools was significantly related to the teachers' perceptions of the principals' leadership behavior and to determine if there was a difference between the morale of general education teachers and special education teachers. This chapter presents a summary of the findings, conclusions, implications for educational practice, and suggestions for further research.

Summary

Leadership was defined by the author as the "process" of providing influential direction for the sake of achieving organizational goals and objectives. In its contemporary sense, leadership focuses on newness, change, and a cutting edge visionary perspective (Starratt, 1995). Operationally, principal behavior was defined as the leadership behavior of elementary principals as measured by the Excellent Principal Inventory (EPI). Morale was operationally defined as the professional interest and enthusiasm that a person displays toward the achievement of individual and group goals in a job situation as measured by the Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire (PTO).

The sample for the study included 278 teachers from nineteen elementary schools in the Hampton City Schools district in Hampton, Virginia. Forty three special education teachers (out of 54 eligible teachers) and 122 (out of 224 general education teachers)
comprised the 165 respondents (59% response rate overall). The EPI was selected as the instrument to measure leadership behavior. The EPI breaks the leadership behavior of principals down into five key commitments and 13 corresponding subcomponents, which are thought to characterize the “excellent principal”. The Purdue Teacher Opinionaire (PTO) was selected to measure teacher morale. The authors of the PTO, Bentley and Rempel, break morale down into 10 factors. The PTO views teacher morale as being multidimensional.

The independent variable of the study was leader behavior as reflected by the EPI and the dependent variable was teacher morale, as reflected by the PTO. An ex post facto research design was used for the study since the variables under study were the perception of leadership behavior of elementary principals as reported by the elementary teachers.

The research questions and the findings are as follows:

1. Is there a significant relationship between the teachers' perceptions of urban elementary principals’ leadership behavior and teacher morale?

The findings indicated that there was a significant positive relationship between urban elementary principal leadership behavior and teacher morale in Hampton City Schools.

2. Do significant relationships exist among factors of principal leadership behaviors and teacher morale?

The findings indicated that the only relationship among the factors of leadership behavior as measured by the EPI and the factors of teacher morale as measured by the PTO was between Commitment to Student Success (leadership behavior factor) and
Teacher Rapport With Principal (teacher morale factor). No other intra-factor relationships were statistically significant.

3. Is there a significant difference between special education and general education teacher morale?

The findings indicated that there were no statistically significant differences between the morale of general education teachers and the morale of special education teachers. Moreover, there were no statistically significant differences among any of the ten morale factors of the PTO.

Conclusions

The Relationship Between Elementary Principal Leadership Behavior and Teacher Morale. The results of this study indicate that there is a relationship between elementary principal leadership behavior and teacher morale in an urban school environment. This finding is consistent with the prior research conducted by Zbikowski (1992), Houseknecht (1990), and DeVault (1981). Zbikowski and Houseknecht studied the relationship between principal leadership behavior and teacher morale at the elementary level and DeVault examined the relationship at the secondary level. Similarly, Nomishan (1989) found correlations between teachers’ job satisfaction and principals’ leadership behavior.

The Relationships Among Factors of Principal Leadership Behavior and Teacher Morale. When examining relationships among factors of principal leadership behavior and factors of teacher morale, this study indicated that the composite variable representing Commitment to Student Success (leadership behavior) is a statistically significant predictor of the composite variable representing Teacher Rapport With Principal (teacher
morale). No other canonical R values were found to be statistically significant for any of the variables. In contrast, Zbikowski found a significant relationship between elementary principal leadership behavior and total teacher morale scores among all but one of the factors when using the PTO and the Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ). This analysis included the 10 factors of the PTO and the 12 factors of the LBDQ. DeVault's (1981) earlier findings, which also employed the LBDQ and the PTO, mirrored Zbikowski's results with the exception of the fact that DeVault’s findings indicated a significant relationship among all of the factors. Such results, supporting the view that morale is multidimensional, were also affirmed by Houseknecht (1990). Houseknecht found a relationship between morale (using the PTO) and the five components of the School Leadership Questionnaire.

The findings of this study present an argument against morale being multidimensional with the Hampton City Schools sample. Although it is difficult to answer the question, “Why is this?”, a few possibilities are offered:

1) Morale may indeed be multidimensional. However, there is something unique about the sample such that it operates in a unidimensional fashion. The existing data do not enable one to ascertain what this unique characteristic(s) might be.

2) The prior research and philosophies indicating that morale is multidimensional are wrong. The conclusion may be that morale is unidimensional - not multidimensional.

3) The construct of the questionnaire items for the Purdue Teacher Opinionaire (PTO) may not adequately address the multidimensional nature of morale.

4) The present study employed the canonical correlation statistic to analyze the
relationships between the respective factors. Zbikowski (1992) used separate Pearson correlation coefficients to analyze the data. Houseknecht (1990) utilized multiple regression. The usage of canonical correlations with these two studies may have yielded results that support a unidimensional model of morale.

**Differences Between Special Education and General Education Teacher Morale.**

The final conclusion of the study is that there is no statistically significant difference between the total morale scores of general education teachers and special education teachers in the urban school district of Hampton, Virginia. Moreover, there are no statistically significant differences between the two groups on any of the factors. These finding are essentially consistent with the previous study by McTernan (1983) when looking at morale from a general standpoint. McTernan's results were based on the responses of 124 teachers at six elementary schools and two middle schools in an suburban school district. When comparing the special education teachers and general education teachers on the various factors, McTernan did note the following differences between the two groups:

1) Principals were more strongly identified with general education teachers than special education teachers.

2) Special education teachers expressed stronger feelings of satisfaction with teaching, teaching load, professional status, facilities and services than general education teachers.

When compared to the validity test data compiled as part of the development of the PTO, both the factor mean scores and the item mean scores for the Hampton City
Schools teachers fall below those of the test group in most areas (see Table 13). The only areas where the scores are essentially the same for the three groups are Rapport Among Teachers (RAT), Curriculum Issues (CI), and Community Support of Education (CSOE). The lowest scores for the Hampton City Schools teachers were in the area of Teacher Salary (TSAL). The highest scores for the Hampton City Schools teachers were in the area of Satisfaction With Teaching (SWT).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Factor Mean</th>
<th>Item Mean</th>
<th>Highest Factor Score Possible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TRWP</td>
<td>Test Group</td>
<td>3023</td>
<td>62.2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Special Ed</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>46.8</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>General Ed</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>52.1</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SWT</td>
<td>Test Group</td>
<td>3023</td>
<td>69.0</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Special Ed</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>61.5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>General Ed</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>64.0</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RAT</td>
<td>Test Group</td>
<td>3023</td>
<td>41.8</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Special Ed</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>41.6</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>General Ed</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TSAL</td>
<td>Test Group</td>
<td>3023</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Special Ed</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>General Ed</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TL</td>
<td>Test Group</td>
<td>3023</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Special Ed</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>General Ed</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CI</td>
<td>Test Group</td>
<td>3023</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Special Ed</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>General Ed</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TS</td>
<td>Test Group</td>
<td>3023</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Special Ed</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>General Ed</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CSOE</td>
<td>Test Group</td>
<td>3023</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Special Ed</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>General Ed</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SFS</td>
<td>Test Group</td>
<td>3023</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Special Ed</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>General Ed</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CP</td>
<td>Test Group</td>
<td>3023</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Special Ed</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>General Ed</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Implications

The Relationship Between Elementary Principal Leadership Behavior and Teacher Morale. The findings of this study serve to further solidify an abundance of existing research that underscores the contention that leadership behavior impacts the organization’s morale (e.g., Centerbar, 1995; Cresswell, 1996; Hipp, 1996). Specifically, this study implies that the teacher morale of a school is a reflection of the teachers’ perceptions of the principal’s leadership behavior. Thus, if the teachers assess the principal’s leadership behavior very highly, they will generally display high morale. Conversely, if the teachers assess the principal’s leadership behavior to be poor, they will generally display low morale. This implication contends that the morale status of schools can be predicted on the basis of the teachers’ perception of the principals’ leadership style.

Whereas a contingency approach to leadership is arguably critical in the turbulent school environment, participative decision making is more likely to result in greater organizational effectiveness, individual performance, and positive teacher morale. Participative decision making does not take away the power of the principal. Rather, it augments the principal’s power. By sharing power, the principal creates a group power which is fundamental to achieving group goals and employee satisfaction. True collaboration between the “principal teacher” and the classroom teachers is the essence of instructional leadership in its purest sense.

Factors of Principal Leadership Behavior. The findings suggest that leadership behavior can be reduced to one factor - as opposed to the five factors specified in the EPI. One cannot determine exactly what this “new” reduced factor is on the basis of the
existing data. However, the implication is that if principals score low when assessed with this one factor, one can predict that teacher morale will be low. Conversely, if principals score high when assessed with this one factor, one can predict that teacher morale will be high.

Factors of Teacher Morale. The findings also suggest that teacher morale can be reduced to one factor - as opposed to the ten factors specified in the PTO. As with leadership behavior, one cannot determine what this “new” morale factor is on the basis of the available data. If teachers score low when assessed with this one morale factor, the contention is that one can predict that their measured perceptions of the principal’s leadership behavior will reflect low scores. Conversely, if teachers score high with this one factor, one can predict that their measured perceptions of the principal’s leadership behavior will reflect high scores.

In light of the finding that morale is unidimensional versus multidimensional, school principals are reminded that morale is indeed very complex. This finding may not disprove the contention that morale is multidimensional, but it certainly raises questions about the dynamics of morale. The underlying implication is that the morale of an organization may operate in a unidimensional fashion or in a multidimensional fashion. It is, then, incumbent upon the school principal to assess teacher morale within the building, to diagnose it, and to treat it on the basis of its behavioral profile. To be reiterated is the fact that managing morale is a process, not a prescription that heals the recurrent and natural dissatisfaction experienced by employees from time to time in the workplace.
Differences Between Special Education and General Education Teacher Morale.

The results regarding special education teacher morale versus general education teacher morale imply that there are no salient treatment differentials by principals when interacting with the two groups. This was a very positive indicator for Hampton City Schools. The finding dispels the common belief that principals have better relationships with general education teachers than special education teachers or that special education teachers typically display much lower morale than general education teachers.

Suggestions for Further Research

1. Research is needed to replicate this study by further examining the relationship between elementary principal leadership behavior and teacher morale in an urban school environment with a different demographic configuration. The finding that morale was unidimensional versus multidimensional necessitates further research to support such results.

2. Research is needed to compare urban elementary principals’ espoused leadership behavior and teachers’ perception of their leadership behavior.

3. Research is needed to further explore differences between special education teacher morale and general education teacher morale. Only a limited number of studies have been conducted in this area. Future research might explore teacher morale in larger urban school districts and in suburban school districts at the elementary and secondary levels.

4. Research is needed to further explore whether morale is unidimensional or multidimensional. Different inventories may be used for comparative purposes.
Examining morale in districts with varying demographic configurations will be meaningful.

5. Research is needed to explore morale and leadership behavior from a longitudinal perspective, with a pre and post assessment. The post assessment could follow a specific set of interventions/treatments that seek to improve student achievement, teacher productivity, principal/leadership behavior, and general teacher morale.

Closing Remarks

The philosophical and theoretical contention that there is a relationship between principal leadership behavior and teacher morale appears to be well supported in the literature and is evidenced in the present study. The degree to which principal leadership behavior impacts teacher morale and school success will continue to be debated in the lecture halls and research institutions across the country. Although total agreement is elusive at best, there is agreement that managing morale is a difficult task. Why? Because morale is not a behavioral constant. It is forever changing, as are the sources of influence and the impact on various individuals. The reality is that it is extremely difficult to change the way a person feels. Yet, this is a must for school principals. Good morale is not just a matter of everyone being happy; rather, it is a situation in which people feel they are serving a worthy purpose, are making significant contributions, and are recognized and appreciated. Although a healthy morale may not be indicative of a good school, one is not likely to find a good school that is not characterized by healthy morale. And as Mitchells and Peters (1988) indicated, good schools are the best incentives for good teachers. Paying serious attention to morale and taking “real actions” to improve it may not only
enhance the quality of instruction and learning, but may prove to be the most underrated school improvement plan amid the rugged terrain of American school reform.
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TRANSMITTAL LETTER

November 1, 1999

Dennis Martin
62 Westview Drive
Hampton, VA 23666

Dear Colleague:

I am a doctoral candidate in the School of Education at the College of William and Mary. I am presently conducting a study of the relationship between elementary principal leadership behavior and teacher morale in Hampton City Schools. The purpose of the study is to determine if teacher morale is significantly related to the teachers' perceptions of the principal's leadership behavior and to determine if there is a difference between the morale of general education teachers and special education teachers. The results of this study will help provide insight to principals seeking to improve teacher morale and seeking to improve their leadership behavior. Additionally, the findings may help facilitate staff development training for both teachers and principals who are involved in strategic school improvement plans.

I am especially desirous of your responses as a teacher because your experiences and instructional leadership in the classroom are critical to the success of this research. It is only with your participation that I can effectively draw conclusions that can be optimally beneficial to schools and the research community. Thus, I kindly request that you complete the two enclosed surveys. The first survey pertains to teacher morale and is named The Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire (PTO). The second survey pertains to the principal's leadership behavior and is named the Excellent Principal Inventory (EPI). The surveys take about 20 minutes each to complete. It is important that you complete BOTH surveys.

Please return the two surveys and the enclosed data card in the self addressed stamped envelope by Friday, November 19, 1999. Be assured that your responses and participation will be held in the strictest confidence. Neither your name nor the name of your school or principal will be mentioned in any of the written results. Your participation, of course, is voluntary. I sincerely hope that you can assist me with this noteworthy study. If you have any questions or concerns regarding the research or completion of the surveys, contact me at 865-8542 (home number). As a small token of my appreciation for your assistance, I have enclosed a $100.00 cash coupon which has been reserved with your survey identification number on it. This coupon will be entered in the pool of participants and one individual will be randomly selected to receive the $100.00 in cash (payable by check). So please remember to return this coupon along with your surveys and informational data card. Thank you for your time, consideration and assistance.

Sincerely,

Dennis Martin
Doctoral Candidate
College of William and Mary, School of Education

Enclosures/3
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THE EXCELLENT PRINCIPAL INVENTORY

INSTRUCTIONS: Please use a #2 pencil. As you complete this questionnaire, please note that each item is preceded by the question, “How satisfied are you with the way the principal...” Your response choices are HD—HIGHLY DISSATISFIED, D—DISSATISFIED, N—NEITHER SATISFIED nor DISSATISFIED, S—SATISFIED, HS—HIGHLY SATISFIED. Please indicate your response by completely filling in the answer space. If you change a response, erase the first mark completely. Do not make marks outside of the answer bubbles.

COMMITMENT TO STUDENT SUCCESS:
DEMONSTRATING RESPECT FOR STUDENTS

1. Genuinely cares for the student’s welfare.

2. Consistently makes student success a top priority.

3. Effectively interacts with students.

4. Encourages and listens to students’ concerns.

5. Appropriately promotes and attends varied student activities.

6. Discourages destructive comments about students.

PURSUITING ALL-AROUND EXCELLENCE

7. Communicates a belief that every student is capable of learning.

8. Ensures that challenging standards are set for all student performance.

9. Is committed to helping all students achieve their full potential.

10. Emphasizes the relationship of all school activities to achieving student success.

11. Supports a full range of extracurricular activities.


13. Gives positive recognition for student accomplishment in non-academic areas.

14. Inspires students to be proud of their school.

COMMITMENT TO TEACHING AND LEARNING:
PROMOTING TEACHING AND LEARNING

15. Is personally committed to the teaching and learning process.


17. Supports opportunities for learning that integrate several subjects.

19. Effectively facilitates the teaching/learning process.

20. Recognizes successful teaching practices.

SUPPORTING CONTINUOUS LEARNING AS A LIFETIME GOAL

21. Encourages staff development experiences in addition to formal academic programs.

22. Encourages development for teachers outside their specialties.

23. Recognizes and promotes education beyond the classroom for students.

24. Models a commitment to continuous learning in his or her own behavior.

25. Engages in personal development experiences on a regular basis.

26. Participates with staff in personal and professional development.

COMMITMENT TO THE SCHOOL STAFF:
DEMONSTRATING RESPECT FOR THE SCHOOL STAFF

27. Demonstrates respect and concern for people as individuals.

28. Helps people feel their work is meaningful and important.

29. Is more concerned with giving credit than taking it.

30. Distributes instructional resources fairly and equitably.

31. Avoids playing favorites.

32. Gives staff members recognition for their outstanding achievements.

33. Discourages destructive comments about staff members.

HELPING INDIVIDUALS IMPROVE

34. Demonstrates a sincere interest in the professional development of staff members.

35. Helps individuals establish clear goals for individual performance.

36. Creates opportunities for individual growth.

37. Assures that training and coaching are provided when needed.

38. Provides development feedback in a timely manner.


40. Effectively deals with performance problems.
BUILDING A COLLEGIAL STAFF

41. Encourages individuals to work together.
42. Supports an environment that is conducive to collaboration.
43. Removes barriers to help improve collaboration.
44. Appropriately involves others in decision-making.
45. Is resourceful in acquiring support for the school’s program.
46. Provides timely feedback on the school’s performance to the school staff.
47. Helps staff members constructively confront and deal with differences.
48. Helps people feel like winners.
49. Inspires staff members to be proud of their school.

COMMITMENT TO INNOVATION:
SUPPORTING CREATIVITY

50. Provides a stable and secure work environment.
51. Personally searches for new ways to improve learning.
52. Stimulates creativity in others.
53. Is willing to rock the boat when change is needed.
54. Facilitates changes required to implement new ideas.
55. Works to remove roadblocks to innovation.
56. Takes risks by trying new ideas.
57. Takes risks by letting others try out their ideas.
58. Keeps current with the latest innovative educational ideas.
59. Gives recognition to people who succeed with new ideas.

SUPPORTING UPWARD COMMUNICATION

60. Asks for staff members’ ideas on improving teaching and learning.
61. Helps others feel free to express their opinions.
62. Genuinely listens to others’ ideas.
63. Works to see the value of differing opinions.
64. Responds to co-workers' suggestions in a timely manner.

65. Seeks information from staff about his or her performance.

COMMITTMENT TO LEADERSHIP:
DEMONSTRATING INTEGRITY

66. Shows a high degree of personal integrity in dealing with others.

67. Does what he or she believes is right, although it may not be popular.

68. Lives up to personal commitments made to others.

69. Leads by example.

70. Demonstrates sensitivity and respect to those of different social and cultural backgrounds.

PRESENTING IDEAS

72. Articulates a clear vision of the school's direction.

73. Makes sure that the school's objectives are clearly understood.

74. Communicates in an open and candid manner.

75. Presents ideas effectively when speaking.

76. Communicates effectively in writing.

77. Provides effective orientation for new assignments.

78. Avoids talking down to others.

TAKING RESPONSIBILITY

79. Takes responsibility and ownership for his or her decisions.

80. Encourages and accepts constructive criticism.

81. Admits to his or her mistakes.

82. Makes decisions in a timely manner.

83. Demonstrates self-confidence as a leader.

RELATING TO EXTERNAL CONSTITUENCIES

84. Keeps parents and the community informed about the school and its programs.

85. Encourages and listens to ideas from parents and community members.

86. Works with dissenting individuals or groups within the community to reach understanding.
87. Is willing to challenge the district office when appropriate.

88. Does not pass the buck or blame the district office or school board.

89. Is sensitive to the interests of different racial and cultural populations.
THE PURDUE TEACHER OPINIONAIRE

INSTRUCTIONS: Please use a #2 pencil. Read each statement carefully. Blacken the corresponding space of the respective items in the following manner: AGREE - if you agree with the statement; PROBABLY AGREE - if you are somewhat uncertain, but probably agree with the statement; PROBABLY DISAGREE - if you are somewhat uncertain, but probably disagree with the statement; and DISAGREE - if you disagree with the statement. If you change a response, erase the mark completely. Do not mark outside of the bubbled spaces.

1. Details, “red tape,” and required reports absorb too much of my time.
2. The work of individual faculty members is appreciated and commended by our principal.
3. Teachers feel free to criticize administrative policy at faculty meetings called by our principal.
4. The faculty feels that their suggestions pertaining to salaries are adequately transmitted by the administration to the board of education.
5. Our principal shows favoritism in his relations with the teachers in our school.
6. Teachers in this school are expected to do an unreasonable amount of record keeping and clerical work.
7. My principal makes a real effort to maintain close contact with the faculty.
8. Community demands upon the teacher’s time are unreasonable.
9. I am satisfied with the policies under which pay raises are granted.
10. My teaching load is greater than that of most of the other teachers in our school.
11. The extra-curricular load of the teachers in our school is unreasonable.
12. Our principal’s leadership in faculty meetings challenges and stimulates our professional growth.
13. My teaching position gives me the social status in the community that I desire.
14. The number of hours a teacher must work is unreasonable.
15. Teaching enables me to enjoy many of the material and cultural things I like.
16. My school provides me with adequate classroom supplies and equipment.
17. Our school has a well-balanced curriculum.
18. There is a great deal of griping, arguing, taking sides, and feuding among our teachers.
19. Teaching gives me a great deal of personal satisfaction.
20. The curriculum of our school makes reasonable provision for student individual differences.
21. The procedures for obtaining materials and services are well defined and efficient.
22. Generally, teachers in our school do not take advantage of one another.

23. The teachers in our school cooperate with each other to achieve common, personal, and professional objectives.

24. Teaching enables me to make my greatest contribution to society.

25. The curriculum of our school is in need of major revisions.

26. I love to teach.

27. If I could plan my career again, I would choose teaching.

28. Experienced faculty members accept new and younger members as colleagues.

29. I would recommend teaching as an occupation to students of high scholastic ability.

30. If I could earn as much money in another occupation, I would stop teaching.

31. The school schedule places my classes at a disadvantage.

32. Within the limits of financial resources, the school tries to follow a generous policy regarding fringe benefits, professional travel, professional study, etc.

33. My principal makes my work easier and more pleasant.

34. Keeping up professionally is too much of a burden.

35. Our community makes its teachers feel as though they are a real part of the community.

36. Salary policies are administered with fairness and justice.

37. Teaching affords me the security I want in an occupation.

38. My school principal understands and recognizes good teaching procedures.

39. Teachers clearly understand the policies governing salary increases.

40. My classes are used as a "dumping ground" for problem students.

41. The lines and methods of communication between teachers and the principal in our school are well developed and maintained.

42. My teaching load in this school is unreasonable.

43. My principal shows a real interest in my department.

44. Our principal promotes a sense of belonging among the teachers in our school.

45. My heavy teaching load unduly restricts my nonprofessional activities.

46. I find my contacts with students, for the most part, highly satisfying and rewarding.
47. I feel that I am an important part of this school system.

48. The competency of the teachers in our school compares favorably with that of teachers in other schools with which I am familiar.

49. My school provides the teachers with adequate audio-visual aids and projection equipment.

50. I feel successful and competent in my present position.

51. I enjoy working with student organizations, clubs, and societies.

52. Our teaching staff is congenial to work with.

53. My teaching associates are well prepared for their jobs.

54. Our school faculty has a tendency to form into cliques.

55. The Teachers in our school work well together.

56. I am at a disadvantage professionally because other teachers are better prepared to teach than I am.

57. Our school provides adequate clerical services for the teachers.

58. As far as I know, the other teachers think I am a good teacher.

59. Library facilities and resources are adequate for the grade or subject area which I teach.

60. The “stress and strain” resulting from teaching makes teaching undesirable for me.

61. My principal is concerned with the problems of the faculty and handles these problems sympathetically.

62. I do not hesitate to discuss any school problem with my principal.

63. Teaching gives me the prestige I desire.

64. My teaching job enables me to provide a satisfactory standard of living for my family.

65. The salary schedule in our school adequately recognizes teacher competency.

66. Most of the people in this community understand and appreciate good education.

67. In my judgement, this community is a good place to raise a family.

68. This community respects its teachers and treats them like professional persons.

69. My principal acts as though he is interested in me and my problems.

70. My school principal supervises rather than “snoopervises” the teachers in our school.

71. It is difficult for teachers to gain acceptance by the people in this community.

72. Teachers’ meetings as now conducted by our principal waste the time and energy of the staff.
73. My principal has a reasonable understanding of the problems connected with my teaching assignment.

74. I feel that my work is judged fairly by my principal.

75. Salaries paid in this school system compare favorably with salaries in other systems with which I am familiar.

76. Most of the actions of students irritate me.

77. The cooperativeness of teachers in our school helps make my work more enjoyable.

78. My students regard me with respect and seem to have confidence in my professional ability.

79. The purposes and objectives of the school cannot be achieved by the present curriculum.

80. The teachers in our school have a desirable influence on the values and attitudes of their students.

81. This community expects its teachers to meet unreasonable personal standards.

82. My students appreciate the help I give them with their school work.

83. To me there is no more challenging work than teaching.

84. Other teachers in our school are appreciate of my work.

85. As a teacher in this community, my nonprofessional activities outside of school are unduly restricted.

86. As a teacher, I think I am as competent as most other teachers.

87. The teachers with whom I work have high professional ethics.

88. Our school curriculum does a good job of preparing students to become enlightened and competent citizens.

89. I really enjoy working with my students.

90. The teachers in our school show a great deal of initiative and creativity in their teaching assignments.

91. Teachers in our community feel free to discuss controversial issues in their classes.

92. My principal tries to make me feel comfortable when he visits my classes.

93. My principal makes effective use of the individual teacher's capacity and talent.

94. The people in this community, generally, have a sincere and wholehearted interest in the school system.

95. Teachers feel free to go to the principal about problems of personal and group welfare.

96. This community supports ethical procedures regarding the appointment and reappointment of members of the teaching staff.

97. This community is willing to support a good program of education.
98. Our community expects the teachers to participate in too many social activities.

99. Community pressures prevent me from doing my best as a teacher.

100. I am well satisfied with my present teaching position.