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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to investigate the relationship between morale of Louisiana public elementary school teachers and their principal's leader behavior. The study was designed to test the following major hypotheses:

1. There is no significant relationship between elementary school teachers' perceptions of the principal's leader behavior and teacher morale.

2. There is no significant difference in the relationship in the mean morale score of teachers perceiving their principals as above the mean on the total leader behavior score and those perceiving their principals as below the mean on the total leader behavior score.

3. There is no significant difference in the relationship between the "initiating structure" factor and the "consideration" factor of the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire in relation to teacher morale.

4. There is no significant difference between the teacher morale - leader behavior relationship of the selected demographic category sub-groups, age and years of teaching experience.

In order to test the hypotheses, a random sample of 600 elementary school teachers was selected from 22 Louisiana parishes. Two instruments, the Purdue Teacher
Opinionnaire and the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire, were mailed to the subjects and 356 or 59 percent responded.

Data derived from the measure of teacher morale, the Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire, was correlated with data derived from the measure of leader behavior, the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire. The correlation coefficients were computed according to the Pearson product-moment correlation formula. Tests for determining the significance of the difference between correlation coefficients and between means were also used.

The following conclusions were determined from the findings related to the testing of the four major hypotheses of the study:

1. Hypothesis One was rejected; there was a significant relationship between the elementary school principal's leader behavior and teacher morale according to the results of this study.

2. Hypothesis Two was rejected; there was a significant difference in the relationship in the mean morale score of teachers perceiving their principals as above the mean on the total leader behavior score and those perceiving their principals as below the mean on the total leader behavior score.

3. Hypothesis Three was rejected; teachers perceived their morale as being more highly correlated with
the "consideration" factor of the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire than with the "initiating structure" factor.

4. Hypothesis Four was accepted; neither age nor years of teaching experience were variables that affected the leader behavior - teacher morale relationship as measured in this study.
Chapter I

INTRODUCTION

With the increase of literature related to teacher stress and burnout, researchers have addressed themselves to the problem of determining the factors which cause this phenomenon. Teacher morale has become a multidimensional concept, the degree of which has been dependent upon a variety of factors (Halpin, 1966). Such items as salary, community, school conditions, professional attitudes, living conditions and job experience have been identified as variables having a bearing on the morale of teachers (Warren, 1953).

Whenever leadership facilitated meaningful interpersonal interaction, productivity and job satisfaction increased, according to research from business and industry (Katz et. al., 1950; Katz et. al., 1951). Likewise, the Herzberg Study (Herzberg et. al., 1959) introduced a theory which supports the relationship between job satisfaction and interpersonal climate.

An examination of the literature concerned with school organizations indicated considerable similarity with organizations in business and industry. Several regional educational studies have been completed that determine the
relationship between the principal's leadership behavior and teacher morale. The findings of these studies supported the same viewpoint that had been accepted by researchers in business and industry.

Redefer (1964) conducted a five-year study of thousands of teachers and concluded that the degree of job satisfaction, or the level of morale of a faculty, appeared to be an adequate barometer of the quality and excellence of a school's educational program. Teacher morale seemed to be one of the key ingredients in the development of a successful educational organization and in facilitating the achievement of all teaching goals. Because of this significant relationship, it was deemed important to investigate the extent to which the school principal's leadership behavior contributed to teacher morale in public elementary schools in Louisiana.

The Problem

Statement of the Problem

The purpose of this study was to investigate the relationship between morale of public elementary school teachers and the principal's leader behavior in terms of various factors.

Hypotheses of the Study

The following hypotheses were formulated to guide the investigation:
1. There was no significant relationship between elementary school teachers' perceptions of the principal's leader behavior and teacher morale.

2. There was no significant difference between the mean morale score of teachers perceiving their principals as above the mean on the total leader behavior score and those perceiving their principals as below the mean on the total leader behavior score.

3. There was no significant difference in the relationship between the "initiating structure" factor and the "consideration" factor of the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire in relation to teacher morale.

4. There was no significant difference between the teacher morale - leader behavior relationship of the selected demographic category sub-groups, age and years of teaching experience.

Delimitation of the Study

This study was limited to elementary school teachers in Louisiana who were considered to be "regular teachers" according to guidelines set forth in the Minimum Foundation Program for distributing state funds to local school districts. Substitute teachers, guidance counselors and all persons employed as special education personnel according to Act 754 of the 1977 State Legislative Session were excluded. Further delimitation excluded teachers employed in schools in which the principal had been serving in that
particular school for less than one school year.

Definition of Terms

Job satisfaction/dissatisfaction. This term referred to the reaction of an individual to specific factors of his job. It was viewed as the discrepancy between actual and ideal states.

Morale. This term referred to the capacity of an individual to carry on a task with determination, cooperation, loyalty and a sense of personal satisfaction (Bentley and Rempel, 1964). Teacher morale was defined as the collective attitudes of individual teachers or teacher groups as related to their duties, goals, responsibilities, supervision, and fellow workers.

Age. Operationally, for this study, age was determined by membership in one of three groups: (1) 20-25 years; (2) 26-35 years; and (3) 36-65 years.

Years of Teaching Experience. For this study, years of teaching experience were divided into three categories: (1) 1-5 years; (2) 6-10 years; and (3) 11 or more years.

The Purdue Teacher Opinionaire (PTO). This instrument, which was designed to measure teacher morale, was developed at Purdue University by Ralph R. Bentley and Averno M. Rempel.
Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ). This instrument, which was designed to measure leader behavior, was developed at the Ohio State University by J. K. Hemphill and A. E. Coons.

Leader Behavior. This term referred to the observed behavior of the leader (elementary school principal, for purposes of this study) rather than the posited capacity inferred from this behavior.

Initiating Structure. This term referred to the leader's behavior in delineating the relationship between himself and members of the work-group and in endeavoring to establish well-defined patterns of organization, channels of communication and methods of procedure (Stogdill and Coons, 1957).

Consideration. This term referred to behavior indicative of friendship, mutual trust, respect and warmth in the relationship between the leader and the members of his staff (Stogdill and Coons, 1957).

Importance of the Study

The literature concerning job satisfaction, or morale, of school personnel supported the belief that the school principal's leader behavior and teacher morale were factors that contributed in determining the quality and excellence of a school's educational program. Because a study regarding the leader behavior - teacher morale
relationship had not been conducted in Louisiana, it was deemed important to investigate the extent to which this relationship existed.

Increased professionalization of teachers, shared accountability for student progress, increased educational status of teachers and teacher unrest were factors that have surfaced within the past two decades. These factors coupled with differing leadership styles of school principals were considerations relating to the importance of this study. After reviewing the literature, there appeared to be a decrease in interest in this topic in recent years. Considering these changes in status and attitudes of both teachers and principals, it was necessary to conduct this study.

**Procedures Used in the Study**

In order to test the four major hypotheses, a random sample of 600 Louisiana public elementary school teachers from 22 school districts were selected to participate in the study. Two instruments, the *Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire* and the *Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire*, were forwarded to the teacher sample.

Data derived from the measure of teacher morale, the *Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire*, was correlated with the data derived from the measure of leader behavior, the *Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire*. Correlation
coefficients were computed according to the Pearson product-moment correlation formula. Other formulae were used to test for significant differences between means and correlation coefficients.

Organization of the Remainder of the Study

The remainder of the study was organized according to the following outline:

I. Review of Related Literature
   Background
   Job Satisfaction Research: Industrial
   Job Satisfaction Research: Educational
   Summary

II. Procedures of the Study
   Selection of Population and Sample
   Collection of Data
   Description of Instruments
   Questionnaire Returns
   Treatment of the Data

III. Presentation and Analysis of Data

IV. Summary, Conclusions and Recommendations
Chapter II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Background

Prior to the Industrial Revolution, the relationship between a craftsman or employer, and his employees was a familial one. The employer enjoyed a close, direct relationship with those that he employed. With the onset of the factory system, specialization of labor and assembly line production replaced the informal arrangement of the craftsman's shop. The close relationship between the employer and employee gave way to an impersonal setting (Roehm, 1954).

A similar transition occurred in the principal-teacher relationship. During the 1800's, those individuals who were designated as school principals were considered "head teachers," "master teachers," or "headmasters." Although they were responsible for limited administrative functions, they had instructional duties as well. Because the principal was a member of the instructional staff, there was a relatively close relationship between him and the teachers. By the 1900's the principals' powers had been enlarged. In most cases, their teaching responsibilities were removed, and the principal-teaching relationship
became less personal (Pierce, 1935). Principals became clearly recognized as the formal administrative heads of their schools.

Morale is an emotionally charged word that has had numerous definitions associated with it. Nash (1942) gave morale a "flag-waving" meaning by writing:

Morale wins wars, wins games on the athletic field, conquers the wilderness, carries us over crises, and gives nations vitality to face and solve problems. It is essential to the life existence of any group and to the maximum achievement of any individual.

Roethlisberger (1942) placed morale in an industrial setting by stating:

For any person who has held a position of responsibility in a business or organization, the word morale comes to have real meaning: that is, it refers to something which is felt to be of great importance even if that something remains vague and illusive.

Lawler (1973) made the distinction between overall satisfaction or morale and facet satisfaction. He defined facet satisfaction as "people's affective reactions to particular aspects of their job," whereas overall satisfaction referred to "a person's affective reactions to his total work role." Lawler felt that the difference between all the things a person determined he should receive from his job and all the things he actually does receive related to his overall job satisfaction.

Locke (1968) viewed morale similarly. He perceived job satisfaction and dissatisfaction as "a function of the perceived relationship between what one wants from one's job and what one perceived it as offering."
According to Argyris (1972), satisfaction and desirable activities were likely to be the result when congruence occurred between individual aspirations and work requirements. He also indicated that as one climbed the organizational ladder, the desire for autonomy and control over his work tended to increase. This theory had implications in education with the increased professionalization of the role of the teacher.

Most of the textbook literature on the school principalship assumed that the degree to which a principal provided leadership to his teachers will be reflected by a more positive influence on the performance of teachers, the staff's morale and on the learning of students.

Some of the literature of the 1950's took issue with this assumption. Moehleman (1951) and Lieberman (1956) expressed the need of teachers to be autonomous. According to these writers, the principal should not be involved in a central way with the teaching-learning process, but should have tasks limited to routine clerical and administrative duties.

Certainly, the way to examine this issue was to measure the relevant behavior of a number of principals and then determine if there was any basis for the assumption that the principal's leader behavior influenced the morale of teachers. Research has been conducted in this area which will be discussed. First, however, organizational theory and research which has eminated from business and
Job Satisfaction Research: Industrial

One of the earliest and most well known studies of job satisfaction was conducted by the Harvard School of Business in 1939. The Hawthorne plant (Chicago) of Western Electric was involved in this twelve-year study which revealed "a pattern of increase in worker productivity attending almost any and all changes in working conditions" (Mouley, 1970). At first, the study appeared to be doomed for failure because of the findings. Productivity increased whether changes in working conditions had actually been made, or whether the employees had only been told the changes had been made. The occurrence of this interesting phenomena has been cited in many works concerning human relations. It has been suggested that social factors, including the attention that the workers received by the experimenters, rather than actual changes in working conditions, influenced an increase in morale and in productivity.

Other studies have not revealed as clear cut a relationship between worker morale and productivity as was suggested in the Hawthorne study. Likert (1961) stated that the development of favorable attitudes among employees toward a company did not appear, in itself to bring high productivity. Research conducted in 1950 (Katz et. al., 1950) revealed that, in an office situation, employees in
high-productivity sections had no more favorable attitudes toward the company than the employees in low-producing sections. Employees who had favorable attitudes were no more likely to be high producers than those who had unfavorable attitudes. Likert (1961) cited that although favorable attitudes did not automatically become converted into high productivity, they had value because of their association with less absence and less turnover. He also stated that favorable attitudes were likely to assist a company in recruiting superior employees. Converting favorable attitudes into productivity depended upon how well the supervisors and managers performed their leadership tasks.

Analyzing the results of a study conducted by Katz (1949), Likert (1961) concluded that supervisory behavior which yielded a high degree of productivity also yielded favorable attitudes on matters concerning supervision, working conditions, compensation and the work itself. Employees in work-groups with both favorable and unfavorable attitudes on job-related matters indicated that their supervisors performed such functions as "enforced the rules," "arranged work and made assignments" and "supplied men with materials and tools." Employees in work-groups with favorable job-related attitudes indicated that their supervisors showed a genuine interest in the well-being of their employees more than did those employees in work-groups with unfavorable attitudes. These supervisors "recommended promotions, transfers, pay increases,"
"informed men as to what was happening in the company," "kept men posted on how well they were doing" and "heard complaints and grievances." Employees in work-groups with favorable job-related attitudes felt that their supervisor took interest in them as a person.

Other results of Katz's (1949) study as reported by Likert (1961) indicated that supervisors, who gave their employees the opportunity to discuss job problems, had appreciably less absence in their work-group than supervisors who exhibited the opposite behavior. Supervisors who "pulled" for the men or both the men and the company had employees with higher job-related attitudes than supervisors who "pulled" for himself or for the company alone.

Likert (1961) summarized the findings of studies he investigated by stating:

The research findings show that the high-producing managers, much more often than the low-producing, have built the personnel in their units or departments into highly effective organizations. These operations are characterized by favorable, cooperative attitudes and high levels of job satisfaction on the part of the members of the organizations.

Investigations conducted by Fiedler (1958) of survey teams, basketball teams, military units and industrial groups were concerned with the prediction of group effectiveness. Fiedler believed that the way in which a group member perceived others affected his relations with them. Using Assumed Similarity of Opposites (ASO) Scores, he tested two hypotheses: (1) that team effectiveness would be determined by interpersonal relations between important
members of the group, and (2) that relevant aspects of these interpersonal relations could be measured by means of interpersonal perception scores.

The ASO consisted of twenty-four paired opposite adjectives listed on a six-point continuum. The scores were obtained by having a subject rate his most-preferred co-worker and his least preferred co-worker. Variations in these ratings provided an index of the amount of similarity the subject saw between these opposites. This score measured "psychological distance" or the tendency to become involved with others as opposed to having a more reserved or self-sufficient attitude.

According to Fiedler's (1958) studies, leaders who saw greater differences between these opposites tended to establish more impersonal and distant relationships with their subordinates. Leaders who did not make such distinctions generally established closer, more personal relationships with their subordinates.

Evidence from Fiedler's (1958) studies indicated that leaders who developed an impersonal style in their relationship with group members were significantly more effective than were leaders who exhibited a more personal style in their interaction with group members. Since the groups used in this study were task-oriented groups, effectiveness of the leader was judged in terms of his group's productivity.

Another sociological investigation conducted by
Gouldner (1954) dealt with theories of human and organizational behavior. The concept of "rule administration behavior" and the subsequent development of the "rule administration scale" were products of Gouldner's inquiry into the dynamics of a gypsum mine and factory operation. Three distinct classes of rules that governed bureaucratic behavior within an organization were identified: (1) mock-centered rules, (2) representative-centered rules and (3) punishment-centered rules.

The "No-Smoking" rule at the factory was an example Gouldner (1954) cited of a mock-centered rule. This rule, imposed by the insurance company, was not observed by the workers, nor was it enforced by the management. There was little flammable material in the factory, and only when the fire inspector visited the plant were the workers advised not to smoke. Mock-centered rules were characterized by these patterns:

1. Usually, the rules are neither enforced by management nor obeyed by workers.
2. As a result, they engender little tension and conflict between the two groups and in fact seems to enhance their solidarity.
3. Both the customary violation of these rules, as well as the occasional enforcement of them, are buttressed by the informal sentiments and behavior of the participants.

The safety rules of the gypsum mine were given as an example of representative-centered rules. These types of rules were characterized by the following:

1. These rules are ordinarily enforced by management and obeyed by workers.
2. Adjustment to these rules is usually obtained by educating and involving the workers in their initiation and administration.

3. These rules generate few tensions and little conflict between workers and management through the interaction that arises in the process of securing conformance and the ultimate mutual acceptance of the program, solidarity between the two groups is enhanced.

The no-absenteeism rule was an example cited in Gouldner's (1954) study of a punishment-centered rule. Upon a worker's return from an absence, the supervisor decided whether or not the excuse was legitimate and, if not, he determined the appropriate punishment. The punishment-centered bureaucratic pattern was characterized by these features:

1. The rules about which the pattern is organized are enforced, primarily by one group, either workers or management, but not by both.
2. Adjustment to these rules are attained by punishment.
3. This type of rule is associated with much conflict and tension.

From his findings, Gouldner (1954) concluded that the presence of a representative pattern of rule administration generated a warm leadership climate and positive personal relationships.

What has come to be known as "Herzberg's Theory" surfaced from business and industry and has been used in educational investigations dealing with job satisfaction. Herzberg et. al. (1959) asked their subjects to respond to questions concerning things that made them feel exceptionally good or bad about their job. Questions included how the subjects' feelings affected the way they did their
job, performance and their feelings toward their jobs and how the consequences of happenings affected their careers. From this study Herzberg and his associates theorized that certain job elements, factors related to the work itself, caused job satisfaction but not job dissatisfaction. On the other hand, factors extrinsic to the work caused job dissatisfaction not job satisfaction. This two-factor theory suggested that two independent continua existed. One runs from satisfaction to neutral, and the other runs from dissatisfaction to neutral. Intrinsic factors caused differing levels of satisfaction; extrinsic factors caused differing levels of dissatisfaction.

Numerous other studies from business organizations have emerged and other organizational theories have been presented; however, the ones cited have given a theoretical framework and a basis for many educational studies. It appeared that researchers from business and industry became students of morale before researchers in education felt a need to investigate the issue. Most of the theory was developed in industrial settings and its applicability to education transpired later.

Job Satisfaction Research: Educational

A survey of the literature by Blocker and Richardson (1963) stated:

During the last twenty-five years, educational literature has seen a rapid proliferation of articles dealing with morale, a term which was virtually unknown prior to World War I and which received scant
attention of educators until the advent of World War II.

One of the reasons morale has received so little attention in public school administration has been a result of the difficulty involved in defining and measuring this concept (Galloway, 1975). Once a general consensus was determined as to what morale included, a number of factors which had apparent effect on morale were identified. Thus, a considerable amount of research has been conducted in this field.

The research teams of Gross - Herriott and Halpin - Croft have done extensive research relating to leader behavior and teacher morale. A summary of the findings of these research teams and a review of other investigations, whose populations have been more limited, follow.

Gross and Herriott (1965), in their study of staff leadership in public schools, identified the concept of Executive Professional Leadership (EPL) as follows:

The efforts of an executive (the principal) of a professionally staffed organization (the school) to conform to a definition of his role that stresses his obligation to improve the quality of staff performance.

Based on the premise that the EPL of principals would have important consequences for their organizations, Gross and Herriott (1965) attempted to test the hypothesis that the principals' EPL would be positively related to teacher morale, performance of the teachers and to the
It was the belief of these two investigators that a principal who exerted a high degree of EPL would create a social climate which would be conducive to the development of high morale in the teachers. Using instruments designed specifically for this investigation, teacher morale was based on responses of teacher-observers to the following six questions about the behavior of the teachers in their schools:

1. Display a sense of pride in the school?
2. Enjoy working in the school?
3. Display a sense of loyalty to the school?
4. Work cooperatively with their fellow teachers?
5. Accept the educational philosophy underlying the curriculum of the school?
6. Respect the judgment of the administrators of the school?

There were 1226 teacher-observers in 166 schools involved in this study. Responses to each question were obtained from the four to ten teacher-observers in each school. The Pearson product-moment correlation between the EPL score and each question on the morale measurement device was obtained. The correlation coefficient for the relationship of the EPL score to each of the indices of morale was statistically significant. Therefore, Gross and Herriott (1965) concluded that the principal can indeed influence the morale of his teachers.

Another assumption made by Gross and Herriott (1965) was that the greater the morale of teachers, the more
professional their performance. To test this assumption, the zero-order correlation of the Teacher Morale Score with the Teacher Professional Performance Score was computed. The scores on both scales were obtained from data provided by teacher-observers. A statistically significant coefficient of .71 was revealed. The difference in the magnitude of the relationship between morale and performance of teachers and morale and performance of workers in an industrial setting was attributed by the researchers to the professional nature of the role of the teacher, the high degree of indeterminancy of the product and the great visibility of "worker" to "client".

Through research done by Halpin and Croft (1963), the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire was developed. Halpin conducted extensive research in the 1950's involving a branch of the military by using the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire, an instrument designed by Hemphill and Coons at The Ohio State University. As an outgrowth of this research Halpin and Croft devised the OCDQ. The OCDQ included eight dimensions. They were: (1) disengagement, (2) hindrance, (3) esprit, (4) intimacy, (5) aloofness, (6) production emphasis, (7) thrust, and (8) consideration (Halpin, 1966). Behavioral statements were the basis for perceptual responses of staff members to this Likert-type scale which categorized a school climate as being open, autonomous, controlled, familiar, paternal, or closed. This instrument has been used in several
studies dealing with the organizational climate of the school and teacher morale.

In addition to major research conducted, numerous articles, addresses, papers and dissertations have ensued within the past twenty-five years relating to various aspects of job satisfaction or morale. A review of this phase of the literature including findings and conclusions follows.

Johnson (1961) conducted a study which, after identifying factors associated with job satisfaction and dissatisfaction in industry, checked the applicability of these factors to the educational enterprise. Five of the twenty-six factors identified had statistical significance in affecting teacher satisfaction and four of the factors had a statistical significance in affecting teacher dissatisfaction. The study revealed several implications for educators. They were: (1) professional educators should concern themselves with the motivating factors of achievement, recognition, the work itself, responsibility and interpersonal relations in order to increase teacher satisfaction; (2) administrators must provide an organizational climate which eliminates forces affecting teacher dissatisfaction; and (3) school administrators must recognize the importance of implementing policies fairly and consistently.

A study to determine whether teachers' attitudes toward their principals could be predicted through the use
of the Rokeach's dogmatism scale, an instrument which measured open-mindedness and closed-mindedness, was conducted by Wilson (1961). The major hypothesis was that the more congruent a teacher was with his principal on "open-mindedness-closed mindedness" the more favorable was the teachers' attitude toward the principal. According to this study, principal-teacher congruency on "open-mindedness-closed mindedness" had no significant relationship with teachers' attitudes toward their principals. Furthermore, teachers who had favorable attitudes toward their principals tended to have favorable attitudes toward the central office administration.

A study initiated by McCain (1963), answered the following questions: (1) Does the behavior of the principal in his supervisory role make a difference in the quality of the supervisory program of the school? (2) What types of activities are more effective with what kinds of supervisory behavior? and (3) Does the principal's behavior affect teachers' perceptions of the supervisory program? McCain found that teachers perceived principals of higher quality program schools using peer relations and service function and employing a positive and considerate approach to a much greater extent than did principals of lower quality program schools. The principal's behavior in teacher-principal relationships or in human relations aspects of the supervisory program influenced the teachers' perception of the principal's supervisory behavior. Human rela-
tions were more significant than the more technical and routine aspects of the supervisory program in the perceptions of the teachers.

Campbell (1963) studied fifteen principals and 284 teachers in an attempt to ascertain reasons why "highly satisfied" teachers liked their principals. Attributes such as a scholarly attitude, general competency, respect for the teacher's worth, the ability to guide without interfering, efforts to make it easy for teachers to teach, maintenance of good discipline, patience and understanding and courteous manner were cited as being characteristics of principals of "highly satisfied" teachers. "Highly dissatisfied" teachers failed to mention the principal, but did mention such annoyances as being given sections of slow-learners, shortage of equipment and extra curricular duties. According to Campbell the principal of a school, must himself, have high morale, or he cannot develop it in his associates.

A study of the principal's role in the job satisfaction of teachers was conducted by McLelland (1964). A group interview technique was used to obtain data from 347 teachers in twelve secondary schools in the Houston Independent School District. The following conclusions were drawn:

1. The genuine concern of the principal for mental, physical, and economic welfare of the teacher contributes to a well-integrated and wholesome teacher personality.
2. The attitudes of the principal are reflected
in the self-concept of the teacher and in the teacher's evaluation of his job.

3. The teacher's emotional outlook is affected by the principal's professional and personal communications with the teacher.

4. The principal's direction of the instructional program affects the teacher's job satisfaction.

5. The teacher's attitude toward his work is affected by the working conditions created by the principal.

Lambert (1958) conducted a study of the relationship between teacher morale and the leader behavior of the school principal. The data obtained from 512 Alabama teachers revealed a significant relationship between these two factors. Neither race, level of position, nor school size affected the correlation between morale and leader behavior.

The possibility of a relationship between the authoritarianism and morale of teachers and the authoritarianism of their administrators was considered by Gubser (1969). The California F-Scale and the Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire were administered to a population of 273 elementary teachers and twenty principals. Faculties of administrators scoring high on the F-Scale did not differ in authoritarianism or morale from faculties whose administrators scored low. Comparison of F-Scale scores to morale factors revealed significant relationships. Older teachers scored much higher in morale and authoritarianism than did younger teachers. Gubser indicated that teachers, who were anti-authoritarian probably left teaching rather than become more authoritative with experience.
Fiedler's theory of psychological distance which emerged from industry was challenged by Watkins (1969). Using Fiedler's Assumed Similarity of Opposite Scores and Halpin and Croft's OCDQ to measure the organizational effectiveness of the school, Watkins found that the maintenance of a psychologically distant relationship with their professional staffs by principals correlated negatively with organizational effectiveness measures. Watkins implied that with the emerging emphasis placed on the professionalization of the teaching role and with the impact of this trend upon the principal-staff relationships, the negative relationship found in this study was timely.

A study was initiated at the University of Toronto by Majoribanks (1970) which analyzed the relationship between the dogmatic structure of school principals and the bureaucratic organization of schools. Dogmatism was measured by response of fifty elementary school principals to the Rokeach Attitude Scale, and the level of school bureaucratization was measured by the Organizational Inventory. Majoribanks' hypothesis, that a direct relationship existed between principal dogmatism and the bureaucratic structure of schools, was rejected. The results suggested that a principal, who was rated as being closed-minded or dogmatic, will not necessarily display characteristics associated with dogmatism when in a school situation.

The Rokeach Attitude Scale, along with Halpin and Croft's OCDQ and Hoppick's Job Satisfaction Questionnaire,
were used to test Warren's (1971) hypothesis that open-minded teachers in open-climate schools and closed-minded teachers in closed-climate schools were more satisfied than teachers in mixed situations. Results of his study indicated that job satisfaction was not dependent upon congruency of organizational climate and dogmatism.

In a paper presented to the American Educational Research Association, Feitler (1972) revealed the findings of a study he conducted to determine the leader behaviors of elementary school principals and the organizational processes of their schools. T-tests were used to determine significant relationships between leader behavior, which was measured by the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire, and contrasting school typologies, which were described by a questionnaire entitled Profile of a School. Four-hundred twelve teachers in twenty-three schools supplied information to complete the two measurement devices. Four leader behaviors - tolerance of freedom, consideration, integration and tolerance of uncertainty - were found to be significantly higher for schools having participative group organizational processes than for schools described as having more authoritative processes. Findings of Feitler's study supported the findings of Likert in his industrial investigations; the organizational leader sets the climate for meeting idiographic needs and that these needs must be accommodated in an effective organization.

Tirpak (1973) studied forty-nine schools in two
Ohio counties in an attempt to answer these questions:

1. Is there a relationship between organizational climate and the age of principals?
2. Is there a relationship between organizational climate of schools and the principals' years of formal education?
3. Is there a difference between the principals' and teachers' perception of organizational climate?
4. Is there a relationship between the intelligence of principals and the organizational climate of the schools?
5. Is there a relationship between particular personality traits of the principals and the organizational climate of schools?

Halpin and Croft's OCDQ and the Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire were used to provide data for the study. Results of the study indicated that neither age of the principal nor years of formal education made a difference in creating or maintaining an open or closed organizational climate. There was a statistically significant difference between the principals' perceptions of the faculty members and between the intelligence of principals of open climate schools and principals of closed climate schools. Certain personality traits were more characteristic of principals of open climate schools whereas other traits were more characteristic of principals of closed climate schools.

Herzberg's two-factor theory was the basis of Holdaway's research problem to ascertain the relationship between overall and facet satisfaction of teachers. Results of the investigation showed that items with the highest percentages "satisfied" generally involved interpersonal relationships with the teaching assignment. Items with the
highest percentages "dissatisfied" were related to attitudes toward practices involving consultation, decision making, and collective bargaining; preparation time; and methods used in making staff decisions. "Overall satisfaction" was found to be related more to the work of teachers than to aspects of the work environment such as salary, allocation of resources and physical conditions.

Malone (1980) attempted to answer three questions in her study: (1) Is there a relationship between the use of human relations by the elementary school principal and teacher morale? (2) What relationship exists between the use of human relations by the elementary school principal? and (3) If the first two relationships are positive, are sixth grade pupils' reading scores in direct relation to the use of human relations by the elementary school principal? According to data collected by the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire and the Morale Questionnaire, no relationship was found to exist between the use of human relations by the elementary school principal and teacher morale, teacher effectiveness and pupils' reading test scores.

Two studies have been conducted that have employed the same instruments that were used in this study. Galloway (1975) used the Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire and the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire to determine if there were statistically significant relationships between the leader behavior of Mississippi public elementary school
principals and teacher morale as perceived by the teachers. An analysis of data collected from 220 elementary school teachers and twenty-two elementary school principals revealed no significant difference between teacher and principal perceptions of the school principal's leader behavior. There was, however, a positive relationship between teachers' perceptions of leader behavior and teacher morale. The higher the teachers rated their principals' leader behavior, the higher the teachers' morale.

The second investigation which used the Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire and the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire as measurement instruments was completed by Laird and Leutkemeyer (1976) to determine the relationship between the leader behavior of principals and teacher morale in the vocational centers of Maryland. Subjects for this study included 179 vocational-technical teachers at fourteen of the fifteen vocational centers in Maryland. Using Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients, these researchers determined that teacher morale was related to the leader behavior of the principal. In this study, although a stronger relationship existed between the principals' person orientation dimension and teacher morale than between the principals' system orientation and morale, both dimensions were significantly related to morale.

Two studies have been conducted concerning the topic of job satisfaction or teacher morale of Louisiana's public school teachers. A study conducted by Warren (1953)
included elementary school teachers in Louisiana. Results of his study revealed a list of factors, some of which were mentioned earlier, related to job satisfaction. Warren recommended three steps to increase job satisfaction: (1) an improved public relations program, (2) a conscientious attempt to discover the needs of teachers, and (3) remuneration for inservice training and merit.

Integration of the East Baton Rouge Parish School District in Louisiana, encouraged McCoy (1973) to investigate the job satisfaction of selected elementary school teachers and certain English, mathematics, science and social studies teachers in that school district who were part of a school crossover to achieve a racially balanced unitary school system. Subjects used in this study were crossover teachers and non-crossover teachers. The results suggested that black, female elementary school teachers in the 20-25 year age group had the highest morale of teachers who had to transfer from a school in which his own race was dominant to a school in which his race was in the minority. Another finding led to the conclusion that female teachers were less satisfied than male teachers.

Cook (1979) indicated that the five components having the greatest impact on teacher morale were administrative leadership, administrative concern, personal interaction, and opportunity for input and professional growth. It was determined that these components, combined with consistency, uniquely affected teacher morale, depending
upon the characteristics and functions of the administrator and teaching staff.

Kampmeier (1976) implied that if an administrator assisted his teachers in achieving the highest level of Maslow's hierarchy, self-actualization, he usually asked the following question: What can I do to help you get where you want to go? A more realistic view for an administrator to adopt would be one that seeks a balance between those leader behaviors geared toward obtaining both organizational and individual teacher goals.

Summary

Morale has been defined as the capacity of an individual to carry on a task with determination, cooperation, loyalty and a sense of personal satisfaction (Bentley and Rempel, 1964). Most researchers have viewed morale as an emotionally charged, multidimensional concept (Halpin, 1966; McCoy, 1973; Holdaway, 1978). Both intrinsic and extrinsic factors related to one's work have been shown to have an influence on morale (Herzberg, 1959).

Theory and research from business and industry concerning job satisfaction or morale surfaced long before interest in this topic emerged in the area of education. Modern organizational theory and research from business organizations by Katz (1950), Herzberg (1959), Gouldner (1954) and Likert (1961) provided much of the theoretical framework upon which educational research involving this
topic has been completed. Some of the theory which has eminated from business organizations was made applicable to educational systems. Educational studies conducted by Watkins (1969) and Laird and Leutkemeyer (1976) disproved Fiedler's (1958) theory of psychological distance. According to Fiedler, a distant psychological behavior exhibited by the leader would enhance the organizational climate. This theory, which was tested in industry, did not hold true in the area of education, possibly because of the increased professionalization of the teaching role.

Halpin and Croft (1963) and Gross and Herriott (1965) conducted extensive research concerning the organizational climate of schools and addressed themselves to the principal-staff relationship with emphasis on the role of the principal's leader behavior in creating an effective organizational climate.

Teacher morale has been recognized by school administrators as one of the key ingredients in the development of a successful educational organization (Cook, 1979). Researchers have conducted studies concerning the teacher morale - leader behavior relationship and have determined that a significant relationship exists (Lambert, 1968; Watkins, 1969; Feitler, 1972; Galloway, 1975; Laird and Leutkemeyer, 1976).

In light of these findings, research articles have been published and addresses have been presented that have offered techniques and guidelines to principals for im-
proving their school's climate and teacher morale (Kampmeier, 1976; Cook, 1979). Suggestions have been made to school boards to consider the type of stylistic behaviors exhibited by a candidate for a principalship before placing him in a school setting in which he may adversely affect the organizational climate and teacher morale (Gubser, 1969; Majoribanks, 1970).

Teacher morale has been identified as being multifaceted. Evidence supported by empirical investigations indicated that the position of the principal's leader behavior has a strong but not exclusive relationship with teacher morale. A principal's personality traits exhibited by his leader behavior seem to have an effect on the organizational climate, and, therefore on the satisfaction of teachers.
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PROCEDURES OF THE STUDY

Selection of Population and Sample

One-third of the sixty-six school systems in the State of Louisiana were selected for participation in the study. The 1981-82 Louisiana School Directory was used to identify schools with kindergarten through sixth grade. Using data available from the 1981-82 Annual Report of the Louisiana State Department of Education, teachers from these schools were identified and from these data 600 elementary teachers were selected on a random basis, using Fisher and Yates' Table of Random Numbers.

Collection of the Data

A letter requesting permission to use teachers in their system as part of the study was sent to the superintendents of the school districts selected for participation (See Appendix A). Permission was granted by sixteen of the superintendents of the districts originally selected. For the six school districts which denied permission to use teachers, six additional school districts were randomly selected and letters were forwarded to the superintendents requesting permission to use their teachers. Upon receiving authorization from twenty-two superinten-
dents, letters were sent to the teachers selected which introduced the researcher, cited reasons for the study and requested their completion of the instruments. The teachers were assured of complete anonymity and were informed that the questionnaires were numbered for purposes of identification (See Appendix C).

The identification numbers were used to send follow-up post cards to the teachers who did not respond within three weeks after the questionnaires were sent (See Appendix D).

These letters, mailed to the teachers, were accompanied by two questionnaires, The Purdue Teacher Opinionaire and the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire, and a stamped envelope addressed to the researcher.

Description of Instruments

The Purdue Teacher Opinionaire. The Purdue Teacher Opinionaire (PTO) developed by Ralph R. Bentley and Averno M. Rempel (1964) was designed to measure teacher morale. The PTO was designed not only to yield a total morale score, but also to provide sub-scale scores which measure some of the dimensions of morale. The ten morale sub-scale and a brief description of the instrument follows:

Factor 1, Teacher Rapport with Principal-dealt with the teacher's feelings about the principal.

Factor 2, Satisfaction with Teaching-pertained to teacher relationships with students and feelings to satisfaction with teaching.

Factor 3, Rapport among Teachers-focused on a
teacher's relationship with other teachers.

Factor 4, Teacher Salary-pertained to a teacher's feelings about salary and salary policy.

Factor 5, Teacher Load-identified such matters as recordkeeping, clerical work, community demands, extra-curricular load, and keeping up to date professionally.

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

Factor 7, Teacher Status-sampled feelings about prestige, security, and benefits afforded by teaching.

Factor 8, Community Support of Education-identified community understanding and willingness to support a sound educational program.

Factor 9, School Facilities and Services-included the adequacy of facilities, supplies, and equipment, and the efficiency of the procedures for obtaining materials and services.

Factor 10, Community Pressures-provided special attention to community expectations of a teacher's personal standards, his participation in outside-school activities, and his freedom to discuss controversial issues in the classroom.

Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire. The Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ) was developed by Hemphill and Coons (1957) at The Ohio State University, and was initially used to describe leader behavior in military organizations. Since its inception, it has been used to describe the behavior of leaders in many types of groups and organizations. There was no satisfactory theory or definition available when the Ohio State Leadership Studies were initiated in 1945. These studies revealed through empirical research that a large
number of dimensions of leader behavior could be reduced to two factors, (1) consideration and (2) initiation of structure.

Of the forty items on the LBDQ, only thirty were scored; fifteen for each of the two dimensions. The ten unscored items were retained in the questionnaire in order to keep the conditions of administration comparable to those used in standardizing the questionnaire.

**Questionnaire Returns**

Of the six hundred subjects to which questionnaires were sent, three hundred fifty-six or fifty-nine percent of the teachers returned the questionnaires.

**Treatment of the Data**

**Hypothesis One**, that there was no significant relationship between the elementary school teacher's perceptions of the principal's leader behavior and teacher morale, was tested by use of the Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient at the .05 level of significance.

**Hypothesis Two**, that there was no significant difference in the mean morale score of teachers perceiving their principals as above the mean on the total leader behavior score and those perceiving their principals as below the mean on the total leader behavior score, was tested by obtaining the significance of the difference between the means. The difference was then tested at the .05 level of significance.
Hypothesis Three stated that there was no significant difference in the relationship between the "initiating structure" factor and the "consideration" factor of the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire in relation to teacher morale. Correlation coefficients were obtained and the formula for determining the significance of the difference between correlation coefficients was used to test this hypothesis.

Hypothesis Four, that there is no significant difference between the teacher morale - leader behavior relationship of the selected demographic category sub-groups age and years of teaching experience, was tested by computing correlation coefficients and employing the formula for significance of the difference between correlation coefficients.

After questionnaires were hand scored, a microcomputer was used to compute the correlation coefficients for the four hypotheses. Using Garrett's (1964) formulae for calculating the significance of the difference between two r's and between two means, the significance of the differences for Hypotheses Two, Three and Four were determined.
Chapter IV

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

The major purpose of this study was to determine if a significant relationship existed between leader behavior as measured by the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire and teacher morale as measured by the Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire of elementary teachers in the State of Louisiana.

Twenty-two school systems and a sample of 600 teachers were randomly selected from schools and school systems within the State of Louisiana. Fifty-nine percent of the teachers selected returned the questionnaires. Because of failure to complete certain questionnaires adequately, thirty-eight of the subjects were eliminated from the study.

The Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient and the Garrett's (1964) formulae for determining the significance of the difference between correlation coefficients and means were the statistical processes utilized to analyze the data. The .05 level of significance was utilized for acceptance or rejection of the null hypotheses.

**Hypothesis One stated:** There was no significant relationship between the elementary school teacher's perceptions of the principal's leader behavior and teacher
morale. The data presented in Table 1 revealed the mean and the standard deviation for both the leader behavior variable and the teacher morale variable. A correlation coefficient, or a Pearson r, of .66 was obtained. This indicated that in ninety-five cases in one hundred, one could be confident that, with this population an r of .66 was not due to mere chance.

Teacher morale and leader behavior were substantially or markedly related as perceived by teachers and measured by the Purdue Teacher Opinionaire and the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire. When teacher morale scores were high, leader behavior scores were high; when teacher morale scores were low, leader behavior scores were low. Hypothesis One was rejected at the .05 level of significance.

**TABLE 1**

MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS AND CORRELATION COEFFICIENT OF THE TOTAL MORALE SCORE AND THE TOTAL LEADER BEHAVIOR SCORE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable X: Leader Behavior</th>
<th>Variable Y: Teacher Morale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean of X = 85.242</td>
<td>Mean of Y = 312.302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D. of X = 18.748</td>
<td>S.D. of Y = 41.549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Pairs (N) = 318</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correlation Coefficient (r) = .66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degrees of Freedom (DF) = 316</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hypothesis Two stated: There was no significant difference in the mean morale score of teachers perceiving
their principals as above the mean on the total leader behavior score and those perceiving their principals as below the mean on the total leader behavior score. To test this hypothesis, the subjects were divided into two groups—those whose leader behavior scores were above the mean and those whose leader behavior scores were below the mean. A mean teacher morale score was obtained for both groups. Using Garrett's (1964) formula for determining the significance of the difference between independent means, a critical ratio of 12.33 was obtained. This CR was above 1.96 and hence was significant at the .05 level; therefore, Hypothesis Two was rejected. In Table 2 these data were presented. There was a significant difference at the .05 level of confidence between the mean morale score of teachers perceiving their principals as being above the mean on the total leader behavior score and those perceiving their principals as below the mean on the total leader behavior score.

Hypothesis Three stated: There was no significant difference in the relationship between the "initiating structure" factor and the "consideration" factor of the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire in relation to teacher morale. Correlation coefficients computed for the "initiating structure" factor - teacher morale relationship and the "consideration" factor - teacher morale relationship were .52 and .65 respectively (See Table 3). These two r's were converted to Fisher's z function of .58 and
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teachers Scoring Below The Mean On The LBDQ</th>
<th>Teachers Scoring Above The Mean On The LBDQ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Variable Y: Teacher Morale</strong></td>
<td><strong>Variable Y: Teacher Morale</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean of $Y = 285.589$</td>
<td>Mean of $Y = 333.582$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D. of $Y = 36.314$</td>
<td>S.D. of $Y = 32.081$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Numbers of Pairs $(N) = 141$</td>
<td>Numbers of Pairs $(N) = 177$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DIFERENCE BETWEEN MEANS** = 47.993

**STANDARD ERROR OF THE DIFFERENCE** = 3.893

**CR** = 12.331*

*Significant at .05 level
### TABLE 3


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable X: Leader Behavior</th>
<th>Variable X: Leader Behavior</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Consideration&quot; Factor</td>
<td>&quot;Initiating Structure&quot; Factor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean of X = 42.135</td>
<td>Mean of X = 43.189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D. of X = 10.863</td>
<td>S.D. of X = 9.850</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable Y: Teacher Morale</th>
<th>Variable Y: Teacher Morale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean of Y = 311.987</td>
<td>Mean of Y = 312.302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D. of Y = 41.693</td>
<td>S.D. of Y = 41.549</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Numbers of Pairs (N) = 318  | Number of Pairs (N) = 318   |
| Correlation Coefficients (r) = .65 | Correlation Coefficients (r) = .52 |
| Degrees of Freedom (DF) = 316 | Degrees of Freedom (DF) = 316 |
| Fisher's z Coefficient (z) = .78    | Fisher's z Coefficient (z) = .78 |

CR = 2.5*

*Significant at .05 level
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.78. A critical ratio of 2.5 was obtained when the formula for determining the significance of the difference between two r's was applied. A CR of 2.5 exceeded the 1.96 standard value of significance at the .05 level. There was a significant difference between the "initiating structure" factor - teacher morale relationship and the "consideration" factor - teacher morale relationship; hence, Hypothesis Three was rejected.

**Hypothesis Four stated:** There was no significant difference between the teacher morale - leader behavior relationship of the selected demographic category subgroups age and years of teaching experience. Because of failure of some of the subjects to reveal this demographic information, the number of subjects used to test this hypothesis was reduced. Information concerning the number of subjects used was available in Tables 4 and 5. First, correlation coefficients of .73, .61, and .70 were obtained for the three age groups used in this study. Applying the formula for testing the significance of the difference between two r's, a critical ratio of 1.0 was obtained for groups A and B, .27 for Groups A and C, and 1.33 for groups B and C. Since the CR's for each of the groups were below the standard for significance at the .05 level, part one of Hypothesis Four was accepted. Correlation coefficients of .67, .58, and .68 were obtained for each of the three categories of years of teaching experience. Critical ratios of 1.07 for Groups A and B, .15 for Groups A and C, and 1.31
### TABLE 4

**NUMBER OF PAIRS, CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS, FISHER’S z COEFFICIENTS AND DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE LEADER BEHAVIOR – TEACHER MORALE COEFFICIENTS OF THE AGE SUB-GROUP OF THE POPULATION SAMPLE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>GROUP A</th>
<th>GROUP B</th>
<th>GROUP C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td>20-25 yrs.</td>
<td>26-35 yrs.</td>
<td>36-65 yrs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of Pairs (N)</strong></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Correlation Coefficient (r)</strong></td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fisher's z Coefficient (z)</strong></td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Critical Ratio (CR) Between Sub-groups**
- AB = 1.0
- AC = .27
- BC = 1.33
TABLE 5

NUMBER OF PAIRS, CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS, FISHER'S z COEFFICIENTS AND DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE LEADER BEHAVIOR - TEACHER MORALE COEFFICIENTS OF VARIOUS CATEGORIES OF YEARS OF TEACHING EXPERIENCE OF THE POPULATION SAMPLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of Experience</th>
<th>GROUP A</th>
<th>GROUP B</th>
<th>GROUP C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 or more</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Critical Ratio (CR) Between Sub-groups AB = 1.07
Critical Ratio (CR) Between Sub-groups AC = .15
Critical Ratio (CR) Between Sub-groups BC = .13
for Groups B and C were obtained after converting the r's into Fisher's z function. Again, the CR's failed to meet the standard for significance at the .05 level and part two of Hypothesis Four was accepted. There was no significant difference between the teacher morale - leader behavior relationship when various age groups and various categories of years of teaching experience were considered.

The results obtained by correlating the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire measures with the Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire measures as perceived by elementary teachers in the State of Louisiana revealed the following information:

1. There was a significant relationship between the elementary school principal's leader behavior and teacher morale as perceived by the teachers. According to the results of this study, a substantial or marked positive relationship existed between teacher morale and leader behavior as perceived and measured in the teacher population of Louisiana. The higher the teacher rated the principal's leader behavior, the higher the teacher's morale.

2. The null hypothesis as stated in Hypothesis Two was rejected. Teachers who perceived their principals as being above the mean on the leader behavior score perceived their own morale as being significantly higher than the morale of those teachers who perceived their principals as being below the mean on the leader behavior score.
When leader behavior scores were above the mean, accompanying morale scores were significantly higher than morale scores accompanying leader behavior scores below the mean.

3. There was a significant difference between the "initiating structure" factor and the "consideration" factor of the *Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire* in relation to teacher morale as indicated by a critical ratio of 2.5. In the elementary school teacher population of Louisiana, the "consideration" factor of the LBDQ was more highly correlated with teacher morale than the "initiating structure" factor. In this study, teacher morale was more highly correlated with the principal's leader behavior that was indicative of friendship, trust, respect and warmth than with the principal's leader behavior that dealt with the "structure" role.

4. Hypothesis Four was retained. Neither age nor years of teaching experience had a significant influence on the leader behavior - teacher morale relationship in this study.
Chapter V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

This investigation was conducted to determine if there was a significant relationship between teacher's perceptions of leader behavior of Louisiana elementary school principals and teacher morale. The rationale supporting the study was that the morale of teachers and the leader behavior of principals were variables that made a difference in the quality of education offered in any given school or school system. It was felt that the problem was worthy of investigation in that it would provide an indication of the degree to which the leader behavior - teacher morale relationship existed.

Four major hypotheses were formulated which provided a means of examining the leader behavior - teacher morale relationship. Two standardized instruments were used to measure the two variables: the Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire which produced a measure of teacher morale and the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire which produced a measure of the principal's leader behavior as perceived by the teacher. The hypotheses were stated as follows:
1. There was no significant relationship between elementary school teachers' perceptions of the principal's leader behavior and teacher morale.

2. There was a significant difference in the relationship in the mean morale score of teachers perceiving their principals as above the mean on the total leader behavior score and those perceiving their principals as below the mean on the total leader behavior score.

3. There was a significant difference in the relationship between the "initiating structure" factor and the "consideration" factor of the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire in relation to teacher morale.

4. There was no significant difference between the teacher morale - leader behavior relationship of the selected demographic category sub-groups, age and years of teaching experience.

In order to test the hypotheses, a random sample of 600 elementary school teachers from twenty-two Louisiana public school systems was selected to participate in the study. Two instruments, the Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire and the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire were distributed to the subjects accompanied by an introductory letter and a stamped, addressed envelope.

The data derived from the measure of teacher morale, the Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire, were correlated with the data derived from the measure of leader behavior, the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire. Correlation
coefficients were computed according to the Pearson product-moment correlation formula. In addition, formulae for determining the significance of the difference between correlation coefficients and between means were employed.

Conclusions

The following conclusions were determined from the findings related to the testing of the four major hypotheses of the study:

1. According to the results of this study, there was a significant relationship between the leader behavior of elementary school principals and teacher morale in the State of Louisiana. An $r$ of .66 was obtained. According to Garrett (1964), an $r$ from $+.44$ to $+.77$ denoted a substantial or marked relationship. A relationship of this magnitude indicated that leader behavior was a solid determinant in contributing to teacher morale.

2. The difference between the mean morale scores of teachers who perceived the principals as being above the mean on the total leader behavior score and the mean morale scores of teachers who perceived their principals as being below the mean on the total leader behavior score was significant. It was concluded that high morale scores were associated with high leader behavior scores and low morale scores were associated with low leader behavior scores, according to the data analyzed in this study. When leader behavior scores were above the mean, accompanying morale
scores were significantly higher than morale scores accompanied by leader behavior scores below the mean.

3. In the elementary teacher population of Louisiana, the "consideration" factor of the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire was more highly correlated with teacher morale than was the "initiating structure" factor. This indicated that teacher morale was more highly associated with the principal's behavior that was indicative of friendship, mutual respect and warmth than with leader behavior that dealt with the structural organization of the school system.

4. There was no significant difference among the sub-groups age and years of teaching experience in regards to the leader behavior - teacher morale relationship. It was concluded that neither age nor years of teaching experience were variables that affected the correlation between the total morale score and the total leader behavior score of elementary teachers in Louisiana.

Recommendations

1. There is need to conduct additional research concerning the leader behavior - teacher morale relationship after identification of various leadership styles. The identification of leadership styles may provide a clearer view of leader behavior and give additional insight into the leader behavior - teacher morale relationship.

2. There is need to conduct additional research
regarding leader behavior and teacher morale using junior high and high school teachers as populations. Generalization to these populations from the results of this study would not be feasible.

3. Local school administrators need to implement steps to foster principals' understanding of the importance of their role as a factor involved in determining teacher morale.

4. There is a need for administrators to initiate ideas that would result in high leader behavior scores of principals within their school systems. Since "consideration" was more highly associated with teacher morale than was "initiating structure", emphasis on improving human relations may be beneficial.

5. Principals need to have knowledge of the level of morale of their respective faculties. This knowledge may be obtained by administering the Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire or a similar instrument.

6. Masters degree programs in educational administration need to provide students with the opportunity to become familiar with theoretical models of leader behavior, leadership styles, job satisfaction and morale and worker productivity.
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APPENDIX A

Letter to Superintendents
Dear Superintendent:

I am pursuing a doctoral degree in Educational Administration at Louisiana State University. As part of my doctoral work, I am investigating the relationship between the leader behavior of public elementary school principals and teacher morale. This study is under the direction of Dr. J. Berton Gremillion, Professor of Education, Department of Administrative and Foundational Services, and committee members; Drs. Sam Adams, B. F. Beeson, Billy M. Seay, Fred M. Smith, and Robert C. Von Brock.

In order to complete this research study, I am requesting the permission of twenty-two (22) school districts to collect data from twenty-eight (28) elementary school teachers. These teachers, selected on a random basis, will receive two questionnaires, the Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire and the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire. Complete anonymity will be granted to the participants. Also, a copy of the results of the study will be available to those who so desire.

Your cooperation is earnestly solicited and vitally needed. If your permission is granted to allow teachers in your school system to participate in the study, please indicate on the enclosed response form and mail in the self-addressed envelope. Should you have a list of classroom teachers, by school, the study would be greatly facilitated if you would include a copy of it in the envelope.

Thank you for your consideration and cooperation.

Sincerely,

Marietta W. James

Enclosure
APPENDIX B

Superintendent's Response Form
Response Form

To: Marietta W. James
1205 South Eastern Avenue
Crowley, Louisiana 70526

From: ___________________________ School System

Subject: The administration of The Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire and The Purdue Teacher Opinionaire

_____ You have the superintendent's permission to use twenty-eight (28) of the elementary school teachers in this school system in your research study.

_____ Permission is not granted to use elementary school teachers in this school system in your study.

Signed: ___________________________ Superintendent
APPENDIX C

Cover Letter
Dear Teacher:

I am pursuing a doctoral degree in Educational Administration at Louisiana State University. As part of my doctoral work, I am investigating the relationship between the leader behavior of public elementary school principals and teacher morale.

You have been selected as one of 600 public elementary school teachers in Louisiana to assist in the completion of this research study. You are urgently requested to complete both of the enclosed questionnaires and return them in the self-addressed envelope.

The Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire, which measures teacher morale, consists of 100 items. The Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire consists of 40 items. Please answer all of the items on both questionnaires. Completion of these instruments should take no more than 30 minutes of your time.

You are assured of complete anonymity. The numbers that appear on the questionnaires will be used strictly for the identification purpose of sending follow-up letters to participants who do not respond within three weeks after receipt of this letter.

A copy of the results of the study will be available to you upon request.

Thank you for your consideration and cooperation in participating in this study.

Sincerely,

Marietta W. James

Marietta W. James

Enclosures
APPENDIX D

Follow-up Post Card
Dear Teacher:

Three weeks ago, I sent two questionnaires to you requesting that you complete and return them to me. If you have not done this, please do so. The success of my study is dependent upon your prompt response.

I am grateful for your assistance in this matter.
APPENDIX E

Policy Statement Regarding

Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire
STATEMENT OF POLICY

Concerning the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire and Related Forms

Permission is granted without formal request to use the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire and other related forms developed at The Ohio State University, subject to the following conditions:

1. Use: The forms may be used in research projects. They may not be used for promotional activities or for producing income on behalf of individuals or organisations other than The Ohio State University.

2. Adaptation and Revision: The directions and the form of the items may be adapted to specific situations when such steps are considered desirable.

3. Duplication: Sufficient copies for a specific research project may be duplicated.

4. Inclusion in dissertations: Copies of the questionnaire may be included in theses and dissertations. Permission is granted for the duplication of such dissertations when filed with the University Microfilms Service at Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106 U.S.A.

5. Copyright: In granting permission to modify or duplicate the questionnaire, we do not surrender our copyright. Duplicated questionnaires and all adaptations should contain the notation "Copyright, 19--. by The Ohio State University."

6. Inquiries: Communications should be addressed to:

   College of Admin Science
   Support Services
   The Ohio State University
   1775 College Road
   Columbus, OH 43210 U.S.A.
APPENDIX F

Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire
LEADER BEHAVIOR DESCRIPTION QUESTIONNAIRE

Below is a list of 40 items that may be used to describe the behavior of your principal. Each item describes a specific kind of behavior, but does not ask you to judge whether the behavior is desirable or undesirable. This is not a test of ability. It simply asks you to describe, as accurately as you can, the behavior of your supervisor.

DIRECTIONS:

a. READ each item carefully.
b. THINK about how frequently the leader engages in the behavior described by the item.
c. DECIDE whether he/she always, often, occasionally, seldom or never acts as described by the item.
d. DRAW A CIRCLE around one of the five letters following the item to show the answer you have selected.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Does personal favors for group members.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Makes his/her attitudes clear to the group.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Does little things to make it pleasant to be a member of the group.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Tries out his/her new ideas with the group.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Acts as the real leader of the group.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Is easy to understand.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Rules with an iron hand.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Finds time to listen to group members.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Criticizes poor work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Gives advance notice of changes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Speaks in a manner not to be questioned.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Keeps to himself/herself.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Looks out for the personal welfare of individual group members.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Assigns group members to particular tasks.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Is the spokesperson of the group.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Schedules the work to be done.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Refuses to explain his/her actions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
19. Keeps the group informed. A B C D E
20. Acts without consulting the group. A B C D E
21. Backs up the members in their actions. A B C D E
22. Emphasizes the meeting of deadlines. A B C D E
23. Treats all group members as his/her equals. A B C D E
24. Encourages the use of uniform procedures. A B C D E
25. Gets what he/she asks for from his/her superiors. A B C D E
26. Is willing to make changes. A B C D E
27. Makes sure that his/her part in the organization is understood by group members. A B C D E
28. Is friendly and approachable. A B C D E
29. Asks that group members follow standard rules and regulations. A B C D E
30. Fails to take necessary action. A B C D E
31. Makes group members feel at ease when talking with them. A B C D E
32. Lets group members know what is expected of them. A B C D E
33. Speaks as the representative of the group. A B C D E
34. Puts suggestions made by the group into operation. A B C D E
35. Sees to it that group members are working up to capacity. A B C D E
36. Lets other people take away his/her leadership in the group. A B C D E
37. Gets his/her superiors to act for the welfare of the group members. A B C D E
38. Gets group approval in important matters before going ahead. A B C D E
39. Sees to it that the work of group members is coordinated. A B C D E
40. Keeps the group working together as a team. A B C D E
APPENDIX G

Purdue Teacher Opinionaire
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