DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 332 378 EA 023 100

AUTHOR Greenfield, William D.
TITLE Toward a Theory of School Leadership.
PUB DATE Apr 91
NOTE 43p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Chicago, IL, April 3-7, 1991).
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Viewpoints (Opinion/Position Papers, Essays, etc.) (120)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Effectiveness; *Administrator Role; Decision Making; *Educational Administration; Elementary Secondary Education; Instructional Leadership; Interprofessional Relationship; *Leaders; *Leadership; Leadership Qualities; Leadership Responsibility; Leadership Styles; Organizational Climate; Politics of Education; School Effectiveness; Teacher Administrator Relationship
IDENTIFIERS *Leadership Effectiveness

ABSTRACT

Recognizing the importance of leadership in effective school administration, this document begins by discussing leadership as defined by Etzioni (1975), including ideas such as personal influence; positional power; the difference between instrumental and expressive leadership; and organizational type as defined by the dominant means of control in the organization. Next, the school work setting is explored and five types of interrelated role-demands or "situational imperatives" that characterize the school administrator's work setting are described: (1) managerial; (2) instructional; (3) political; (4) social; and (5) moral. The nature of school leadership is explained, with emphasis on conditions in which teachers would voluntarily change their preferences. Four personal qualities of school leaders are explored along with the nature and effectiveness of personal influence in leadership. A final section explains the need for more descriptive studies of the school as an organizational work context, for the study of actual activities of administrators, and for context-sensitive research. Several questions for future study are posed. (62 references) (CLA)

Toward a Theory of School Leadership

by

William D. Greenfield

Portland State University

Introduction

Leadership is an important and compelling idea, particularly among education professionals and reformers, and enthusiasm about the connection between "effective leadership" and "good schools" is not likely to wane, despite the observations of some theoreticians and researchers that leadership is not necessarily the most critical variable associated with an organization's effectiveness (Bass, 1981; Gibb, 1969; Yukl, 1989; Pfeffer, 1978, 1981; Hall, 1987, Duke, 1986).

While this may be a valid observation for many types of organizations, the thesis explored in this paper is that leadership is a particularly critical variable associated with administering a school effectively. Understanding this thesis requires that attention be given to the special character of the school as an organizational type and, correspondingly, to the particular challenges and constraints that differentiate the work of school administrators from that of administrators in other organizational settings.

The remainder of the paper is organized into six parts. First, the concept of leadership is defined and discussed briefly to

This paper was presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL, April 3-7, 1991. The Center for Urban Research in Education, a research collaborative of the Portland Public Schools and Portland State University, provided support for this report.

provide a frame of reference for the comments to follow. The second part of the paper describes special features of the school as an organizational work setting and discusses their implications for the school administrator. The objective is this discussion is to establish the special significance of leadership for the school administrator. Building on this description of the school work-setting, the third section briefly examines the relationships among five kinds of role demands characterizing the day-to-day work of school principals. The purpose here is to underscore the significance for the school administrator of what might be termed the "situational imperatives" of school administration. A fourth section offers tentative observations regarding key concepts associated with the nature of school leadership, and argues the importance of conceptually differentiating among the personal qualities and characteristics of individual leaders, the behaviors of formal and informal leaders, and leadership processes and activities fostered by school leaders. It is argued that such distinctions will advance the field's study of school leadership, and that these distinctions offer guidance for leaders themselves as well as for those involved in the preparation and development of school leaders. The paper then discusses the implications of these ideas for educational administration as a field of study and practice, and concludes with some general propositions and specific questions for further study.

The Concept of Leadership

Leadership is a complex and multifaceted phenomena. A working definition to orient the reader is that framed by Etzioni in his discussion of dual leadership in complex organizations: "Leadership is the ability, based on the personal qualities of the leader, to elicit the followers' voluntary compliance in a broad range of matters. Leadership is distinguished from the concept of power in that it entails influence, i.e., change of preferences, while power implies only that subject's preferences are held in abeyance." (1965: 690-91).

Three additional clarifications explored by Etzioni are critical to the ideas discussed here. One is the extent to which a leader relies upon broad personal influence, positional power, or some combination of both. An actor relying only of personal influence may be referred to as an "informal leader"; an actor relying only on position power may be referred to as an "official", and one who relies upon a combination of both may be thought of as a "formal leader". (Etzioni, 1975) A school principal typically relies upon both position power and personal influence; teacher leaders frequently rely only on personal influence in relations with colleagues.

A second set of ideas relevant to this discussion is Etzioni's differentiation between instrumental and expressive kinds of leadership. "Instrumental activities deal with the input of means into the organization and their distribution within it.....

Expressive activities affect interpersonal relations within the organization and the establishment of and adherence to norms by organizational participants." (Etzioni, 1964: 61-62). In a school, instrumental activities would be those directly concerned with task accomplishment, while expressive activities encompass interpersonal relations designed to maintain morale and commitment of teachers and others, and to be responsive to their socio-emotional needs.

A third set of ideas essential to this discussion is Etzioni's differentiation of organizational "types" in terms of the dominant means of control applied by the organization. The use of physical means (coercive power) to control participants characterizes one class of organization as "coercive". Prisons and insane asylums are examples. The use of material means (utilitarian power) to control lower participants through material rewards characterizes another class of organizations as "utilitarian". Production organizations like General Motors, McDonald's, and IBM are examples. A third class, "normative", is characterized by the use of normative (prestige and esteem) and social symbols (love and acceptance) to influence participants. Schools and churches are examples. (Etzioni, 1964: 58-61)

Of particular significance for the ideas discussed in this paper is Etzioni's "normative" class of organization, of which the public school is an example. Theoretically, according to Etzioni's (1975; 1964; 1965) organizational compliance theory, normative-social methods of influence are more likely than others to induce

moral involvement among participants in normative organizations. Essentially, moral involvement means that actors do what they do because they believe it is the right thing to do. This idea is central to understanding the challenge of leadership in schools.

The School Work Setting

Schools are unlike other work-settings in important ways (Waller, 1961; Bidwell, 1965; Weick, 1976; Cusick, 1973, 1983; Dwyer and Smith, 1987; Dwyer et al, 1983; Bossert et el, 1982), and these conditions make their administration difficult. It is suggested that the features described here require that school principals rely much more extensively upon leadership than do their administrative counterparts in other settings.

Schools are extremely open and vulnerable to their environments, and there are often multiple and continuing threats to the stability of a school. Some of these threats are external; others are associated with the character of students and the student sub-culture; and others are associated with the character of the teacher-student relationship.

Teachers are unlike workers in non-school settings in several important ways: they are relatively isolated from one another; compared to counterparts in other work settings they experience and expect a high degree of autonomy in the control of their daily work; there is a low level of interdependency among teachers in terms of task accomplishment; teachers place a high significance on the importance of psychic rewards derived from relations and

successes with students; etc. Teachers' views of themselves, students, one another, parents, and the school principal are important factors shaping the demand environment to which the school principal must respond (Lortie, 1975; Becker, 1951; Waller, 1961; Johnson, 1990; Lieberman and Miller, 1984; Reyes, 1990).

The work of the school principal is different in important ways from that of administrators in other settings. Most of the work of the principal involves face-to-face communication; it is action-oriented; it is reactive; the presented problems are unpredictable; the principal must rely on others for information and frequently must make decisions without accurate or complete information (Wolcott, 1973; Blumberg and Greenfield, 1986; Blumberg, 1989; Dwyer et al, 1987; Cusick, 1973, 1983; Peterson, 1978, 1981; Morris et al, 1984).

The work of the principal occurs in a setting of immediacy; responses often cannot be put off until later; information frequently is incomplete; resolution of problems often involves multiple actors; the dominant pressure on the principal is to respond to threats to the school's stability, and to maintain a peaceful and smoothly running school. School principals spend more time than they would like maintaining stability. The penalties for ignoring threats to stability are more apparent and immediate than are penalties for ignoring the need to lead or change.

In most schools there is no explicit or recurrent pressure to lead, either from teachers or superiors, or from the school's

patrons. The stimuli calling for reactions aimed at stabilizing the school are concrete and immediate; stimuli for change are of a different order, and usually are not of similar magnitude as those threatening the school's stability. It is not necessary for a principal to lead, at least in the short run, in order to survive. It is critical, however, that the principal respond to practically every threat to stability, for failure to respond may not only threaten the stability of the school itself, but may threaten the principal's very survival. No such consequences accompany the failure to lead, at least in the short term.

Five Situational Imperatives

Analysis of the school as a work-setting suggests that five interrelated types of role-demands characterize the school administrator's work-world (Greenfield, 1988). Referred to as "situational imperatives", they include the managerial, instructional, political, social, and moral aspects of the work of school administration. These five dimensions are constitutive of the character of the school administrator's work-world; they might be attended to ineffectively, or only to a limited degree, but they cannot be ignored.

While these dimensions will vary in degree from one school context to another, they are constant in kind and may be said to characterize the range of types of role-demands encountered by administrators in any public school. It is this particular constellation of demands that characterizes the school as a highly

normative organizational work context, and which necessitates a much higher reliance upon leadership by the school administrator than is characteristic of administrators in other public agencies and other types of organizations. The five role-demands are interrelated and each has significance for understanding the nature of leadership in a school.

The point of reference for these observations is the principalship and the character of that particular work context. There are parallels in the central office and in the district superintendency, but those work-worlds differ in important ways from that of the school principal.

The managerial dimension has received the most attention in theories of school administration, and correspondingly is given the most attention by researchers and by those responsible for the training of school administrators (Bridges, 1982; Boyan, 1988; and Erickson, 1979). The managerial dimension subsumes all technical aspects of the administrator's work associated with day-to-day coordination, control, and operation of the school in support of the instructional program and associated school goals. Scheduling teachers and students and coordinating procedures and activities needed to implement instructional and extra-curricula policies, and procedures are examples of this set of role-demands. Developing and implementing effective organizational routines to assure the smooth operation of the school are central aspects of the managerial dimension of the school administrator's work. Supporting food

service and physical plant operations and implementing provisions of the negotiated contract detailing the responsibilities and prerogatives of teachers are other examples of activities and responsibilities illustrative of the "managerial imperative" in schools (Cuban, 1988). A central criterion associated with this dimension is that of efficiency. What resources are used to accomplish the goals and objectives of the school, and can available resources be used more efficiently? Another is compliance with the law and established organizational policy. To what extent do teachers, the administrator, and others comply with established procedures and guidelines, and local, state, and federal laws?

There have been calls in the past urging principals to pay more attention to the core schooling activities of teaching and learning, but these instructional role-demands actually have received little attention, either by school administrators, by researchers studying school administration, or by those responsible for the professional preparation and development of school administrators (Bridges, 1982; Erickson, 1979). While one would think that principals would focus much of their attention on the instructional dimension, this appears not to be the case for a majority of administrators, despite their insistence that this is a dimension to which they would prefer to give more attention (NASSP, 1966; 1978). Instructional role-demands include activities and processes associated with the core activities of teaching and learning. Such activities include technical and substantive matters

related to the content and objectives of the school's curriculum, the processes of teaching and learning, and evaluation of the effectiveness of the school's instructional programs and processes and of the teaching and learning efforts of teachers and students. A central criterion associated with this dimension is that of effectiveness. To what degree are the instructional goals and objectives of the school accomplished?

The day-to-day work of the school administrator is largely social in nature, in that most of what school administrators do is work directly with and through other people to coordinate and monitor their efforts, and to develop and implement programs and policies to accomplish the school's goals (Blumberg and Greenfield, 1986; Morris et al, 1984; Greenfield, 1986; Kmetz and Willower, 1982; Martin and Willower, 1981; Peterson, 1978; and Wolcott, 1973). Most of this work is accomplished through face-to-face interpersonal interactions with students, parents, teachers, superiors, and school support staff. Direct and indirect interactions with people constitutes the medium of the daily work of administering a school. As has been observed by (Gronn, 1983, 1984a and b), "talk <u>is</u> the work", (emphasis not in the original) of <u>school</u> administration.

The political dimension of the school administrator's world historically has been recognized by theoreticians and researchers, but with practically all of such attention focused on aspects of the school environment and the implications of local community,

state, and federal contingencies for district superintendents (Iannaccone, 1967; Iannaccone and Lutz, 1970; Mitchell et al, 1981; Boyd, 1988). Very limited attention has been given to internal political phenomena characterizing the day-to-day work entailed in administering a school. What is termed the "micropolitical" aspects of the work of school administrators includes their development and use of power to influence the allocation of resources within the school or district, and to influence the multiple and conflicting special interests among participants within the school or district (Bacharach and Lawler, 1982; Ball, 1987; Blase, 1987; Hoyle, 1986; Greanfield, 1988, 1991b).

Understanding and being responsive to the political dimension is critical in that the school represents a "negotiated" social order. There is not one objective reality; realities are multiple and they are experienced and understood subjectively. There are on-going efforts by teachers and administrators (and as well among parents and students) to influence others through the exercise of formal and informal power.

The moral dimension of the work of school administration entails a concern with the rightness or wrongness of one's actions as an administrator; with what "ought" one do as principal (Crowson, 1989; Greenfield, 1986, 1987a and b, 1988, 1991a; Hostetler, 1986). This role-demand requires that the principal make normative judgements regarding school programs and policies and the actions of teachers and students. These judgements are influenced

by the character of the principal, by the ethics of the profession of school administration, by the standards of good conduct characterizing the normative community of educators extending through history, and by the moral values and culture of a particular school and community. It is a particularly complex dimension because of the multiple, competing, and often conflicting standards of goodness which might be applied to any given action by an administrator.

These five role-demands are interactive and constitute the very fabric of the school administrator's milieu. To summarize:

(a) By virtue of the role and office, a principal is organizationally and professionally responsible for managing the daily school operations necessary to sustain the enterprise;

(b) The core activities of the school are teaching and learning and, by virtue of the role and office, a principal is organizationally and professionally responsible for supporting and improving the school's instructional goals and activities, and the associated work of teachers, parents, and students;

(c) Much of the daily work of school administration is accomplished through direct and indirect interpersonal interactions by the school administrator with others in the school. Working with and through people is what school administrators do. The principal's work-world is largely a social milieu;

(d) Schools have scarce resources and there are multiple and often conflicting special interests among the participants to be

served. The situation is political in requiring that the principal develop and utilize power to influence the allocation of resources and the conflicting and competing special interests of school participants. Authority is a special form of power, and authority rooted in personal qualities of the principal (rather than the office) is central to one's ability to lead teachers;

(e) Schools are characterized by a complex constellation of competing and conflicting standards of goodness to be applied in judging the rightness or wrongness of the conduct of the school administrator. Additionally, school participants differ in the values they attach to the means and ends of schooling, teaching, learning, managing, and social relations within the school and between the school and community. The school is a highly normative organization and much of the work of the school administrator requires the making of normative judgements regarding the moral values and obligations shaping the fabric of school life.

The nature of the relations among these five role-demands is not entirely clear, although it appears that the managerial and instructional dimensions might be thought of as "intermediate" ends which in effect serve as the means by which the goals of the school are accomplished. These "intermediate" ends in turn are addressed through the social, moral, and political dimensions, the means by which managerial and instructional objectives and purposes are accomplished. Although these relationships are not clear, it does appear that all five are interrelated, and that they represent

aspects of the school work-world which a principal cannot ignore.

The Nature of School Leadership

The thesis advanced in this paper is that because of the special character of the school as an organization, as manifest in the five "situational imperatives" described above, the principal must rely extensively on leadership in order to achieve the goals of the school. Etzioni's concept of leadership is adopted as a working definition: "Leadership is the ability, based on personal qualities of the leader, to elicit the followers' voluntary compliance in a broad range of matters. Leadership is distinguished from the concept of power in that it entails influence, i.e., change of preferences, while power implies only that subject's preferences are held in abeyance." (1965: 690-91)

Three ideas in this definition are critical: (1) Leadership is an ability rooted in personal qualities of the leader; (2) The object of leadership is to gain followers' voluntary consent; and (3) Influence, or the ability to get others to change their preferences, is the constellation of behaviors through which leadership is operationalized. The purpose in the comments that follow is to discuss (a) the conditions necessary for successful school leadership by the principal, (b) the personal qualities shaping the principal's ability to lead effectively, and (c) the necessity to conceptually unpack and distinguish among the many interrelated ideas associated with the concept of school leadership.

Conditions for School Leadership

What are the conditions associated with effective leadership by a principal? Posing the question another way, why would teachers **voluntarily** change their preferences (regarding classroom teaching practices, parental involvement, decision making and communication practices, working relations with colleagues, their assumptions about children as learners, etc.)? There obviously are a very broad range of potential objectives for the focus of principal leadership in a school. But, given any one of those which might be identified, why would a teacher **voluntarily** change his or her action, philosophical, or attitudinal preference, particularly when the nature of the typical school work-setting makes it so easy for teachers to ignore efforts by the principal, pressures from colleagues, directives from the central office, and state and federal mandates?

While the answers posed here undoubtedly are incomplete, these speculations are offered as a way to begin an exploration of what the author believes is **the** fundamental question regarding school leadership: Why would teachers voluntarily change their preferences? Listed below, numbered but not intended to suggest an ordering among the ideas, are some tentative answers:

1. Teachers believe the principal knows best;

2. They believe the change would serve the best interests of children;

3. Teachers see the change as a way to advance their standing

in the eyes of colleagues or the principal;

4. They believe, as a professional educators, that they are morally bound to make the change;

5. The change in their practice would make their work easier, more effective, or more efficient;

6. Teachers believe it is the right thing to do;

7. Adopting the change in preference satisfies some psychological or emotional need of the teacher;

8. Teachers believe, as professional educators, that they have a moral obligation to change because doing so will put their practice in line with what research and the normative professional community confirm as effective practice;

9. The teacher has a professional "revelation" which stimulates the change in preference; or

10. (you add your ideas to this list).....

This set undoubtedly is incomplete. However, among the possibilities listed, it is posited that principals experienced in school leadership would argue that successfully influencing teachers to **voluntarily** change their practice requires that either the teacher believe that the practice will make the teacher's work easier, or that the change in practice ultimately will serve the best interests of children. If it is assumed that this proposition is valid, what are some of the implications regarding the ability of a principal to lead?

Personal Qualities for School Leaders

There obviously are many qualities associated with effective leadership. While not exhaustive, five that appear central to school leadership are interpersonal competence, a moral commitment to serve the best interests of children, command of and commitment to the standards of good practice informing teaching and learning, and a measure of political and organizational competence. Each of these is discussed below in terms of their relevance for the challenge of school leadership.

Interpersonal competence involves both knowledge and skill (Argyris, 1962; Greenfield, 1978). The principal who would lead a school well must have the interpersonal skills needed to interact frequently and successfully with teachers and others at a face-to-face level, and be sensitive enough to grasp the meaning of verbal as well as non-verbal signs and to empathize with teachers, students, and parents. In addition to these skills, interpersonal competence includes a knowledge dimension. In the case of the principal, this means knowledge about the work of teaching and learning, the views the teacher has of oneself, students, colleagues, and the principal, and an understanding of the non-work dimensions of the teacher's life. Thus the adage, "Know your staff!"

Interpersonal competence is especially crucial for a principal because it is primarily with and through teachers and others that the work of school administration is accomplished. Little of

significance occurs in a school that does not involve face-to-face exchanges with teachers to enlist their ideas and support. Leadership by a principal, to the extent that it occurs, requires direct interpersonal interaction with teachers, students, parents, and superiors. Leadership to elicit voluntary changes in teacher preferences occurs through direct and indirect interpersonal interactions with teachers.

A second personal quality of the principal who would lead effectively is a moral commitment to serve the best interests of children, and the ability to be deliberate in identifying and analyzing actions, decisions, problems, and outcomes in moral terms. This is especially critical to effective school leadership because the school essentially is a moral enterprise (Greenfield, 1987b; 1991a). This aspect of a principal's ability to lead has variously been addressed as "vision" and "moral imagination" (Greenfield, 1988; Blumberg and Greenfield, 1986). In a school, essentially what this means is that one is committed to the standards of good practice informing teaching and learning, and that these standards are brought to bear in actions and decisions by the principal. The idea of vision and moral imagination refer to a principal's capacity to see that the current situation need not remain as it is, but that it can be changed for the better, not in terms of what is ideal, but rather in terms of what is possible given the particular school context. Competence in the skills of moral reasoning and commitment to the standards of good practice

informing the profession are central to one's ability to lead teachers.

Another element undergirding the importance of the moral character of the principal is that the problems and decisions encountered by a principal often reflect the necessity to weigh and choose among competing and conflicting standards of good practice. It often is not clear what is right, or which alternative is best, and frequently the desire to be responsive to one standard of good conduct may have to be tempered by the necessity to consider an equally compelling, but competing standard. Standards must be applied and alternative courses of action weighed. Competing standards might include preferred pedagogical practice, friendship, organizational policy, local, state, and federal laws, political expediency, efficiency, and loyalty to superiors. This is not an exhaustive list. The point is that it is not always clear what is the right decision or best course of action. In the absence of clear rules for every situation, a school principal can be counted on to make a good decision to the extent that he or she is morally committed to serve children's best interests, and is competent in skills of moral reasoning.

A third quality that appears critical for school leadership, especially given the moral obligation of the principal to serve the best interests of children, is command of and commitment to the standards of good practice informing teaching and learning. Without knowledge about these practices, and a belief in their importance

as a foundation guiding the school curriculum, the work of teaching, and the supports for children's learning and development, it is not likely that the principal would in fact be able to make good decisions affecting the core schooling activities of teaching and learning. Good decisions in this arena would be those which are responsive to (a) the best interests of children, given the school's responsibilities, and (b) the standards of good practice informing teaching and learning.

A fourth critical quality is the principal's political and organizational competence. The school is a very complex normative organization and differs in important ways from other kinds of organizations. One's understanding of these conditions and the capacity to act on that knowledge is essential to the ability to lead in a school. Without the capacity to use normative-social means to influence and persuade teachers, there is little a principal can do to influence or otherwise shape the efforts of teachers. It is very easy in a school for teachers to ignore a principal's efforts to influence what occurs in teachers' classrooms.

The basis of the authority relationship between the principal and teachers is a combination of power derived from position (the office of principal) and from influence rooted in qualities of the principal as a person and as a professional educator. Given the structural looseness of the school, the relative isolation of teachers from one another, and the ease with which teachers can

ignore a principal's initiatives to influence what occurs in teachers' classrooms, it is critical that a principal understand and be able to effectively act upon knowledge of the school as a complex normative organization, and upon an understanding of teachers' perspectives (Johnson, 1990; Greenfield, 1991b). An understanding of the culture of the school and the ability to shape the culture are critical knowledge and skills affecting the principal's capacity to influence teachers through leadership.

Similarly, to lead effectively in a school a principal must be politically competent. The school is a negotiated social order, resources are scarce, and there are many competing and conflicting special interests. Political competence, as used here, refers to the principal's ability to develop and use power to achieve valued ends (Pfeffer, 1978; 1981; and 1982; Blase, 1991; Greenfield, 1991b). Defined broadly as "the capacity of the particular social actor to overcome opposition" (Pfeffer, 1982), power and its appropriate use is a fundamental element undergirding a principal's capacity to lead. While the micropolitics of organizational behavior have been given only scant attention in educational administration (Ball, 1987; Hoyle, 1986; Blase, 1991), personal influence and power not derived from position are critical to the school principal's capacity to lead.

These personal qualities are central to school leadership by the principal. It is this particular constellation of knowledge, skill, and character that enables a principal to be responsive to

the school work-world milieu described earlier. The "situational imperatives" constituting the school administrator's work-world are such that without the personal qualities noted above it would be extremely difficult, probably impossible, for a principal to lead effectively. This is not to say that one must have these qualities in order to administer a school (although it is anticipated that trying to administer a school solely on the basis of the authority of the office of principal would not be effective). It is posited, however, that these qualities are directly associated with one's ability to provide effective leadership in a school. This is significant because relying upon means other than leadership to influence teachers is expected to yield very limited results. This is why schools are so difficult to change (and this is doubly true if the changes one desires involve teaching and other activities in a teacher's classroom).

Unpacking School Leadership

To understand the nature of leadership in schools it is critical to conceptually separate the person from the process, leaders from leadership, and to think of leadership as an interpersonal influence process associated with improving the school's effectiveness. School leadership involves a complex set of interpersonal processes and activities, undertaken to improve the school's effectiveness, that are initiated, stimulated, guided, cultivated, sustained, and supported by formal and informal leaders, and especially by the principal.

school leadership

The major shortcoming of much of the leadership literature is that it offers little concrete guidance to principals and teachers about how to lead; about what it is that leaders do to foster leadership in a school. The value of the results reported in a recent study of the micropolitics of leadership in an urban elementary school (Greenfield, 1991b), is that concrete examples are offered of the activities and processes that foster leadership in a school setting. These include sharing information; clarifying expectations; obtaining needed materials; making people feel part of the team; backing up and advocating for staff; and initiating activities and processes helpful in identifying and solving problems teachers experience in their classrooms. There is a need for basic descriptive studies of what teachers and principals actually do in providing leadership. The results of such studies will illuminate more specific and concrete examples of the what, how, and why of **school** leadership.

In addition to getting more concrete in the study of leadership, scholars would do well to distinguish between (1) the personal qualities associated with ability to lead in a school, (2) the actual behaviors constitutive of the activity of leading, (3) the <u>intermediate</u> aims of those leadership behaviors (changes in group norms, organizational policies, procedures, and processes and activities stimulated by the leader which foster the identification and solution of problems interfering with the school's effectiveness), and (4) the outcomes and effects of leadership.

school leadership

In short, scholars need to more deliberately attend to identifying and studying the antecedents, intentions, activities, and consequences of leadership, differentiating the qualities of the person of the leader, the actions of leading, and the effects of leadership. In the context of school administration, leadership needs to be thought of as a special type of administrative behavior aimed at increasing the school's effectiveness. Leadership is an influence phenomenon enacted through the interpersonal interactions between leader and others, and it seeks to elicit a voluntary change in an other's beliefs, behaviors, and/or attitudes. It is a process which may flow upward, from subordinate to superior, downward, from superior to subordinate, and laterally, among colleagues and between school professionals, and parents and other agents external to the school.

Implications and Recommendations

Leadership and associated concepts are elusive, and there are virtually hundreds of attempts to define these phenomena (Bass, 1981). Leadership has been usefully connected to aspects of the school work-place (primarily its organizational features and the dual and conflicting imperatives to change and adapt and to maintain and stabilize) and differentiated from administration (Lipham, 1964, 1973).

Relating the idea of leadership to the basis upon which influence is exercised is important and has not received the attention warranted. This is especially critical to understanding

the nature of leadership in schools. To the extent that a principal relies only or primarily upon sources of influence deriving from the authority of position (authority of office or position in Etzioni's (1964) schema) he or she is likely to diminish his or her capacity to lead teachers. Given the primarily social and cultural goals of schools, normative power is theoretically the most efficient and effective means of influencing participants (Etzioni, 1964, 1975).

The theoretical consequence for participants of the use of normative power (influence through the use of persuasion and symbols related to good practice) is moral involvement; the orientation among participants is behavior grounded in the belief that certain actions and attitudes are more preferable to others. People do what they do because they believe it is the right thing to do. Teachers **voluntarily** change their preferences.

The most potent basis for the exercise of normative power resides in qualities that the follower attaches to the leader; that is, the leader can influence others by relying on personal sources of power only to the extent that followers consent to be influenced on that basis. The critical idea here is leadership-as-consent (Levinson 1968:45; Schriesheim et al, 1982). Consent is temporary, it must be earned, and it can be both given to and taken away from leaders by followers. Influence through the exercise of personal power is leadership-by-consent. One can force compliance (coercion) or negotiate behavior (utilitarian exchange), but one

cannot induce beliefs in the same manner. Beliefs cannot be changed unless one is willing to change them.

The great challenge for school leaders is getting people to behave in certain ways toward themselves, one another, and students (or to work in the service of or toward certain goals and objectives) not because they are being forced to, and not because of some utilitarian principle of exchange or transaction (Etzioni, 1964; Burns, 1978), **but because they believe it is the right thing to do**; one's behaviors and attitudes are grounded in personal beliefs and one's moral commitment to preferred standards of good practice rooted in the norms of the historical community of the profession.

As noted earlier, a principal who must resort to influence on the basis of authority derived from position or office (legal or rational authority) diminishes his or her ability to lead. This is especially true in a school for two reasons. First, schools have properties of looseness in their structural couplings that distinguish them from other kinds of orga .zations. Teachers may be tightly coupled to their students or to the school culture, but tend to be rather loosely-coupled to superiors and to formal rules, regulations, and procedures (Weick, 1976). Secondly, teachers view themselves as a professionalized work-force, and the ethos of teachers as a group (which generally is respected by school principals) supports groups norms of autonomy over the activities of teaching. These two conditions in schools severely limit the

capacity of school principals to meaningfully influence teachers. The reality is that the classroom is the teacher's turf and teachers can pretty much teach whatever and however they like (Cusick, 1983; Becker, 1951; Lortie, 1975). In short, the school principal who relies upon position as his or her source of influence can't really have much of an impact on teachers. Teachers will nod their heads, pay lip service, look "as if" they agree, and then will decide for themselves whether or not to pay attention to the latest memo, order, rule, procedure, or whatever.

School principals who rely on personal sources of influence have a much better chance of leading teachers. Personal influence can be granted to or taken away from principals by teachers; teachers cannot take away a principal's authority of position (but structurally and culturally there are severe limits on the effectiveness of relying on such sources as a basis for influencing teachers). Sources of personal influence reside in qualities attributed to a leader by those whom one desires to influence. The critical feature is that if one is to be influenced at all, it is by choice; one consents to the influence; one is willing to be influenced. Preferences are changed voluntarily.

Typical sources of influence include information, one's functional or technical expertise, one's ability to be helpful, one's expressed level of commitment to certain goals, values, and beliefs, and one's trustworthiness and authenticity as a colleague, friend, or superior. School leaders who are not able to rely upon

one or more of these sources of personal influence will not be very effective in efforts to lead teachers; teachers simply will not consent to be lead. This leaves the formal leader with three options; ignore teachers (i.e. don't attempt to lead them at all), force compliance (and alienate your staff), or buy compliance through negotiation and exchange (which develops a calculative "what's in it for me" orientation by staff that must be perpetually renegotiated if one is to get teachers to do anything).

While the most effective choice is to lead teachers on the basis of personal influence (the writer suspects this is what many effective principals do), most principals probably ignore teachers most of the time (i.e., make no efforts to influence or lead them), and, when teachers must be led (i.e., the principal needs them to accommodate his or her preferences in some non-routine way), the principal is likely to rely upon leadership by negotiation or exchange; a transaction occurs between leader and follower and a compliance bargain is struck that satisfies both (Burns, 1978). This approach to leadership is perhaps the most prevalent kind found among principals, and yet it is peculiarly problematic. Teachers who are not among those favored by the "bargain" are likely to charge the leader with "favoritism" and the followers as "ass-kissers" or whatever (Blase, 1987). In any event, there are a lot of negative and dysfunctional consequences associated with transactional leadership, although it probably represents the primary basis most principals rely upon in their efforts to

influence teachers.

Turning now to implications for further study and for the preparation and development of school leaders, several important advances have occurred over the last decade. Several middle-range theories about leading and administering schools have emerged through studies of school principals. Research has led to a richer array of roles and images associated with the work of leading and administering a school. Much has been learned about what principals actually do in leading and administering schools. Coherent and integrated conceptions of the role-demands of the principalship (managerial, instructional, political, social, and moral) are emerging and warrant systematic empirical scrutiny. Much of the more recent research has observed how critical school cultures and contexts are to the activities and effects of leading and administering schools. These all are promising but relatively untapped avenues of inquiry.

What is needed are descriptive studies of the school as an organizational work context for administration. Such investigations will yield solid evidence of the "situational imperatives" constitutive of the school administrative setting, and those data will in turn permit more informed study of what school leaders actually do, thereby permitting more informed examination of the relationships between leadership and the organizational conditions within which it evolves. A major limitation of efforts to understand leadership in schools is that researchers have proceeded

without sufficient attention to the special challenges of schools as settings for leadership. Furthermore, scholarship in educational administration tends to accept existing theories (developed in non-school contexts) as appropriate for the study of school leadership. While many of the ideas in the extant leadership literature are useful, they are very abstract and are not context-sensitive. It is difficult to know what the results of such studies might mean.

The study of leadership in schools needs to be very context-sensitive. We need comparative studies of elementary, middle, and high school leadership. We need to compare school leadership in rural, suburban, and urban schools, and between large, medium, and small schools. What are the similarities and differences? How are these patterns of school leadership similar and different from those in other types of organizations, or in other cultural contexts?

In concluding these recommendations, a number of questions are offered for study. These are embedded in the following summary observations about the nature of leadership in schools. Some of questions are posed explicitly -- others remain to be ferreted out by the reader:

1. While leadership is a multifaceted phenomenon, it at root is associated with goodness, with effectiveness, with improvement, and with efforts to achieve a future state more desirable than the one at present. What are the antecedents to leadership, and what are the connections between leaders' intentions, their actions, and

school leadership

their effects?

2. While leadership variously is associated with expectations for a position, office, or status, leadership also refers to a certain form of influence, to behavior, to an aesthetic quality, and to attributes or characteristics of individuals. What does the complete "set" of leadership phenomenon look like, and what can be observed about the elements of the set and their interrelations? What is gained or lost through efforts to make our understandings of school leadership more concrete?

3. Leadership as described in this paper is a special form of influence associated with inducing others to change their preferences (actions, attitudes, premises, etc) **voluntarily**. What are the various sources of influence employed by school leaders, and what are their consequences for others, for leaders, and for the school as an organization?

4. Principals are responsible for maintaining a smoothly operating school as well as for making the school more effective in achieving its goals. These dual goals are accomplished through administering the school **and** leading teachers. How are administering and leading similar and different in a school, and what is the relationship of one to the other, and to goal accomplishment?

5. Because the school is a special type of normative organization, principals must rely extensively upon leadership as the primary means by which to maintain and improve the school. What

other means does the principal employ to accomplish these ends? What are the observable "substitutes" for leadership?

6. A basic challenge for the principal is to develop and sustain an effective source of normative influence with teachers. While numerous sources may be cultivated, it is proposed that norms rooted in the ethos and culture of teaching as a profession will provide the most effective basis for leadership in a school, be it leadership by the principal or by a teacher. What are the sources of normative influence cultivated and used by principals, and how is one's ability to lead in a school cultivated and sustained?

7. Central to the culture of teaching is a belief that teachers, as professional educators, have a moral obligation to contribute positively to the intellectual, social, and emotional development of the children in their charge; that the principal, as a school administrator and as a professional educator, is duty-bound to support teachers in their efforts and to secure for teachers and children the materials and conditions needed for their work. What is the nature of the authority relationship among teachers and between teachers and the principal, and how is this associated with a principal's ability to lead teachers?

8. It has been argued in this paper that the most efficient and effective basis for leadership in a school is to draw upon and be responsive to the values and beliefs of teachers about their craft; to remind teachers of their core values and beliefs, of the importance of teachers' efforts in the lives of children, and of

the principal's efforts to support teachers and to create and maintain conditions that will enable teachers to teach and children to learn. In what manner is the principal's commitment to these moral values (and others) associated with their capacity to lead teachers?

9. Would schools be more able to accomplish their goals if they were more characteristically "feminine" in their structures, processes, and culture? That is, would they be more effective if they reflected moral values more typically associated with being female than male? For example, organizing and administering the school (including associated core activities of teaching and learning) along principles of cooperation rather than competition may yield better results. Similarly, is a principal committed to an ethic of cooperation more able to lead teachers than a principal who proceeds from a different (or opposite) premise? Does this hold for all school levels, or just elementary schools?

10. What are the consequences for a principal of teachers' expectations for leadership? What can be learned about leadership by gaining an understanding of the meaning of followership?

Conclusion

For Ed Bell, principal of Taft Elementary School, the critical observation by Wolcott (1973) is that every problem is perceived as important. This provides an important clue to understanding the challenge of leadership in schools. That every problem is perceived as important by Ed Bell tells us something about Ed as well as

about the character of Taft Elementary as a work setting. The thesis that runs throughout this paper is that the nature of leadership in schools is a product of the interaction between the principal and the situations he or she faces as the school's administrator. Because of differences in the demand environment faced by the school administrator, much of what one does to lead in a school differs from what one does to lead in other settings.

The demand environment in a school (even Taft Elementary) is complex and presents the school principal with a continuous stream of incidents (some more critical than others), most of which are unanticipated and of brief duration (Peterson, 1978; Morris et al, 1984). The demand environment in a school, by its nature, places the school principal in a reactive posture. Looked at from the principal's point of view, the question for that individual becomes whether or not to react to the presented "problem", how to respond, when to respond, who to involve, etc.

The demand environment is the given. While it will vary in particulars from one school to another, depending upon numerous other conditions, this continuous press to respond is a pervasive characteristic of schools in general, and it places the principal in a reactive posture. The difference between more and less effective principals thus centers in part on the personal qualities of the principal; the "situation imperatives" are given, for the most part, in most schools -- they aren't going to vary too much..

Personal qualities of the principal include one's motives,

ideas, skills, and, most importantly, one's moral value commitments as a professional educator. These qualities determine the response of a principal to the presented problem. Ed Bell's orientation was clear: he saw every problem as important and did the best he could to respond in what he believed to be the most appropriate manner. This is probably true of many school principals.

What influences what one sees and how or whether one responds to those perceptions? This question is nearly impossible to answer in detail, given the human condition. We all are relatively unique as individuals and, not counting basic biological and physical differences, our perceptions and actions are shaped by a complex constellation of experiences, motives, ideas, values, feelings, skills, and by the situation of the moment. What a school principal perceives and how or whether he or she responds is a function of the interplay between the immediate situation and all that one brings to that particular moment of action, decision, or reflection.

Despite these complexities of the principalship and of leadership in a school, the two-fold challenge for the field of educational administration is to (1) obtain a more complete descriptive understanding of the "situational imperatives" shaping the work-world milieu of school administration, and (2) describe the specific behaviors of formal and informal school leaders. What does day-to-day leadership in a school look like? Using Duke's (1986) very compelling theory about the aesthetics of leadership,

school leadership

what are the qualities of day-to-day leadership in schools?

More complete knowledge of these two realms will provide a basis for more informed preparation curricula, and more concrete guidance regarding the specific intentions, strategies, behaviors, and processes associated with effective leadership in schools. There is not a single best theory or conception of school leadership. Our field needs all the ideas it can muster, and a serious and sustained effort to study what school administrators do on a daily basis in schools will contribute in important ways to advancing our understandings and theories of school leadership.

References

Argyris, C. (1962). Interpersonal competence and organizational effectiveness. Homewood, Ill: Dorsey Press.

Bacharach, S.B., & Lawler, E.J. (1982). Power and politics in organizations: The social psychology of conflict, coalitions, and bargaining. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Ball, S. (1987). The micro-politics of the school: Towards a theory of school organization. London: Methuen.

Bass, B.M. (1981). Stogdill's Handbook of leadership. New York: Free Press.

Becker, H.S. (1951). Role and Career Problems of the Chicago Public School Teacher. Ph.D. Thesis, University of Chicago.

Bidwell, C.E. (1965). "The School as a Formal Organization." In J.G. March (Ed.). Handbook of Organizations. Chicago: Rand McNally.

Blase, J.G. (In press). The Micropolitics of Life in Schools. Newbury, MA: SAGE Publications, Inc.

Blase, J.J. (1989). The micropolitics of the school: The everyday political orientation of teachers toward open school principals. Educational Administration Quarterly, 25, 377-407.

Blase, J.J. (1987). Political interaction among teachers: Sociocultural context in the schools. Urban Education. 22, 286-309.

Blumberg, A. (1989). School Administration as a Craft. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Blumberg, A. and Greenfield, W. (1986). The effective principal, 2nd ed. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Bossert, S., Dwyer, D., Rowan, B., Lee, G. (1982). The instructional management role of the principal. Educational Administration Quarterly, 18, 34-64.

Boyan, N.J. (1988). "Describing and Explaining Administrator Behavior." In N.J. Boyan (Ed.). Handbook of Research on Educational Administration. New York: Longman.

Boyd, W.L. (1988). "Policy Analysis, Educational Policy, and Management: Through a Glass Darkly?" In N.J. Boyan (Ed.). Handbook of Research on Educational Administration. New York: Longman.

Bridges, E.M. (1982). "Research on the School Administrator: The State of the Art, 1967-1980." Educational Administration Quarterly. 18(3), 12-33.

Burns, J.M. (1978). Leadership. New York: Harper and Row.

Crowson, R. (1989). "Managerial Ethics in Educational Administration: The Rational Choice Approach". Urban Education. 23 no. 4: 412-435.

Cuban, L. (1988). The Managerial Imperative and the Practice of Leadership in Schools. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Cusick, P.A. (1973). Inside High School. New York: Hope.

Cusick, P.A. (1983). The Egalitarian Ideal and the American High School. New York: Longman.

Duke, D.L. (1986). "The Aesthetics of Leadership." Educational Administration Quarterly. 22(1): 7-27.

Dwyer, D. & Smith, L. (1987). The principal as explanation of school change: An incomplete story. In W. D. Greenfield (Ed.), Instructional leadership: Concepts, issues, and controversies (pp. 155-178). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Dwyer, D., Lee, G., Rowan, B., and Bossert, S. (1983). Five principals in action: Perspectives on Instructional Management. Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, San Francisco.

Erickson, D.A. (1979). "Research on Educational Administration: The State of the Art". Educational Researcher. 8: 9-14.

Etzioni, A. (1964) Modern organizations. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.

Etzioni, A. (1975). A Comparative Analysis of Complex

Organizations: Revised and Enlarged Edition. New York: Free Press.

Etzioni, A. (1965). "Dual Leadership in Complex Organizations." American Sociological Review. 30(5): 690-91.

Gibb, C.A. (1969). Leadership. In G. Lindzey & E. Aronson (Eds.), The handbook of social psychology, 4, (pp. 205-282). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing.

Greenfield, W.D. (1991a). "Rationale and Methods to Articulate Ethics and Administrator Training." American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL.

Greenfield, W.D. (1991b). "The Micropolitics of Leadership in an Urban Elementary School." American Educational Research Association. Chicago, IL.

Greenfield, W.D. (1988). "Moral Imagination, Interpersonal Competence, and the Work of School Administrators." In Leaders for America's Schools. Ed. D.E. Griffiths, R.T. Stout, and P.B. Forsyth. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan Publishing Company.

Greenfield, W.D. (1987a). "Moral Imagination and Interpersonal Competence: Antecedents to Instructional Leadership." In W.D. Greenfield (Ed.). Instructional Leadership: Concepts, Issues and Controversies. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon, Inc.

Greenfield, W.D. (1987b). "Moral Imagination and Value Leadership in Schools." American Educational Research Association, Washington, D.C.

Greenfield, W.D. (1986). "Moral, Social, and Technical Dimensions

of the Principalship." Peabody Journal of Education 63: 138-149.

Gronn, P.C. (1983). "Talk as the Work: The Accomplishment of School Administration." Administrative Science Quarterly. 28: 1-21.

Gronn, P.C. (1984a). "I Have a Solution...": Administrative Power in a School Meeting." Educational Administration Quarterly. 20(2): 65-92.

Gronn, P.C. (1984b). "On Studying Administrators at Work." Educational Administration Quarterly. 20(1): 115-129.

Hall, R.H. (1987). Organizations: Structure and process. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.

Hostetler, K. (1986). "Ethics and Power: Implications for the Principal's Leadership." NASSP Bulletin 70, no. 488; 31-36.

Hoyle, E. (1986). The politics of school management. London: Hodder & Stoughton.

Iannaccone, L. and Lutz, F.W. (1970). Politics, Power, and Policy. Columbus, OH: Merrill.

Iannaccone, L. (1967). Politics in Education. New York: Center for Applied Research in Education.

Johnson, S.M. (1990). Teachers at work. New York: Basic Books, Inc.

Kmetz, J.T. and Willower, D.J. (1982). "Elementary School Principals' Work Behavior." Educational Administration Quarterly. 18(4): 62-78.

Levinson, H. (1968). The Exceptional Executive. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Lieberman, A. and Miller, L. (1984). Teachers, Their World, and Their Work. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Lipham, J.M. (1964). "Leadership and Administration." In D. Griffiths (Ed.). Behavioral Science and Educational Administration. Chicago: National Society for the Study of Education.

Lipham, J.M. (1973). "Leadership: General Theory and Research." In L.L. Cunningham and W.J. Gephart, (Eds.). Leadership: The Science and the Art Today. Itasca, IL: F. E. Peacock Publishers, Inc.

Lortie, D.C. (1975). Schoolteacher: A Sociological Study. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Martin, W.J. and Willower, D.J. (1981). "The Managerial Behavior of High School Principals." Educational Administration Quarterly. 17: 69-90.

Mitchell, D.E., Kerchner, C.T., Erck, W.C., and Pryor, G. (1981). "The Impact of Collective Bargaining on School Management and Policy." American Journal of Education. 89(2): 147-188.

Morris, V.C., R.L. Crowson, C. Porter-Gehrie, and E. Hurwitz (1984). Principals in Action: The Reality of Managing Schools. Columbus, OH: Merrill.

Peterson, K.D. (1981). "Making Sense of Principals' Work." Los Angeles, CA: Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association.

Peterson, K.D. (1978). "The Principal's Tasks." The Administrator's Notebook. 26(8): 1-4.

Pfeffer, J. (1982). Organizations and organization theory. Marshfield, Massachusetts: Pitman Publishing, Inc.

Pfeffer, J. (1981). Power in Organizations. Marshfield, MA: Pitman Publishing, Inc.

Reyes, P. (1990) (Ed.). Teachers and Their Workplace. Newbury Park: SAGE Publications, Inc.

Schriesheim, C.A., Tolliver, J.M., & Behling, O.C. (1982). Leadership theory: Some implications for managers. In J.L. Gibson, J.M. Ivancavich, & J.H. Donnelly (Eds.), Readings in organizations (pp. 211-220). Plano, TX: Burness Publications.

Waller, W. (1961). The Sociology of Teaching. New York: Russell and Russell.

Weick, K.E. (1976). "Educational Organizations as Loosely-Coupled Systems." Administrative Science Quarterly. 21: 1-19.

Wolcott, H.F. (1973) The Man in the Principal's Office: An Ethnography. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.

Yukl, G.A. (1989). Leadership in organizations. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.