CHAPTER III

REVIEW OF EARLIER RESEARCHES

3.1 Principal: The Apex of the School System

The conceptualization of organizational processes, including the leadership construct, is constantly evolving. Hence, no universal paradigm or theory exists for examining organizational behaviour that is valid in all contexts (Glasman & Heck, 1992; Hallinger, 1992; Leithwood & Hallinger, 1993).

The reviews by Hallinger and Heck (1996) in the Educational Administration Quarterly examined research on principal leadership conducted during the previous decade. More interestingly, the reviews drew quite different conclusions. Based on her assessment of the literature, Bridges (1982) concluded: "Although researchers apparently show a greater interest in outcomes than was the case in the earlier period, they combine their excessive reliance on survey designs, questionnaires of dubious reliability and validity, and relatively simplistic types of statistical analysis".

This conclusion was sobering for those who hoped that research might assist in solving problems of educational policy and practice in educational administration.
In contrast, Bossert and his colleagues (1982) at the Far West Laboratory for Research and Development suggested that principals could have a positive impact on a variety of in-school factors, and at least indirectly affect the achievement of students. The Far West Lab. group's assessment was supported by independent reviews conducted by scholars. Although not blind to methodological problems of the literature, their conclusions were distinctly more optimistic than those of Bridges.

In retrospect, it may be explained by several factors. First, Bridges' review (1982) did not include the venues that were featuring the earlier effective school research. Second, the school effects research was comprised of general investigations into the effectiveness of schools. Thus, these studies may not have met Bridges' selection criteria even if they had appeared in the journals included in Bossert's review. Third, it would be fair to say that the foci differed.

Finally, it is also true that if the earlier effective schools studies had been included in Bridges' review, they would have been apathy characterized by several elements noted in his methodological critique. Moreover, the research designs and statistical methods were not always up to the task of determining casual relationships.
Together, these factors explain the incongruence in findings drawn from reviews conducted at the same time. In a sense, however, these reviews all predated a new generation of research on principal effectiveness. Instrumentation developed from the conceptual work, made it possible to design studies that would more reliably determine the nature and effects of the principal's role behaviour in this domain eg., Hallinger & Murphy, (1985); Van de Grift, (1990).

3.1.1 Principal Leadership as an Intense Input

The belief that principals have an impact on schools is long standing in the folk wisdom of American educational history. Research on change implementation conducted during the 1970's identified the important role principals play in school-improvement efforts. (Berman & McLaughlin, 1978; Fullan, 1982). Research of Van Zanten (1989) has identified a strong principal as one of the traits common to effective schools. The focus of this study was to measure the relationship between leadership style of the principal and school effectiveness in the urban setting. It had been hypothesized that leadership style was an important factor in determining the effectiveness of a leader. It had also been hypothesized that an autocratic leadership style would be a more effective style in an
urban setting. The findings partially supported these assumptions. There appeared to be some support of the hypotheses that a more directive form of administrative leadership style has a positive influence on student achievement. Democratic forms of administrative leadership styles may not have provided enough structure, resulting in less productive student achievement.

According to Vernotica (1989) a common element of school effectiveness studies is that of strong leadership. These studies suggest that leadership by the school principal is characteristic of effective elementary schools. He explored the behaviours of principal goal clarity, goal related interaction and principal-teacher consensus on student achievement. The major hypothesis predicts that the principal behaviours will have an indirect effect on student achievement through their influence on teachers. Findings demonstrated that although the principal behaviours of goal clarity and interaction do affect academic consensus there was no significant relationship between consensus and achievement. Careful analysis also suggested that principal behaviours demonstrated a direct relationship to student achievement at an intermediate grade level.
Derzo (1988) observed that the Principal instructional and managerial expectancy motivations, are related to the resultant achievement-oriented instructional leadership behaviour. Results demonstrate that principal instructional leadership behaviour directly influences teacher energy which exerts positive effects on three measures of school adaptability, and teacher's satisfaction with school and job.

Jayajyothi (1992) found that the principal is responsible for the organizational climate and the teacher morale in central schools.

Taj (1997) after studying 145 teachers from schools of different categories has opined that the school heads should strive to enhance their school organizational health so that it will create a atmosphere to work in harmony and peace.

3.2 Leadership Styles - A Paramount Factor

The study of Jennings (1961) was to identify the relationship between specific principal leadership styles and the effectiveness of urban elementary schools. This investigation probed into the leadership behaviours of urban elementary school principals as perceived by themselves and their professional local
school staff along with these leadership behaviours' relationships with the effective schools correlates. Jennings was interested in the differences between effective 'high-achieving' and improving elementary schools in the same locality.

The results revealed that the differences between high-achieving and improving schools may be attributed to the behavioural patterns of the principals' leadership styles. All high-achieving schools' principals and professional staffs perceived themselves and their principals leadership styles as being consultative to moderately participative. Improving schools' principals also perceived themselves as being consultative to moderately participative. However, improving schools' professional staff perceived their principals' leadership styles as being benevolent-authoritarian to consultative. The level of leadership styles and means for high-achieving schools implied that high-achieving school staff expected and received more from their students, staff and community as it related to their commitment to academic excellence.
Nanda (1992) studied the leadership behaviour of heads of primary schools and found that ineffective leaders show more consideration - behaviour and less initiating - behaviour, were inefficient in consideration behaviour and initiating and some are manifesting higher type of leadership in "initiating structures" and consideration.

3.3 Instructional Leadership Behaviours of the Principal and School Characteristics

Sheppard (1994) studied the relationship among instructional leadership behaviours of the school principal and selected school-level characteristics. Instructional leadership was considered from a 'broad' perspective to include behaviours that have been identified through research primarily based on a goal attainment model of effectiveness. In such a model school effectiveness is measured by student achievement on standardized tests. The selected school-level characteristics were:

(1) Teacher Commitment,

(2) Professional Involvement, and

(3) Innovativeness.

These have been identified as characteristics of an effective school by those adhering to a systems resource perspective.
The hypotheses were:

1. There is a positive relationship among instructional leadership behaviours exhibited by principals and the level of teacher commitment to and support of the school.

2. There is a positive relationship among instructional leadership behaviours exhibited by principals and the level of teacher professional involvement.

3. There is a positive relationship among instructional leadership behaviours exhibited by principals and the level of innovativeness in the school.

4a. School type (elementary or high) does not affect the relationship among instructional leadership behaviours exhibited by principals and teacher commitment.

4b. School type (elementary or high) does not affect the relationship among instructional leadership behaviours exhibited by principals and teacher professional involvement.

4c. School type (elementary or high) does not affect the relationship among instructional leadership behaviours exhibited by principals
Only two of these hypotheses were not supported. These were hypothesis 4 (b) and hypothesis 4 (c). The relationship among instructional leadership behaviours of principals and the school-level characteristics of innovativeness and professional involvement were found to be statistically different for each school type.

The results of this study reinforce the validity of the 'broad' conceptualization of instructional leadership in the development of effective schools. It suggests that such a conceptualization is compatible with both the goal attainment and systems resource perspectives of organizational effectiveness. The findings bring into question arguments that instructional leadership is negatively related to Teacher Commitment, Professional Involvement, and Innovativeness. Finally, the developed models should be of value to practitioners and researchers as they attempt to determine leadership practices that will lead to new levels of school effectiveness.

3.4 Principal Leadership Behaviours in Effective and Ineffective Schools

The study of Callahan (1992) aimed at the levels of leadership effectiveness of school principals in schools that had gained recognition as effective schools, and compared these principals with four
principals in schools that had yet to achieve such recognition. Each effective school was paired with an ineffective school.

The following hypotheses were tested:

(1) Principals in effective schools display a common set of leadership behaviours.

(2) Principals in effective schools function at relatively high levels of effectiveness.

(3) Principals in ineffective schools do not display the same behaviours as principals of effective schools, and the range of their leadership behaviour varies.

(4) Principals in ineffective schools function over a wider range of effectiveness levels than principals in effective schools.

(5) Principals in effective and ineffective schools which have similar characteristics display a high degree of common leadership behaviours.
The major conclusions were:

(1) Principals in effective schools exhibit many common behaviours and make use of a wide range of behaviours in response to environmental stimuli.

(2) Principals in schools that are ineffective differ in the scope of their behaviours in response to similar situations.

(3) Principals in effective schools function at high levels of effectiveness.

(4) Principals in effective schools vary considerably in levels of effectiveness and it is not possible to predict at what level of effectiveness these principals function. There are many principals in ineffective schools that exhibit effective behaviours.

(5) The profiles of behaviours of principals in demographically similar schools show common trends regardless of whether schools have been recognized as effective or not.
3.5 Principal Power and School Effectiveness

Kshensky (1990) pondered the key concept that power remains as a fundamental factor in the study of leadership and organizational behaviour. It has recently gained attention in school settings as teacher unions seek 'teacher empowerment' while many supervisors lament over their loss of power.

In fact, principals exercise a great deal of power, and in effective schools a synergistic power relationship develops between principals and their staff.

Social power, or the ability to direct another person's actions was for years the focus of debate between social scholars. One school of view is that power is inherently negative or creates negative relationships, while others argue that power can be used to benefit society. Positive use of power is the key to 'transformational leadership'.

The survey utilized:

(a) respondent background information,
(b) The Administrator Behaviour Scale (ABS), and
(c) The School Assessment Survey (SAS).
The ABS includes scales for goal coercion, authority, and influence, while the SAS includes scales for goal consensus, leadership, climate, teacher communication, administrator communication, and teacher performance.

Significant relationships are revealed between power behaviour and a school’s effectiveness. Coercion correlates negatively while authority and influence correlate positively with school effectiveness.

The manner in which principals use their power has a profound effect on their schools. Power behaviour is the key component of leadership and as such has considerable impact on staff and a school’s operation.

Through the principal’s use of influence and authority teachers can be empowered to play a key role in school decision-making, and other processes, while not diminishing the principal’s power. A true leader-principal uses power wisely, knowing that power is not a zero-sum commodity, but rather that principal power increases as staff gains a sense of ownership for the school program.

The conclusions of this study of Jones (1997) indicate that the principal is critical in creating a school climate that will motivate and encourage students to succeed.
3.6 Principal Effectiveness

Despite the optimistic perspective assumed by many writers in the field of principal effectiveness, closer inspection of individual studies has generally disclosed a need for considerable caution (Miskel, 1982; Rowan et al., 1982; Van de Grift, 1990). This review of theoretical and related empirical models used to study the role of principal leadership in school effectiveness yields a somewhat unexpected finding.

When the studies were grouped in terms of underlying theoretical models, patterns emerged that indicate that model type makes a difference in what is found. These studies yield more frequent instances of positive findings concerning the role of the principal in school effectiveness.

These studies support the notion that principal leadership can make a difference in student learning. What these studies further indicate, however, is that we must attend to the conditions under which this effect is achieved.

At a more general level, however, the most theoretically and empirically robust models that have been used to study leadership effects tell us that principal leadership that makes a difference is aimed toward influencing internal school processes that are directly linked to student learning.
Interestingly, when the studies that report positive findings are reviewed, only one mediating variable shows up with consistency as a significant factor interacting with principal leadership: school goals eg., Brewer, 1993; Bamburg & Andrews, 1990; Glasman & Fuller, 1992; Goldring & Pasternak, 1994; Hallinger & Murphy, 1985; Heck et al., 1990; Leithwood, and Hallinger 1993; Silins, 1994.

In some studies, the goal variable was measured in terms of good consensus. In others, it was operationalized in terms of the presence of school goals, the degree of academic focus, principal vision or focus, or the principal’s role in communicating a mission. Notably, the studies further reinforce the notion that the interaction between leadership and goal structure within the school is also influenced by environmental variables.

At this time, the specific nature of these complex interactions across sets of variables within a model of principal effectiveness remains unclear. However, the fact is that such relationships are emerging from empirical analysis of both practical and theoretical interest.
The finding of positive indirect effects of leadership derives from among the best studies conducted to date in this field. In the often ambiguous domain of social science research findings this trend gives rise to cautious optimism.

The fact that leadership effects on school achievement appear to be indirect is neither a cause for alarm nor dismay. Achieving results through others is the essence of leadership. A finding that principal effects are mediated by other in-school variables does nothing what so ever to diminish the principals importance.

Thus the review supports both the potency of Bridges' highly critical review of methodology in educational administration and the conceptual promise hinted at by others (Bosser, et al., 1982; Murphy, 1990).

The major conclusions by Hanke (1989) were: Principals of exemplary schools were selective in how they accomplished curriculum/instructional leadership tasks and did tasks which they did not consider to be relevant principal tasks because they perceived the tasks to be very important for school effectiveness.
3.7 School Effectiveness as Perceived by the School Administration

Legaard (1991) identified activities that are perceived by selected secondary school principals, superintendents, and past chairpersons of North Central Association self-studies as important in contributing to the effectiveness of a school.

The primary findings were:

(1) There was a high level of agreement among the respondents regarding those activities that were perceived as important in contributing to a more effective school in regard to higher student achievement, higher student attendance and a lower student drop-out rate.

(2) The effective school has a climate that is purposeful and orderly, has high standards of performance, has a clear sense of mission, has strong, goal and achievement oriented leadership, and has a staff that is involved in planning.

(3) The principal gives priority to the education of students, conveys high expectations for students' achievement and teachers' performance.
(4) The superintendent makes decisions after receiving the recommendations of appropriate administrative personnel.

(5) Candidates for faculty positions are given personal interviews.

(6) The faculty demonstrates an active concern for the solution of education problems. The professional evaluation program's central purpose is the improvement of student learning.

(7) Faculty members are encouraged to continue their education and no deductions are made in pay when faculty are on professional leave.

3.8 Principal Behaviour and Students Achievement

Educational policy makers have been inclined to believe that principal leadership is critical to the achievement of students (Murphy, 1990). In this light, research that focused on measures of student achievement held increasing salience for policy makers (Glasman & Heck, 1992).

Given apparent support from research community, policy makers now tend to view the principal as a key educational input, and one easily accessed through policy channels. Although there is little disagreement
concerning the belief that principals have an impact on the lives of teachers and students, both the nature and degree of that effect continues to be open to debate (Pitner, 1988; Van de Grift, 1990). The appropriate perspective is that the principal’s role is best conceived as part of a web of environmental, personal, and in school relationships that combine to influence organizational outcomes (Heck, et. al., 1990).

Erickson (1988) examined the relationship between the principal’s leadership behaviour and student achievement. He measured perception of the principal and teachers on the principal leadership. It was concluded that there was very little single or multiple relationship among the various independent variables and student achievement. He further points out that situational leadership theory posits that effective leaders are able to adjust their leadership behaviour to fit the social system at hand.

3.9 Role of a Principal in Developing a School Climate

Lechner - Knowles (1987) describes the role of the principal in a school improvement project in an urban elementary school. Concurrently, it explains how a principal can use a reflective process to track, monitor, and innovate change. Although the literature
on effective schools directs the principal to be an instructional leader, there is little research that describes how a principal gives this leadership and what is demanded as she interacts with other adults. The principal in this study served as the researcher and practitioner. By using the action research technique of reflection-in-action, she became reflective upon her leadership role and informed her decision-making. This process was iterating as data collection and analyses were on-going and interrelated. Data was collected from multiple sources over a one and a half year period. While the principal served as the primary instrument by maintaining a daily log, data was compiled from school-based evaluations and from the repeated visits to the school by observers who interviewed teachers.

A detailed description of what a principal actually did to develop a school climate to facilitate students' learning is provided in this study. School improvement was not linear, but interactive. Building a climate with a vision of what a school should be was focused on the dynamic relation between the principal and other adults, teachers and parents. The most significant gain for the school in its school improvement effort was building a climate to perpetuate
productive adult behaviours. The fact that students made significant progress on standardized tests was less important than the internalization of these behaviours, which offered the hope that the students' progress will be sustained and that the adults will continue to grow.

3.10 Methodology

Bridges (1982) concluded that the frame of reference for studies in educational administration tended to be neither theoretical nor practical. As Pitner (1988) suggested in her earlier review, several models roughly constituting a theoretical frame work provide a useful means of representing how researchers have conceptualized the principal's role.

In contrast, a number of researchers have been explicit in their attempt to link empirical efforts to theoretical issues involving relationships among school environment factors, principal leadership, in-school progresses, and school outcomes (Goldring & Pasternak, 1994; Heck et al., 1990; Jones, 1987; Leitner, 1994; Silins, 1994.

The relationship between theoretical models proposed, methods of investigation, and results is not only one which can be drawn from these studies. It does
not offer, however, one useful benchmark for differentiating between efforts that are primarily empirically or theoretically driven. Overall, this represents significant improvement over the picture depicted by Bridges (1982), who termed research in the field as "intellectual random events".

3.11 Research Design

Almost all of the studies identified in our search used a cross-sectional, correlation design. Most often the investigators used surveys or interviews as their methods of data collection.

In theory, experimental designs are better equipped to make determinations of causation than are correlational designs. However, in practice, experimental research is difficult to implement in a domain where the unit of analysis is the school.

3.12 Teachers: a Strong Input to School System

3.12a School Effectiveness Vs Teachers

The purpose of the study by Reiter (1989) was to analyse the importance attributed to characteristics of school effectiveness by secondary teachers. Samples for this study consisted of secondary teachers in public school districts in the State of Missouri with a high school population of 500 pupils or larger. Among other
things Reiter concluded that factors that effect secondary teacher perceptions of effective schools are education, experience and age. The more experienced and educated secondary teacher places a high value on monitoring of student progress and basic skills instruction. Older secondary teachers view the leadership of the principal, basic skills instruction, and concentration on academic learning time as more important than do younger teachers.

Teacher perceptions were measured on an instrument developed by the researcher, the Principal Behaviour Questionnaire (PBQ).

SES was constructed for the purpose of studying the learning environment of various types of schools. The test has been constructed in Hindi. (Dixit 1971).

Objectives of study by Haq (1975) were:
(1) to examine the nature and quantum of political content.
(2) the relationship between teachers' level of politicization and students.
(3) to examine relationship between parents' level of politicization.
The major objectives of the study by Gandhi (1997):

(1) To classify secondary schools of Gujarat on a climate continuum.

(2) To study the factors that contributes to creation of extreme climates.

(3) To find out differences in teachers' and principals' perceptions.

The major findings of Gandhi were as follows:

(1) 36% of schools belonged to closed type, 35% to intermediate type and 29% to open climate in Gujarat State

(2) Small schools are open climate and larger schools in closed type

(3) The category of schools did not bear any relationship with the organizational climate

3.12b Congruence Between the Principal and Staff and its Relationship to School Effectiveness

The research on effective schools by Fitch (1988) has identified the importance of the principal as a leader in relationship to the level of effectiveness of a school-building. The role of the principal has evolved from one of a manager of a school building to one of an instructional leader who
articulates the goals of school-building and provides the support mechanism needed for the goals to be realized. Several researchers have identified the establishment and maintenance of good communication within a school as an essential element with which the effective principal needs to be concerned. It is important that all members of the building staff know the expectations and the processes required to accomplish the goals.

The study reinforced the importance of principals to have good interpersonal and communication skills to foster the type of school climate that maximises the potential for effectiveness.

3.13 Principal Leadership Behaviour and Faculty Trust

Traditional studies of principal leadership and school effectiveness have focused on such variables as personality characteristics of the principal, school organization, curriculum variations, expectation of teachers, school site, goal setting, and other principal behaviours. Although these factors of leadership are important, they are not the only ones that are involved in providing leadership. There are other interpersonal principal behaviours that seem to have a significant impact on school effectiveness
because of their relationship to levels of faculty trust and school climate.

This study of Depasquale (1996) focuses on four of these behavioural variables that seem to have a high correlation with levels of faculty trust and school climate. These variables are specific principal behaviours that have been identified in the research and have been categorized into the following constructs: Buffering, Caring, Involving, and Praising behaviours.

The results showed a very high correlation between the four principal behaviours and levels of faculty trust. There was also a high correlation among the four principal behaviours themselves. These findings were fairly consistent, even when comparing sample schools with higher standardized test scores to those with lower standardized test scores and provides a unique perspective in the analysis of principal leadership and its relationship to faculty trust and school climate. The notion that a principal’s leadership behaviour and faculty trust are so highly correlated with such interpersonal human behaviours is an important one. It beckons to view leadership in much broader human terms; and not to accept as fact that the traditional hierarchical models of leadership are always the most effective.
3.13a Principals' Leadership Style and Faculty Perception of Principals' Effectiveness

The study Palmer (1996) was to identify the relationship between principals' leadership styles and school effectiveness. The specific objectives were:

(1) to determine if a relationship existed between leadership style and school effectiveness;

(2) to determine if there was a relationship between leadership style adaptability level and school effectiveness in the domains of organizational development, organizational environment, and educational program; and

(3) to determine if there was a relationship between range of leadership styles and school effectiveness in the domains of organizational development, organizational environment, and educational program.

The findings indicated that a significant relationship existed between leadership style and school effectiveness. Principals who used the leadership styles of selling and participating were perceived to be more effective than those using a telling or delegating leadership style. Although no
significant relationship was found to exist between school effectiveness and range of leadership styles, and school effectiveness and leadership adaptability level in any of the domains tested, principals who rated high on the adaptability scale and principals who had four leadership styles in their style range were perceived more effective than those who rated moderate or low on the adaptability scale and those who had three or two leadership styles in their style range.

3.13b Teacher Perceptions of Principal Behaviour Related to Student Achievement

Research on school effectiveness concluded that strong administrative leadership was among those factors within the school that make a difference in student learning. (Brookover & Lezotte, 1977; Edmonds, 1979; Rutter, et. al., 1979).

Research of Springer (1997) has shown that principal behaviour is a factor in school effectiveness. A set of ten variables describing principal behaviour within three constructs, school management, school environment, and instructional leadership were presented. The variables of principal behaviour included: resource management, personnel management, decision-making, communication interpersonal behaviour, professional integrity,
supervision and evaluation, educational expertise, staff development, and curriculum. The variables were drawn from traditional and contemporary effective schools literature.

The purpose of the study was to determine if there was a difference in principals' behaviour as measured by teachers' perceptions in schools characterized as more effective and schools characterized as less effective as determined by student achievement scores.

Results showed there were significant differences between principals in high-achieving and low-achieving schools on nine of the ten variables. Socioeconomic level was found to have an effect, in that schools with the highest achievement were in the high socioeconomic group and schools with the lowest achievement were in the low socioeconomic group.

3.14 Leadership Style

If the decision taken is wrong or defective it will adversely affect the administration and may spell disasters. Organizational Health is characterized by the capability of a system to grow and to effectively cope with any problems it faces. The main problem before the country is to evolve a common school system
of public education which will cover all parts of the country and of all levels of school education and provides equality of access to all children.

For the smooth conduct and efficiency of school administration undesirable discrimination that now exists between teachers working under different management, government, private or local authority should be done away with.

The nature of educational administration changed rapidly during the early 20th century. Considering educational administration over its past history reveals that the place of education in the structure of government has been affected by marked changes.

The word Administration means a welfare work in the service of others. The unique purpose of administration is to direct the utilization of limited resources of time, people, space, equipment, supplies and work technique in the realization of coherent operation of an enterprise.

According to Gertrude Stein, "a leader is a follower is a leader". The most basic ingredient of leadership is a 'guiding vision'. The second basic ingredient of leadership is 'passion'. The next basic
ingredient of leadership is 'integrity'. Two more basic ingredients of leadership are 'curiosity' and 'daring'. Leadership courses can only teach skills. Developing character and vision is the way leaders invent themselves. Benis (1989) feels "a leader is not a pusher; he pulls rather than pushes".

Leadership may be effectively studied through activities such as small-group discussions, role plays, games and simulations. However, the presenters of these activities have a responsibility to recognize their powers as leaders and to modify their leadership styles to serve the learning needs of the groups.

The cognitive frames of school administrators can be measured using both qualitative and quantitative methods. Qualitative work suggests that most principals use only one or two of the frames with context a significant determinant of which frames are salient.

Both qualitative and quantitative results suggest that the ability to use multiple frames is critical to principals' effectiveness as both manager and leader.

The human resource and political frames are significant positive predictors of success as both
leader and manager. Pre-service and in-service programs for school administrators rarely give much attention to symbolic and political skills, yet results show that they are crucial components for effective leadership.(Bolman, and Deul 1993).

On the basis of working with leaders worldwide, it is believed that one can enhance their chances for success when they can use a manageable number of frames. The four most common and useful frames among managers and leaders are:

(1) The political frame,
(2) The Human resource,
(3) The structural frame, and
(4) The symbolic frame.

Leadership may be defined as the ability to influence and direct the task-related activities of the members of group. A leader is a goal-setter, planner, executive, expert, group representative, administrator of rewards and punishments and a symbol of the group.

Three approaches to the study of leadership are: The traits approach; behavioural approach and contingency approach.
The behavioural approach has focused on leadership styles. Studies of leadership styles have distinguished between a task-oriented, authoritarian or initiating structure and an employee-centered, democratic or participative style. There are a number of factors peculiar to a situation which determine the effectiveness or otherwise of a leadership style.

An effective leader is the one who creates conditions in which his subordinates feel secure and independent.

Livingston, (1992) investigated teacher leadership. In her study, Teacher leadership is defined as influencing and engaging colleagues toward improved practice. Analysis of the roles of teachers and experiences suggest four principles for developing more powerful leadership roles for teaching:

(1) Many teachers do not want to leave the classroom or undertake management functions to exercise leadership.

(2) Teacher leaders must have legitimate power.

(3) Teachers are interested in learning opportunities.

(4) Different collaborative relationships offer different incentives and leadership opportunities.
Empowerment and leadership are explored from the perspectives of teacher leaders. The study of teachers leadership stress the need the construction of new paradigms for leadership in schools. Professional development programs need to provide leadership development for practicing and aspiring teacher leaders.

School improvement through shared decision making, requires new leadership roles for teachers. One formal role is change facilitator. Districts can enhance efforts through careful selection, training and assignment of change facilitators.

Many schools are committed to transforming their schools into a center of inquiry. This has led to leadership roles for teachers. As teachers feel comfortable as learners and leaders, they begin to transform their vision into reality - the school as a center of inquiry for their students.

Teacher leadership requires collaboration with peers; "voice" is essential for risk-taking and inquiry; and leading may require "leaving" or "letting go" - with peers to encourage collaboration and leadership across the faculty, and with students to become facilitators of learning rather than givers of information.
Teacher participation in leadership is critical to the process of school change. Teacher leadership roles are now expanding. Teacher leadership requires skills and abilities. Teacher learning and a continuous process of evaluation are at the core of the new professionalism. There is need to continue our efforts to understand and build collaborative cultures for learner-centered schools.

The issues of teacher leadership are complex. Teacher leaders who are leaders of teachers must be credible to their peers. There should be flexible time in schools to allow teachers to reconnect their rich body of practical knowledge with the ideas of classic educational scholars. Students—should also be included in the quest for shared leadership.

The important managerial functions may be classified into 6 namely: planning, organizing, staffing, directing, coordinating and controlling.

American Association of School Administration and Research Division (1968) describes administration as "the total of the processes through which appropriate human and material resources are made available and made effective for accomplishing the purpose of an enterprise".
Planning and management are relatively new subjects. Planning is for tomorrow, and management is for today. Planning includes: (a) Plan formation (b) Execution, and (c) Evaluation.

The Organizational dimensions which describe school climate and health, account for varying levels of teacher commitment, principal/teacher trust, principal leadership, student achievement and school effectiveness.

Main objectives of the investigation by Sharma (1982) were:

(1) To study management of a Technological University.

(2) To study management of a Technically Oriented University.

(3) To study management of a Indian Institute of Technology.

Organization variables were classified into:

(1) Leadership processes used

(2) Character of Motivational forces

(3) Character of Interaction influence process (Hersey and Blanchard, 1997).
The study of teachers attitudes towards educational administration had a respectable ancestry. Educational administrators and teachers are the plan makers and the plan implementors respectively. (Sharma 1985).

Educational policy makers have been similarly inclined to believe that principal leadership is critical to the achievement of students (Hallinger and Heck 1996).

Main purposes of the study by Bhushan, (1968) were to explore the relationship between certain personality variables and preference for an authoritarian or democratic type of leadership, and to ascertain the influence of the political set-up and some personal factors upon leadership choice. His findings were:

1. The personality factors were substantially related to leadership styles

2. A democratic type of leadership was negatively correlated to authoritarianism, intolerance of ambiguity and neurotism were positively related to ascendance and extroversion.
3.15  

**Student Achievement and Effective Schools**

Higdon (1988) examined the correlation between student achievement and the effective schools correlates, defined by the Connecticut State Department of Education, in selected Wyoming high schools. The main findings were:

1. There was little correlation between any of the effective schools correlates and the achievement of middle/high socioeconomic status students.

2. There was higher correlation between the effective schools correlates and the achievement of low socioeconomic status students, but no correlates met a .10 level of significance.

3. There was a significant correlation between several individual effective schools correlates. Positive correlations were present between Frequent Monitoring of Student Progress and Instructional Leadership, Clear School Mission, High Expectations for Success, and Home and School Relations: between Instructional Leadership and Clear School Mission and Opportunity to Learn and Time on Task;
between Opportunity to Learn and Time on Task and Clear School Mission and High Expectations for Success; and between Home and School Relations and High Expectations for Success and Opportunity to Learn and Time on Task.

(4) Frequency response tables for analyzing individual school effectiveness and determining areas for school improvement.

The study of Weger (1989) examined the correlation between student achievement and the effective schools characteristics, defined by the Connecticut State Department of Education, in a selected Wyoming school district. The findings were:

(1) There was little correlation between any of the effective school characteristics and the achievement of high socioeconomic status students.

(2) There was significant correlation between the effective schools characteristics, Instructional Leadership, Clear School Mission, and Safe and Orderly Environment, and the achievement of low socioeconomic status students.
(3) There was a significant correlation between certain, specific effective school characteristics. Positive correlations existed between the effective schools characteristics, High Expectations and Opportunity to Learn and Student Time on Task; Safe and Orderly Environment and Instructional Leadership; Safe and Orderly Environment and Clear School Mission; and Instructional Leadership and Clear School Mission. Negative correlations existed between the effective schools characteristics, Home and School Relations and High Expectations; and Home and School Relations and Opportunity to Learn and Student Time on Task.

(4) Frequency response tables can be useful tools in analyzing individual school effectiveness and showing areas for improvement.
3.16 School Effectiveness Research

A tool to Improve Educational Quality.

The study of Kager Balkwill (1988) designed a process for examining the extent to which School District 94 teachers demonstrated the application of variables relating to school effectiveness in their classrooms and designed a model for staff development which addresses the weakness viewed in lessons observed during this study. The researcher extrapolated from current research six correlates of school effectiveness (mission, expectations, leadership/organization, instruction environment, and assessment), and operationally defined each correlate. The data revealed that a particular district (#94) teachers demonstrated the highest frequency of weakness in the areas of instruction and environment. Using this data as well as current research on staff development, Kager proposed a model for staff development.

The purpose of the study by Huranis (1987) was to verify the reliability and validity of the School Climate Survey. The results revealed that the student perception form of the School Climate Survey is both valid and reliable. The hypothesized dimensions were found to have strong intercorrelations. Evidence relating to the construct validity indicated there is a
statistically significant relationship between achievement and attitudes measured on the School Climate Survey. These results indicate that the instrument is a useful device for assessing students' perceptions of the school's learning climate.

3.17 The Perceptions of Parents of School Effectiveness

King (1987) assessed the perceptions of parents in regard to the quality of their child's school and examine the relationship of the quality of the school to 14 indicators of school effectiveness. The study also compared the responses of a parent sample in 9 schools in a Kentucky school district to parent responses previously gathered from 14 schools in Massachusetts, Alabama, Missouri, and Tennessee.

Secondary data were gathered using the School Public Image Inventory (Weldon 1996). Findings showed that the school's commitment to mission and vision and school climate were high structure and order, academic emphasis, and leadership were moderately related to quality. Student involvement and community support were not related to school quality. Of the 14 school effectiveness indicators, 12 were highly or moderately related to the other indicators.
It was recommended that administrators be appraised of the importance of shared goals and common purpose regarding the public's perception of school quality. The resulting information should be valuable to researchers and practitioners as a basis for evaluating schools with research-based indicators of school effectiveness.

3.18 Organizational Climate and Health

The Organizational Health Inventory (OHI) maps the Organizational health of secondary schools along seven dimensions. Principals of healthy schools should have more dedicated, loyal and satisfied teachers possessing resourceful, secure and innovative skills. Healthy Organizational climate results in effective supervision.

The Organizational Health Inventory (OHI-E) maps the Organizational health of elementary schools. This is a useful tool for practitioners and researchers and results in cooperative supervisory relationships that in turn leads to instructional improvement.

Openness in principal behaviour seems crucial to generating faculty trust and perceived school effectiveness. Openness in the interaction patterns of teachers is most directly related to the perceived effectiveness of the school (Hoy et. al., 1991).
Teaching constitutes one of the major tasks of a teacher. Competency over this task of teaching is the essence of a successful educational system. The term 'teaching' can be defined as a set of observable teacher behaviours that facilitate or bring about pupil learning. (Passi, and Lalitha 1997). They could develop a scale called General Teaching competency Scale (GTC) and were successful in testing the reliability of the scale and finally validating the scales.

The important objectives of this study were:

(i) to construct and standardize a teacher morale inventory

(ii) to study the morale of teachers

(iii) to subject the results of the developed inventory to factor analysis. (Dekhtawala, 1977).

Findings from the Kentucky parent sample showed that the schools commitment to mission and vision and school climate were highly related to the perceived quality of the school. (King, 1987).

School improvement was not lined, but interactive. Building a climate with a vision of what a school could be was focused on the dynamic relation between the principal and other adults, teachers and parents. (Lechner Knowles, 1987)
3.19 Variables Contributing to Organizational Effectiveness

The issue of the organizational effectiveness in the schools has become the critical focus of the decade. The purpose of this research by Herzog (1991) was to determine the relationships between organizational effectiveness and selected variables in non-public secondary schools and public secondary schools. The end result of this comparison of the relationships between the selected variables and organizational effectiveness in the various settings was to project universally in educational organizations.

The methodology included comparisons between the two groups for effectiveness and independent variables contributing to effectiveness using t-tests, regression, and path analysis.

While the groups were found to be significantly different, both approached effectiveness using the same critical variables. Conclusions included the following: Principal leadership will be the key variable cluster contributing to school effectiveness.

Particular goal selection will be second in its contribution to school effectiveness falling only slightly behind the impact of principal leadership.
Herzog (1991) has found the key threads of effectiveness to be principal leadership, particular goal selection, school climate, and other intervening variables which flow out of leadership. These conclusions reaffirm the pioneering research of Likert. Much stands to be gained in education from the theory and research in business and industry.

Studies conducted in educational administration and other management fields have presented evidence to suggest that various forms of leadership can determine the effectiveness of organizations. Some researchers have proposed that hierarchical control or influence exists in the form of 'organizational leadership,' wherein authority is found at various organizational levels and is exerted by any organizational member.

The study of Adams (1993) was to examine the relationship between organizational leadership and school effectiveness. Specifically, leadership, as an organizational quality, was measured, along with four organizational functions that can be used to predict effectiveness: (a) adaptation, (b) goal achievement, (c) integration, and (d) latency. She observed that the presence of organizational leadership would correlate with increased levels of organizational effectiveness.
It was further thought that organizational leadership would emerge as a significant predictor of the effectiveness.

The Organizational Control Questionnaire/Graph was used to measure the amount of organizational leadership existing in schools. In addition, the Index of Perceived Organizational Effectiveness, Overall Job Satisfaction Questionnaire, and Loyalty Questionnaire were employed to assess the contribution of adaptation, goal achievement, integration, and latency to levels of perceived effectiveness present in each participant's school.

Data collected from these four instruments were correlated. In addition, aggression and path analyses were conducted to examine the relative impact of organizational leadership on the four functions and to assess their contribution to perceived and independent indicators of effectiveness. Independent effectiveness measures included predicted and actual student performance on Stanford Achievement Tests, student absenteeism, and employee turnover rates of certificated staff.
It was hypothesized that leadership would be found to exist across the various educational hierarchies that characterize schools. It also was hypothesized that the presence of organizational leadership would correlate with Parsons' four functions and with increased levels of organizational effectiveness. It was further hypothesized that organizational leadership would emerge as a significant predictor of the effectiveness outcomes employed in this dissertation study.

Weldon (1996) studied the effective schools research of the 1970s concluded that some schools has certain characteristics that made them better schools. These characteristics are sometimes described as the 'atmosphere' in a school. In turn, the atmosphere affects how the members of a school behave. The organizational dimensions which describe school climate and health account for varying levels of teacher commitment, principal/teacher trust, principal leadership, student achievement, and school effectiveness.

School reformers often include these differing characteristics among schools when describing alternatives to the traditional school structure. Some
alternatives are generally defined under the rubric of schools of choice. Magnet schools are one example and will be a major focus of this study.

The purpose of Weldon's (1996) study is to investigate the interrelationships between organizational climate and health in order to determine if significant organizational differences exist between the two school settings. Is there a difference in the relationships among teachers and between teachers and principals in magnet and non-magnet schools?

In secondary magnet and non-magnet schools, she found significant differences in organizational climate and health as measured on the OCDQ-RS and the OHI. In elementary schools, magnet and non-magnet schools differed significantly in organizational health, but not in organizational climate.

3.20 Parent's Perception of Secondary School Effectiveness

Krueger (1995) measured parents' perception of secondary school effectiveness at Harbor Beach High School. Study bases were seven parameters of school effectiveness: safe environment, clear school mission, instructional leadership, teacher expectations, opportunity to learn/student time on task, frequent
monitoring of student progress, home-school relations. Parents responded to twenty-seven questions in a modified version of the San Diego Survey of 1987 following by open ended questions. The conclusions were Parents felt positively about secondary programme, desired consistent communication with school, were highly involved in school activities and were aware of clearly articulated school mission.

3.21 The Structural and Functional Characteristics of Schools that Predict Effectiveness

Developing a better understanding of school effectiveness and identifying characteristics that impinge on the success of schools are critical to the theory and practice of education. The research study of Montesano (1991) examines critical managerial, instructional, and organizational variables and explores their relationship to a multiple set of school effectiveness variables.

The results of this study suggest that certain independent variables predicts different aspects of effectiveness. In general, school health predicts systems effectiveness, while a controlled climate nurtures instructional effectiveness. The leadership of middle school principals was, at best, only indirectly related to effectiveness. Centralization was the only
variable related to both dimensions of effectiveness; high centralization was related to effectiveness in middle schools. In fact, middle schools with tightly coupled, simple structures were most effective.

Short and Spencer (1990) identify principal instructional leadership as a key variable in school effectiveness.

3.22 The Influence of Earlier Reviews on the Present Study

The present study has focused on the interdependence between the school effectiveness with reference to the principal behaviour and organizational health. Though the topic is a new conceptualisation of these parameters, similar studies were done world over to prove the mutual dependence of administrative parameters and the organizational climates. These two factors on one side and the outcome the other was a theme to ponder. The earlier investigations helped the investigator to conceptualise the problem and to fine tune the methodologies. The readings of the literature helped to fix up a new dimension of the problem.