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ABSTRACT

A change-agent worked to develop leadership in a medium sized private secondary school. Two similar schools were used as control groups.

Prefects were helped to clarify the aims and objectives of their education, and to agree upon the role of prefects in the school. A series of exercises designed to develop human-relations skills associated with leadership was completed. Ideas and information generated by the prefects were conveyed to staff, who were encouraged to discuss and implement useful suggestions.

Towards the end of the programme the prefects were to review their experiences and attempt to set objectives for their successors.

Two questionnaires, a diary, and interviews with staff were used to guage progress.

Evidence suggested the need for a more permissive form of leadership to be exercised by staff in order to allow the idealistically motivated and technologically sophisticated pupils scope to develop themselves and their school. A great need exists for support, encouragement and co-operation from staff in helping pupils to conceptualize and implement development programmes they propose for the school.
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This thesis is concerned to study leadership, and in particular, the development of leadership in secondary schools, especially among prefects. The study focused particularly on the leadership of prefects in three girls' secondary schools; all private schools of medium size.

This thesis is essentially an exploratory study. Testable hypotheses are therefore not the target or focal point of the work. Instead it is bounded and directed by aims, and by some tentative exploratory hypotheses. By the end it should be possible not only to offer comment on the likelihood of the hypotheses, but also to offer suggestions for improving the hypotheses themselves.

Approaches combining elements of the classical psychological experiment, the participant-observer style of investigation, and the anthropological investigation, are worked together in the study. It is hoped that the mixture of styles will serve to make it a more worthwhile contribution to our understanding of leadership in schools, and an instructional aid for those who are concerned with developing leadership qualities in secondary school pupils and particularly in prefects.
LEADERSHIP

In schools, where the present work was set, leadership is a ubiquitous phenomenon. To some extent most school members have some degree of leadership. Leadership is also considered to underlie a great deal of the school's life: the spirit, the standards, the culture of the school are all products of, and causes of, leadership.

But leadership is an evasive entity. It does not admit of precise definition (though everyone knows what it is!). It seems not to exist without leaders, but on the other hand the removal of a leader rarely removes leadership: it only changes its expression.

Leadership seems to be related to the setting of a vision or ideal, to the way example is provided, and to the way encouragement is offered. Leadership is both the fruit of, and the cause of these qualities. Leadership has been the stimulus for huge volumes of study, musing, speculation and philosophizing.

Leadership is a topic that has aroused great interest. Perhaps it is no exaggeration that it has been a topic of interest since the beginning of men's involvement with one another. The psychological literature contains a great deal of theorising about and study of leadership, especially leadership in work situations. Attempts have been made to develop sophisticated general theories of leadership, and
approaches have fallen between one extreme of attributing leadership almost entirely to the personal characteristics of the leader, and another of attributing leadership almost entirely to the nature of the particular social environment in which it arises. (Marlowe 1972)

**THIS STUDY**

The present study begins with a review of some of the more prominent theories offered in the literature, and describes the one theoretical attempt which seems to the present author to best blend comprehensiveness, usefulness and intelligibility. An attempt is also made to gain some understanding of the way leadership is viewed by teachers in the schools, and by the educational authorities.

After this foundation is laid, aims and tentative hypotheses are established. Next the present study's method of approach is explained; the way systematic investigative procedures were organized and executed is described. The results of the investigations are then presented: these results consist of statistics from the questionnaire, interviews with staff, and the reflections from a diary.

The results are evaluated and discussed and their bearing on the hypotheses is considered. Finally some areas where future work is necessary are proposed, and some suggestions about how this might be carried out are offered.
SCHOOL SETTING

In the schools investigated leadership is vested primarily in the principal. Beyond her (in each case) teachers were given an official hierarchy to work within, with a deputy-principal, heads of departments, the rest of the staff. In each school some staff members also had portfolios such as discipline, boarders (for the two schools where some pupils lived at school), sports responsibilities, class responsibilities. The network was sufficiently complex that it took some time to realise who was responsible for what.

Among pupils in two schools prefects were nominated and appointed, by senior pupils and staff respectively. These sixth or seventh form girls were then assumed to fulfil many leadership functions among the pupils of the school: some such as 'house leaders', were assigned portfolios by a member of staff, usually the principal. (Pupils were assigned to one of four "houses" for sports competition and other cultural activities).

Beyond these specific portfolios, prefects as a group were expected by the staff to "set the tone" of the school. This task was seen (when people thought of it at all) in terms of policing school rules, and setting a good example. School rules applied to dress and behaviour in school and around town. (e.g: No wearing of jewellery while in school uniform).
The third school appointed school councillors. For the purposes of this study sixth and seventh form councillors are equated with prefects in the other two schools (and called prefects) but this equation is only very approximate. In the third school a serious effort was made to give pupil leaders real responsibilities; councillors were appointed to specific functions because of their abilities and interest and the system appointed councillors throughout the school (at all levels). In these three respects the leadership system for these pupils was different from that at the other two schools.

The third school's 'prefects' excepted, two general observations about leadership apply in all of the schools both among staff and pupils.

Firstly, rules (in some shape or form), apply to just about every situation where scope might exist for leaders to lead. For the staff curricular bind their approach to the subject matter; policies govern every other area of school life. For the prefects, staff create and uphold an equally restricting structure of rules or regulations (no jewellery with school uniform!).

And secondly, inspite of rules and of assigned positions, most often when someone in school is interested and/or skilled in something, they go right ahead and do it. Often in doing so they generate a following, so that many activities proceed and are led quite satisfactorily without any structured link to the rest of the school.
DEFINING LEADERSHIP

A necessary first step in the study of leadership is to clarify precisely what leadership is. The definitions of "leaders" or "leadership" that authors use are sometimes not accurately reflected in the people they select as leaders in experiments, and sometimes the clarity of the definitions themselves can be questioned. Such statements as "leadership is best understood as a role relationship in which one or more members are recognised as special facilitators toward group goals" (Newcombe et al. 1965 p. 485) are common, but as is apparent, are heavily influenced by the bias of the author. The task (of defining 'leadership') is one fraught with conceptual and other difficulties.

To some extent one can work backwards by seeing how authors pick the people that they study in studies of leadership, and inferring from this the kind of definition or approach to leadership that they have implicitly or explicitly adopted. As Newcomb; Turner and Converse (1965) mention, some authors explicitly espouse a definition of leadership which their evidence shows they implicitly deny. Riedesal, in his consideration of Bales work, for example, observes that "a long standing indicator of expressive prominence or leadership in small group interaction has been popularity" (Riedesal 1974 p.557) although no attempt to relate popularity to leadership is offered.
One method of choosing leaders is simply to choose characters who are, in the estimation of the common populace, outstanding leaders. ("Studies" abound of Winston Churchill, Montgomery, Adolf Hitler and plenty of other (supposedly) great leaders, but these studies are mostly historical investigations rather than scientifically controlled studies). Another approach, quite common in the studies reviewed, is the selection of leaders in accord with the expressed opinion of the majority of members of a group which the leader is supposed to have led. Many researchers have used the judgements of the leader's supervisor as a criterion of their leadership and there are those who simply equate leadership with official position or title. Sometimes a criterion for leadership is the output or satisfaction of members of the group, it being hypothesised that good leaders get the best results from their groups. Some researchers have chosen, within a broad sphere of leadership, to concentrate simply on a few specific behaviours that might be related to leadership.

In order to make a choice between any of the above methods in selecting leaders we should begin by examining some of the main approaches to leadership theory.

LEADERSHIP IN TERMS OF PERSONALITY ATTRIBUTES

In 1948 Stodgill undertook a survey of the literature of personal factors associated with leadership. In the survey he was "concerned only with those studies in which some
attempt has been made to determine the traits and characteristics of leaders". (Stogdill 1948 p.35) He observed (as I already have) that leadership is frequently not defined, and that "methods used in the investigation appeared to have little relationship to the problem as stated". (Stogdill 1948 p.36)

His survey included only factors which were studied by three or more investigators, a wise precaution, since in an earlier "review of twenty different investigations of the traits of individuals regarded as leaders in various kinds of groups" (Bird 1940), altogether seventy nine different traits were mentioned. Less than half of these seventy nine traits appeared on more than one of the twenty lists, even allowing for near synonyms". (Newcombe et al. 1965 p.474) Stogdill lists as the primary methods employed for identification and study of leaders:

"(a) observation of behaviour in group situations
(b) choice of associates (voting)
(c) nomination or rating by qualified observers
(d) selection (rating or testing) of persons occupying positions of leadership, and
(e) analysis of biographical and case history data". (Stogdill 1948 p.36)
Stogdill's approach is simply to take the suggested personality trait or characteristic and to list all the studies in favour of each of the positions that can be adopted with regard to it. For example

"1. Chronological age

(a) leaders found to be younger; six studies.

(b) leaders found to be older; ten studies.

(c) no difference found; two studies.

(d) differs with situation; one study". (Stogdill 1948 p.39)

In a large number of studies "student leaders are found to rate somewhat higher than followers in dependability, trustworthiness and reliability in carrying out responsibilities ... girls chosen as leaders tend to be those who inspire confidence ... The evidence available suggests that leadership exhibited in various school situations may persist into college and into later vocational and community life. However, knowledge of the facts relating to the transferability of leadership is very meagre and obscure". (Stogdill 1948 p.64)

"The items with the highest overall correlation with leadership are originality, popularity, sociability, judgement, aggressiveness, desire to excel, humour, co-
operativeness, liveliness and athletic ability, in approximate order of magnitude of average correlation coefficient". (Stogdill 1948 p.63) He suggests that suitable general headings for all of the factors which are associated with leadership might be capacity, achievement, responsibility, participation and status.

One might say of this 'personality' approach to leadership that the train of argument is somewhat circular. A dominant or responsible person is chosen as a leader for the purposes of the study, then after careful research into what makes him a leader we discover that it is because he is dominant or responsible.

The other major criticism to be levelled at this type of approach is that it does not clearly and precisely define its terms, in such a way that they can usefully serve as precise scientific tools. Such terms as sociability, cooperation, adaptability, dependability, persistence, alertness, judgement and many more are all, to greater or lesser extents, wide open to this criticism.

Also it "becomes clear that an adequate analysis of leadership involves not only a study of leaders, but also of situations". (Stogdill 1948 p.65) Since the early work, largely reviewed by Stogdill, it has become fashionable to consider leadership more in situational terms than as an artifact of an individual's personality. Any controversy as
to the relative importance of "personality" and "situational" variables in leadership should be carefully examined for the conceptual clarity of these notions.

Two people, and the theories generated by them and those that have gathered around them, now tend to dominate the field of leadership to a large extent.

LEADERSHIP IN TERMS OF BEHAVIOUR

E.A. Fleishman is the first of these people. Fleishman has conducted a lot of his research with the U.S. Air Force Air Training Command, Human Resources Research Centre, Ohio. He recognised the emphasis that had been placed on "postulated traits that leaders should possess, or overall evaluations of leaders" (Fleishman 1953 p.1) and argued in favour of an approach which described leadership behaviour and could be applied in many situations. Fleishman used "expert judges" to generate over eighteen hundred items which could conceivably be linked with leadership behaviour. These were then sorted by the judges into nine dimensions of leadership behaviour.

"1. Integration - acts which tend to increase co-operation among group members or decrease co-operation among them.

2. Communication - acts which increase the understanding and knowledge about what is going on in the group."
3. Production emphasis - acts which are oriented towards volume of work accomplished.

4. Representation - acts which speak for the group in interaction with outside agencies.

5. Fraternisation - acts which tend to make the leader a part of the group.

6. Organisation - acts which tend to differentiation of duties and which prescribe ways of doing things.

7. Evaluation - acts which have to do with distribution of rewards (or punishment).

8. Initiation - acts which lead to changes in group activities.

9. Domination - acts which disregard the ideas of persons or members of the group". (Fleishman 1953 p.2)

One hundred and fifty items such as "he encourages group members to work as a team" or "he insists that everything be done his way", (examples of integration and domination respectively) were then selected for these nine categories. A questionnaire thus constructed was applied and the results analysed. A factor analysis was undertaken "in order to identify empirically the factor structure of the questionnaire". As a result of this process, two major factors were identified and defined as consideration and initiating structure.
"Initiating Structure (S): Reflects the extent to which an individual is likely to define and structure his role and those of his subordinates toward goal attainments. A high score on this dimension characterises individuals who play a more active role in directing group activities through planning, communicating information, scheduling, trying out new ideas, etc.

Consideration (C): Reflects the extent to which an individual is likely to have job relationships characterised by mutual trust, respect for subordinates' ideas, and consideration of their feelings. A high score is indicative of a climate of good rapport and two-way communication. A low score indicates the supervisor is likely to be more impersonal in his relations with group members". (Korman 1966 p.349)

"Two minor factors were tentatively labelled 'Production Emphasis' and 'Social Sensitivity'." (Fleishman 1953 p.2)

Since the work of Fleishman and of Hemphill (1950), who is attributed with initiating the research which led towards the development of the Leader Behaviour Description Questionnaire (L.B.D.Q.) by Stogdill (1969), the LBDQ has been used a great deal in industry and other situations, and variants of it have been derived in order to allow people to assess themselves, or their supervisors, and give results on the same 'consideration' and 'initiating-structure' scales. (See, for example, Fleishman 1953).
In 1966 Korman undertook a review of the substantial literature which had by that stage been generated by research using the LBDQ and LOQ. He made a number of penetrating criticisms. These were well summarised in an update of Korman's review made by Kerr and Schriesheim in 1974. In their update, Kerr and Schriesheim attempted

"1. to summarise the criticisms and recommendations of the Korman (1966) paper; and

2. review those published and unpublished studies concluded since then, to determine to what extent his criticisms have been met, and his recommendations adopted." (Kerr and Schriesheim 1974 p.555)

"In most cases, the researchers have made little attempt either to conceptualize situational variables which might be reflected or measure them". (Korman 1966 p.355) Since the time of Korman's review efforts have been made by many researchers to do so, but it is apparent from Kerr and Schriesheim's evaluation that there are a very large number of variables which can be construed as affecting leadership in important ways.

The second of Korman's criticisms was that "most of the reviewed studies yielded generally insignificant correlations between leader behaviour measures and criteria". (Kerr and Schriesheim 1974 p.556) This criticism Kerr and Schriesheim still considered to be valid in 1974, although
the practice of grouping data and operating from means had declined, thus providing slightly more significant results.

Korman observed that many of the studies employed a design which required that predictor and criterion ratings be made by the same individual and that this could well tend to nullify results. While Kerr and Schriesheim said that "this criticism remains true of many of the more recent studies" (Kerr and Schriesheim 1974 p.560), they considered that the problem was less acute in 1974 than it had been in 1966.

Korman’s fourth comment concerned the unsuitability of studies in enabling the question of causality to be approached. He noted that there was an absence of literature in which consideration and/or initiating structure were experimentally varied in order to observe the effects of various criteria. Kerr and Schriesheim found a few longitudinal studies which had attempted to bear upon this question, but without enormous success, and they concluded "Korman’s fourth criticism, relating to the impossibility of resolving the question of causality, is very nearly as valid today as it was in 1966". (Kerr and Schriesheim 1974 p.564)

Korman’s final criticism was that no one had attacked the problem of determining which Leader Behaviour Scores are related to criterion variables, and which are not. This task was considered to be of critical importance since some researchers had discovered curvilinear relationships which
made it important to know the boundaries within which consideration and structure made a difference. In 1974 this task had still not been undertaken.

Kerr and Schriesheim conclude: "thus, while we have unquestionably progressed in our knowledge and understanding of consideration and initiating structure, it is obvious that a great deal of additional research needs to be done before definitive statements about the effects of these two behaviour dimensions will be possible". (Kerr and Schriesheim 1974 p.565)

"The definition and measurement of leader Initiating Structure is not an easy task. It should also be obvious that far too little attention has been paid to this problem in the past, with the result that a myriad of definitions, working definitions and operationalisations have taken their place in the research literature. These have made comparability among leadership studies all but impossible, and have led to confusion and controversy surrounding the consequences of the Leadership Initiating Structure upon various criteria and the importance of the structuring dimension altogether." (Schriesheim, House and Kerr 1976 pp.317 - 318)

"It was never the primary intention of the Ohio State researchers to develop a full-blown situational theory of leadership" but Kerr, Schriesheim, Murphy and Stogdill (1974) attempted this task.
Kerr et al. proposed a set of ten propositions concerning situational effects of leadership. But they admit that their set of propositions leaves much to be desired as a theory of leadership. They acknowledged that "in order to develop a situational theory of leadership, ways must exist to classify both the leader and the situation". (Kerr et al. 1974 p.72) A problem, (common also to the Fielder model) is that "it is both conceptually and physically impossible to define and study all of the important variables which comprise the 'situation'". (Kerr et al. 1974 p.72)

LEADERSHIP IN TERMS OF PSYCHOLOGICAL INFLUENCE

Another group of writers who have established something of a school have formed around F.E. Fielder. His school has in some ways run parallel to Fleishman's, but has developed and investigated another measure of leadership. In recent years, one group of authors, (Kerr et al. 1974) have at least gone so far as to mention both schools in the same article, but one could not say that a co-operative approach has existed between the two schools. Indeed, it may be that their models are quite incompatible.

Leadership, according to Fiedler, is the process of influencing others for the purpose of performing a shared task. In grossly over-simplified terms, the leader may use the power of his position to enforce compliance, or he may
persuade and cajole his members to do his bidding. The measures utilised by Fiedler are designed to inspect these two styles of leadership. They are called the 'assumed similarity between opposites' (ASo) and the 'esteem for the least preferred co-worker' (LPC). To attain the ASo score, which Fiedler used most in his earlier studies, he asked subjects to think of everyone with whom he had ever worked, and then to describe the person who he considered his 'most preferred co-worker' (MPC), and the person who he considered his least preferred co-worker (LPC). These people need not be people with whom the subject is working at the time, allowing scores to be ascertained before people commence a job. The scores were attained on eight point bipolar scales, with poles describing personality attributes for example:

"Pleasant: --:--:--:--:--:-: Unpleasant
8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1
Friendly :--:--:--:--:--:-: Unfriendly"
8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

(Fiedler in Cartwright and Zander 1968 p.363). ASo scores are computed by working out the distance between the MPC and LPC as rated on the profiles. The LPC score is one component of ASo and is obtained simply by summing the scores on the profile describing the LPC.
Having constructed these scales, Fiedler admits that "they have been very difficult to interpret, since they do not correlate with commonly used personality and attitude scores". (Fiedler 1972 p.459) While at first they were interpreted as being a measure of psychological distance, later research has shown them to be more a motivational measure which manifests itself in different behaviours under different circumstances. A person who rates his LPC favourably (who has a high LPC score) is primarily motivated to obtain recognition and reward from others. A low LPC leader gains his self esteem and need satisfaction from performing the task. "He tends to be task oriented and structuring in his behaviour, and concerned with productivity rather than inter-personal relationships". (Fiedler, in Cartwright and Zander 1968 p.363)

After testing, a model was devised for classifying group task situations and indicating the type of leader who would function well in each.

Low LPC leaders perform best in groups in which they are either highly accepted or strongly rejected, while high LPC leaders perform better in groups intermediate in this respect. According to Fiedler, these results fit our everyday experience. "When the group backs the leader and the task is straightforward, the leader is expected to give clear directions and orders. The leader who under those conditions acts in a passive, non-directive manner will tend to lose the esteem of this group...
The considerate, human relations oriented approach seems most appropriate when the liked leader deals with a group engaged in a highly unstructured task such as a committee engaged in creative work or in decision making and problem solving tasks. Here the liked leader must be considerate of the feelings and opinions of his members; he must be permissive and non-threatening. The task-oriented, low LPC leader is likely to be impatient to get on with the work and perhaps too intolerant of side comments and offbeat suggestions". (Fiedler, in Cartwright and Zander 1968 pp. 372-373).

While Fiedler has developed the plausibility of his theory a great deal, a number of substantial criticisms of it still have not been met. There is no clear notion of what it is that LPC is a measure of. As we have mentioned, it was at first considered a measure of psychological distance, but later thought to be a motivational factor. In his more recent work Fiedler has discussed low and high LPC leaders variously as autocratic, control and task oriented type, and permissive and considerate type. "Fiedler describes the high LPC individual as 'relationship oriented' and the low LPC individual as being 'task oriented'. The theoretical orientation is derived from need theory and the behaviour is predicted on the basis of need satisfactions. If this is the case, then tests which demonstrate the relationship between individuals' need structures and LPC scores is
warranted. Although Fiedler never performed this test, he does note that several studies suggest that this assumption is true. Given the fact that this is such a crucial element of the theory, much more conclusive evidence is needed before this relationship can be accepted". (McMahon 1972 p.700)

McMahon summarises his criticisms:

"1. The LPC construct lacks explanatory power

2. The validity and reliability of the measure is questionable

3. Research presented on LPC offers conclusions which are contrary to the assumptions of Fiedler

4. LPC is supposed to measure need structure, but there is a lack of studies testing this point". (McMahon 1972 p.702)

Others have observed: "the fact that there is such a marked technological impact on the structure of management leads one to believe that the technology of an industry is an essential influence in structuring management, and also, at least by influence, the functions and character of supervision". (Dubin et al. 1965 p.12) This suggests that task structure is a primary variable, whereas Fiedler's model assigns it only a secondary place.
In recent years, Fiedler has suggested that the leadership styles measured by LPC sources are closely related to consideration and initiating structure; however a weight of recent evidence has denied this contention and some has indicated it to be false.

Although Fiedler repeatedly claims LPC to be "a relatively stable measure of personality," authors show that the research that has approached this question does not support his conjecture (Cummins 1972). Stinson and Tracey suggest that "the apparent instability of LPC scores may result from a change in the reference person (the least preferred co-worker), or it may be the result of an educational experience which influences such attitudes. In addition, leadership style of supervisors does not correspond to subordinate observation of leadership as reported on the LBDQ." (Stinson and Tracey 1974 p.484)

Kerr and Harlan asked "to what extent is situational favourableness affected by training and experience?" (Kerr and Harlan 1973 p.114) It is apparent that Fiedler's theory has moved ground on this question at least once. A second question is "is leader experience and training an important additional variable to the contingency model?" (Kerr and Harlan 1973 p.115) Fiedler at different times suggests both the affirmative and negative answer to this question. Kerr and Harlan wonder if it is "reasonable to assume that leadership training and experience will produce no change in LPC scores?" (Kerr and Harlan 1973 p.116)
Finally, Kerr and Harlan point out the need for some concern with the type, as well as the extent of training. They deplored Fiedler's practice of lumping human relations approaches to training with "the more orthodox type of approach which is concerned with providing the leader or manager with the more technical and administrative skills". (Fiedler 1972 p.115)

LEADERSHIP IN TERMS OF GROUP FUNCTION

It would be false to claim to have in any way reviewed the literature of leadership having only covered two rather narrow schools. Unfortunately though much of the rest of the leadership literature is enormously diverse in its background, the way it approaches leadership, and the conclusions it draws. There follow some of the sorts of contributions that the "human relations" approach to leadership offers. (The term "human relations" is used in a very broad sense).

In 1951 Carter et al. observed that there were no detailed descriptions of the actual behaviour of group members obtained in such a fashion as to allow definitive statements regarding the activities of one member relative to those of other members, and so they set out to provide this information. When their data were analysed only two categories emerged which consistently showed a significantly different level of activity between leaders and other group members:
"diagnoses situation makes interpretation" and "gives information on how to carry out action".

A number of other categories were also prominent, although not achieving statistical significance. These were "proposes course of action to others", "initiates action towards problem solving which is continued or followed", "gets insight" and "integrates group behaviour".

"These categories, along with the two previously mentioned, definitely imply that leaders are characteristically concerned with

(a) getting insight or analysing the situation, and

(b) with initiating the action required".

(Carter et al. 1951 p. 591) In some cases, the leaders' behaviour seemed determined by the task and the group.

The authors also observe some interesting differences between leaders who were appointed, and those who were allowed to emerge within the group without any official appointment. "It appears that in the appointed situation, the leader may perceive his role as that of a co-ordinator of activity, or as an agent through which the group can accomplish its goal. In the emergent group, on the other hand, the person who becomes the leader may take over the leadership by energetic action and by trying to get the other members to accept his leadership". (Carter et al. 1951 p. 591)
Various authors have suggested a list of group functions which the leader, or the leadership, must perform in a group. In few cases have these been based on such an empirical study as that of the last group of authors. But they are based on a great wealth of experience by group participants.

Different authors opt for slightly different lists, but the kind of functions generally agreed to constitute 'leadership' functions are:

**Initiation** - originating and facilitating new ideas and practices,

**Membership** - ensuring one's continued membership of the group,

**Representation** - relating on behalf of the group to outside individuals and groups,

**Organisation** - structuring one's own work and that of others,

**Integration** - conflict resolution and atmosphere management,

**Internal Information Management** - facilitating and controlling information exchange,

**Gate-keeping** - filtering and managing information entering and leaving the group,
Rewards - evaluation and expressions of approval or disapproval of members,

Production - managing the group in achieving tasks.

(Summarized from Burgon et al. 1974 pp. 147-148)

In addition to this classification of the functions of leadership, leaders themselves can be classified according to their 'style'. This classification uses an 'ideal type' approach, and again there is some dispute about details surrounding each of the types.

A bureaucratic leader is impersonal and rule-orientated: communication with other group members is infrequent and impersonal.

An autocratic leader is motivated by the need for power and prestige. Characteristically the leader determines all policy, and attempts to control all information.

A diplomatic leader seeks leadership for personal gain and recognition, but often creates an illusion of participation or democracy.

The democratic leader works hard to maintain membership functions, accepting leadership positions because of a desire to serve the group.

The laisse-faire leader. This style is more a non-leader style. There is complete freedom for group or individual
decision with a minimum of leader participation.
(Summarised from Purgoon et al. 1974 pp. 150-152)

These leadership styles are perhaps more sociological than psychological. They may be more useful for categorizing than for continuing scientific investigation in the psychological sphere.

LEADERSHIP IN TERMS OF SITUATIONAL VARIABLES

Another group of studies is concerned, to a large extent, with things that at least the Fleishman and Fiedler schools have called "situational variables".

Group size was studied by Hemphill (1950), who examined the relationship between group size and leadership in a group of "superior" leaders. Hemphill concluded, firstly that "as the group becomes larger, demands upon the leader's role become greater and more numerous". (Hemphill 1950 p.21) As a second conclusion, Hemphill suggested that as a group increases in size, tolerance for leader-centred direction of group activity becomes greater.

In 1969 Skinner undertook to examine "relationships between leadership behaviour patterns and organisational situational variables". She examined the form and degree of relationships between 'consideration' and 'structure' (as measured by SBDQ and LOQ) and three organisational criteria (turnover, grievance rates and supervisory ratings), as well as three situational variables (department size, working
conditions, and employee skill). In accord with earlier findings she noted a very definite curvilinear relationship between SBDQ 'consideration' and 'structure', and grievances and turnover. In particular, she noted that a 'consideration' score of above 66 does not appreciably influence turnover, whereas below that value there is a clear relationship between high 'consideration' and low grievances and turnover rates. Skinner also observed after a replication of her first study in a different situation, that although the background data for foreman in both situations was comparable, the results were not. This suggested that company and other situational influences are important and ought to be investigated further.

Although there was a time, perhaps in the 1940's, when the criticism was valid that insufficient attention had been paid to style, structure and setting in studying leadership, the contention of Hollander (1971) is that these institutional variables have tended to become something of a 'bandwagon' in the research since then. He and others, (e.g. MacLennan 1975) have recently been concerned to emphasise the proper value of the personal qualities of leaders.

LEADERSHIP RELATED TO SOME ISOLATED VARIABLES

Some other authors have not attempted to establish broad and comprehensive approaches to leadership. Instead they have specialised in a circumscribed area, which may nevertheless be important as part of an overall approach to leadership.
Probably chief among these areas is non-verbal communication. Black's examination found "that differences in judgement may be the result of non-verbal communication and suggested that non-verbal cues should be regarded as essential". Gitter et al. said that these results were of questionable "generalizability" but they certainly were suggestive (1975). Another study conducted by Stein in 1975 produced results quite consistent with these general conclusions after presenting subjects with group meeting records containing only verbal, only non-verbal, or both types of behaviour. After his study, Stein suggested that "why an individual has emerged to fulfil a leadership role in a group be studied from the point of view of group members selecting leaders or permitting emergence rather than of leaders emitting behaviours". (Stein 1975 p.125)

In 1969 Mehrabian undertook to survey the literature relating to "the significance of posture and position in the communication of attitude and status relationships". He found more studies which discussed the functions of posture and position variables relative to the communicator's attitude than those of posture and position variables relative to the status of communicator and addressee. Important variables generally agreed upon were physical distance between the two people, eye contact, the orientation of the communicator's body (i.e. the direction of his physical approach to the addressee), the use of the 'arms - akimbo'
position, and the relaxation of the trunk. All these actors acted as important indicators of the communicator's attitude towards the addressee. Along with these variables, the degree of arm openness of female communicators, and the degree of asymmetry in the arrangement of arms and legs in communicators have all been found, or hypothesized, to be associated with status relationships between the communicator and the addressee.

In discussion groups, research has found that quite minor artificial reward systems can have a significant impact on the behaviour of leaders and other group members. Nydegger remarks that the leader in such groups "appears to function in some way to maintain a favourable balance between rewards and cost." (Nydegger 1975 p.366)

Obviously appropriate would be some mention of female leadership. Unfortunately all the writing this author reviewed on the subject concerned the female leader who attempts to achieve leadership position in a large male-oriented organisation. Apart from this, it suffers from being couched in rather general and vague terms which are unhelpful. For example Chapman and Luthans conclude that their article "suggests that female leadership research shows there is probably no significant difference between male and female leadership styles but that there is a difference in leadership behaviours". (Chapman and Luthans 1975 p.173) Unfortunately Chapman and Luthans omit to ade-
quately distinguish between leadership styles and leadership behaviours in their article.

**A SYNTHESIS OF LEADERSHIP THEORY**

In the previous sections of this review it has become apparent that no general theory of leadership exists that can be considered adequate. The areas in which general theorists fail to reconcile studies and generate consistent theoretical notions seem adequately explained by adopting concepts from the approach of the following author, who succeeded in generating what Maddi (1972) calls a "comparative analysis". Useful themes, concepts, ideas, hypotheses, propositions and facts from many pieces of research and theorizing are all combined in an intelligent synthesis which is presented in the 1974 work of W.E. Halal.

After reviewing existing theories, Halal proposed to overcome their limitations by suggesting a model based on three criteria: "leadership style is the type of working relationship between subordinates and superior; and task technology is the type of work which subordinates perform; and subordinate motivation is the type of interests and values which characterise subordinate perceptions and behaviour". (Halal 1974 p.403) Few authors have included all three of these criteria in their theorizing.

Halal defines leadership effectiveness as the optimum functioning of the social system which is formed by subordinates
performing tasks under the direction of a superior. Subordinate job satisfaction and performance are the criteria of effectiveness, and therefore the dependent variables in the framework.

When the development of all three of these variables is in a similar state, a relatively stable leadership situation exists: its crudest system may be an 'autocracy', or at successive levels of sophistication 'bureaucracy', 'human relations', 'participation' and 'autonomy'. Halal develops 'ideal - types' of each of these leadership systems which are derived by collecting different cases of leadership style, task technology and subordinate motivation. They form, in Halal's contention, the outline for a general theory. It is possible to develop a continuum for each of these three dimensions, on which each of the above five systems fall. (See Figure I).
Halal goes on to propose that "leadership effectiveness is positively related to congruence among the permissiveness of leadership style, complexity of task technology, and idealism of subordinate motivation." *(Halal 1974 p.409)*

'Congruence' indicates that the level of sophistication on each dimension is similar; there is a tendency towards this congruence.
Difficulties arose in the writings of both Fleishman and Fiedler, and their schools, because they neglected one or other of these variables in their attempt at explanation. The application of these propositions allows a new understanding of their difficulties, although lack of space prevents a detailing of the difficulties and their solutions here.

When an imbalance exists between the levels of the three crucial variables - a lack of congruence - half a dozen distinct types of conflict occur; the type of conflict depends on the nature of the incongruence. For example, with permissive leadership style and simple task technology goes anarchy; with directive leadership and complex technology goes inhibition. (See Figure II)
Halal's propositions describe states of equilibrium which social systems composed of a superior and subordinates tend to maintain. "It is a condition in which leadership, technology, and motivation are congruent and, as a result, per-
formance and satisfaction are high". (Halal 1974 p.412) Of course not all systems will tend to approach their perfection very quickly, for any number of reasons, but those which do not tend to congruence will have much more difficulty in justifying and maintaining their existence. (March and Simon 1958)

Using Maslow's notion that people move towards what are here called more idealistic motivations, Halal proposes the obvious corollary, namely that all three of these dimensions in the long term tend towards their more sophisticated extreme.

"But there are several limitations to this theory which should be recognised. The particular concepts embodied within the three independent variables of leadership, technology and motivation may not encompass other important determinants of leadership effectiveness. Other variables, such as the charismatic qualities of the leader, organisational structure, identification of subordinates with the goals of the organisation, characteristic abilities and aptitudes of subordinates, cultural differences, etc. are probably also important determinants of leadership effectiveness. Also, the theory does not specify how maximum levels of effectiveness vary along the three dimensions (or among the five models). All of the above limitations obviously restrict the generality of the theory". (Halal 1974 p.414)
In spite of this criticism which Halal levels at his own theory, it does serve as a useful, intelligent and, in the present author's opinion, thoroughly acceptable synthesis of a field which has been marred by a seemingly unrelated, contradictory and bewildering morass of concepts, ideas, theories, hypotheses, and items of scientific research. It provides us with a model which is useful in discussing leadership at almost any level, from the most simple to the most complex, from the largest scale to the smallest, and from the most formal to the most creatively flexible situations.

A similar basic approach as been adopted recently by Hersey and Blanchard (1977). They apply their analysis to the narrower field (than leadership) of management: this diminishes Halal's emphasis on task technology as a crucial variable, and allows leadership effectiveness to be used as a criteria.

Just as changes are necessary when applying leadership theory in management, the setting of leadership in schools also qualifies some important factors. Although much work has explored leadership in management or work situations (Blake and Mouton 1964, Fiedler and Chemers 1974, Fleishman 1953, Fleishman and Peters 1962, Spector et al. 1960), relatively little has examined it in the school situation (Czartoryski 1974, Galfo 1975, Jensen 1975, Morrison 1974).
LEADERSHIP IN THE SCHOOL SITUATION

Much has been written and discussed in educational circles that bears specifically on the life of school pupils, but leadership appears to be a neglected topic. However, one major, recent, and local study has been conducted which devotes some consideration to the topic. The work, based on research conducted in New Zealand in 1976, focuses on the 'Realities of Curricula'. (Campbell 1978) Data was collected from a questionnaire administered to a national sample of teachers and pupils in state secondary schools, and from group interviews of members of the samples. Sampled groups included staff and pupils from co-educational, boys and girls schools of large (825+), medium (325-824) and small (-325) size. A total of 635 teachers and 1883 pupils completed the questionnaire.

While many of the issues discussed are outside the scope of the present work, Campbell's sections on the involvement of pupils and recognition of individual differences contain many significant points bearing on leadership. Her work shows that all groups acknowledge a large gap between the ideal and the real situation of pupil involvement, democratic classroom leadership and encouragement of group work. Her data on choice of activities and the making of rules shows that all levels of teachers have by far the dominant role in these activities. The gap perceived between the
ideal and its practice is greatest at fourth and fifth form level, but is significant throughout the whole school—including among staff.

There was some tendency for the seventh form pupils "throughout this study to be the most conservative and closest in their values to the teachers" (Campbell 1978 p.43)

"In the opinion of those who are just completing their secondary education, pupils have almost no say in decisions on curriculum content, teaching methods, assessment methods and forms of reporting to parents. There is some involvement of school councils in formulating aims and rules, but, again, the modal response is 'no involvement'. On the other hand, the dominant view is that all pupils should be involved in matters of aims, curriculum content, teaching methods and rules, and this view receives strong support too, in matters of assessment and reporting. The consultations that do occur are frequently described by the students as token ones". (Campbell 1978 pp. 43-44)

After citing statistical evidence showing that teachers believe the actual is only slightly nearer the ideal than the pupils do, Campbell concludes "when we consider items of this kind, it becomes clear that chasms have developed among intentions, commitments and practices". (Campbell 1978 p.48)

"There is no suggestion in the official publications that teachers should abdicate their traditional leadership roles,
and retreat into a resource one; rather, the intention is that they would retain the initiative but provide opportunities for pupils to become much more involved in the learning experiences as well as in decision making. The critical items, then, are ones in which teachers are doing things with, rather than to or for, pupils". (N.Z.P.P.T.A. 1969 p.11)

The kind of literature that is most likely to have been read by teachers (or pupils) about leadership is often not the sort of material alluded to so far. It is more commonly the type of "study" in which reputable individuals offer their ideas and feelings about the subject. Almost any popular magazine presents simple examples of this type of article, (e.g. Eisenhower 1965) which may be particularly useful to teachers, who do have extensive opportunities to study such fields as leadership in depth. It should be noted that Stogdill concludes his important review of the literature saying; "The most fruitful studies, from the point of view of understanding leadership, have been those in which leadership behaviour was described and analysed on the basis of direct observation or analysis of biographical case history data". (Stogdill 1948 p.64)

The kind of model of leadership which has most credence in the school environment has to do almost entirely with the personal qualities of an individual leader. Increasingly it is accepted that senior pupils need opportunities to have
differences emerge in many areas of school and social life. "It is widely accepted that sixth and seventh formers need opportunities to take initiatives and accept responsibility of their own choice, and time for discussion and argument on issues which range much wider than the normal subjects of the school curriculum, in short, they need to be treated more like students and less like pupils." (Renwick 1974 p.245-246) But the New Zealand Post-Primary Teachers' Association observed "teachers are often doubtful about their function in a classroom which gives children increased opportunities to participate in their own education". (N.Z.P.P.T.A. 1969 p.14) The P.P.T.A. admits that "children can grow in desirable ways even though their behaviour is not dictated by authority". (ibid.)

While the principles are there, often the reality is quite different, if understandably so. "Recognition of individual differences among pupils is still largely notional and while this is frustrating it is understandable. The teacher is given a large class of pupils, and a heavy teaching load for which a great deal of preparation is needed. With one but not the other - that is, large classes but plenty of preparation time, or little preparation time but small classes - we could probably manage. But we are often in the unhappy situation of having both together. Under these circumstances, we are being told to take account of individual differences, and we know that we should be doing this". (A teacher - reported in Campbell 1978 p.47)
The result of all this is that teachers are hampered in developing a more sophisticated understanding of or approach to the development of leadership by many factors; among them are the teachers own heavy workload, the teachers past experience, the absence of suitable direction, or leadership, or in-service training from those in a position to offer it, and an all round suggestion (from parents and the business community alike) that their fundamental responsibility is in the academic area. The shortage of easily read, clear, well developed and scientific data on leadership is no doubt also to blame.
Chapter 3  AIM OF THE RESEARCH

INTRODUCTION

A plan was devised whereby a change-agent (the present author) would be introduced into a secondary school, with the aim of facilitating some development in the leadership of the school. It was hoped to influence both the practices and attitudes of pupils and even of the school staff.

It was planned that work should be in the first place directly with the prefects in the school. This group is a vital influence in affecting the tone, and, it was supposed, the leadership initiative of others in the school. Although the prefects were the centre of the project, it was envisaged that work begun at their level would have repercussions throughout the school.

Throughout the literature review it has been apparent that the work of psychologists is still far from providing decisive parameters to, or well defined relationships between variables within, the field of leadership. On the contrary, even a consensus as to what the important variables are has yet to be achieved. Even Halal's work serves more to propose a synthesis of the work to date and suggest new hypotheses, than to state a widely accepted thesis. Accepting this present state of knowledge this study was
more concerned to recognise important variables than to explore hypotheses about the precise relationships between them.

Complex leadership relationships exist in many places in schools. The principal acts as leader in relation to staff, the prefects act as leaders towards the junior levels of the school, their fellow seniors, and to some extent towards each other. In addition a change-agent acts in some ways as a leader in his relationships with the principal, the staff, prefects and the seniors. 'Leader' does not denote one person in the school situation, or even one role, but it refers to any one of several different individuals or groups, depending on the specific population being discussed.

Throughout the whole project it was clearly recognised that this programme could be considered in a number of different ways. In the first place it could be considered simply as a classical psychological experiment with pre and post tests and control groups, and with a course of 'goal clarification' and 'human relations exercises' constituting the independent variable. Or the study might be considered more in the nature of an anthropological investigation with an observer coming in from outside and watching what was 'really' happening in the school (which is considered to be a 'sub-cultural' group). A third approach, which probably lies somewhere between the previous two as a theoretical approach, and nearer to the truth as a model of what actually happened, is one advocated by Warr. (1971)
In its purest form it proposes a team of social scientists which is split so that some members of the team become intimately involved in the social situation which they are attempting to analyse and influence, while other members of the team remain quite detached from it. The team meets regularly to discuss and analyse what seems to be happening. In this way the close involvement of those who are in the situation may be capitalised on, along with the more objective outside interest of other members of the team. In the present case this outside support was supplied both by the author's course supervisor at Massey, and by a secondary school teacher who has an extensive background in professional education.

**AIMS**

The primary aim of the present undertaking was to improve leadership in a school.

Stemming from this, the secondary aims were to:

(i) develop a strategy for improving leadership in the school;

(ii) study the effects of the strategy as it was implemented;

(iii) propose, on the basis of the experience, recommendations for future work in the area.
These aims did not however, stand isolated from the aims and motivations of the change-agent, the principal, or others involved with the undertaking. Although everyone's aims often coincided, scope existed for conflicts of interest, some of which did emerge and had to be resolved.

Particularly important were the motives of the change-agent and of the school principal, who by merit of her responsibility and authority was the official leader of the school, and under whose jurisdiction any work was (rightly) conducted. The change-agent's primary concern was that for the schools involved, the experience of having a psychologist working with them should not be a bad experience. Schools are institutions which are greatly influenced by tradition, and in some cases are slow to accept new ideas or experiment with changes. The feedback that the school receives about its performance is given over a long time span, and because of this, use of traditional methods does have benefits, especially where a school can see that the methods employed in the past have to a fair extent produced good results.

Using people with particular expertise in one field who are not part of the regular school staff is something of an innovation for schools. Though it is one which might fruitfully be adopted by a number of schools, staff are apt to be very sensitive about "outsiders" coming in and becoming closely involved with them in the running of the school.
The change-agent was concerned that if the school's expertise of him suggested that psychologists were people to be wary of, whatever results may have been produced for his own benefit, the growth of the school could be impaired.

The change-agent sought to become involved in a constructive way in the school by encouraging pupils to establish and clarify their own goals. This desire was also expressed in the area of human-relations, because it is here that schools have the opportunity to make a huge contribution to the experience of pupils - an opportunity that is too often not taken up fully.

High on the principal's list of priorities (if not at the top) came her desire to see the pupils benefit to the full from the academic and other pursuits of the school. She was also concerned to see the school running with a minimum of fuss, confusion and disruption. The principal was prepared to tolerate a certain amount of experimentation, and willing to allow the change-agent to attempt some creative changes, and to examine the results these produced.

As is apparent from a look at all these aims, there were many potential causes for conflict or controversy. Some of these occurred within the change-agent when it was not always apparent which of his aims should be pursued at a particular moment. Others occurred between him and the principal, when some aim being pursued by one was in conflict with the other's. And no doubt the principal her-
self suffered some concern on occasions in trying to establish priority in her own mind. In spite of the many potential conflicts that might have arisen we were able to work out differences that arose with an ease and goodwill which was impressive, and for which the change-agent was, and is, most grateful.

**HYPOTHESES**

In light of: examination of the literature, knowledge of the characteristics of the subjects and the school situation, the range of instruments available, and practical issues facing the change-agent, tentative hypotheses were proposed. Within the general framework of this exploratory study these hypotheses guide the content of the research towards fulfillment of the primary and secondary aims.

Null Hypothesis (Ho. 1) 'That there will be no significant difference between the movement of school groups (prefects and seniors) on various measures of leadership attitudes'.

If Ho. 1 is rejected, then one or more of the following may be accepted:

(i) a difference between seniors and prefects indicates that the experience of being a prefect will affect various measures of leadership attitude change;

(ii) a difference between trained and untrained prefects indicates that training will affect various measures of leadership attitude change;
(iii) a difference between senior pupils in "prefect-structured" schools and "council-structured" schools indicates that the school leadership structure affects various measures of leadership attitude change.

If the groups being tested are represented as:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prefects</th>
<th>School 1</th>
<th>School 2</th>
<th>School 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Seniors</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

then the hypothesis may be represented more simply.

$H_{01}$ proposes no relationships between the pre and post test differences of $A$ and/or $B$, and/or $C$, and/or $D$, and/or $E$, and/or $F$.

If rejected the alternatives are:

(i) $A + B + C$ differences $\neq D + E + F$ differences

(ii) $A$ difference $\neq B + C$ differences

(iii) $A + D + B + E$ differences $\neq C + F$ differences

Two subsidiary hypotheses were also considered:

$H_{02}$ 'That there is no relationship between initial LEAD score and subsequent score after one year's experience of senior schooling'.
If Ho is rejected then one or more of the following may be accepted:

(i) a positive correlation between initial score and change in score indicates that good leaders improve more than poor leaders with school experience.

(ii) a negative correlation between initial score and change in score indicates poor leaders improve more than good leaders with time; alternatively it indicates a regression towards the mean. (These two alternatives are indistinguishable).

The second subsidiary hypothesis is related to Halal's "possible modes of incongruence" presented in Figure II. This model proposes six possible incongruences in the matrix of relations between the "motivators" of subordinates (which can vary between materialistic and idealistic), the level of sophistication of the task "technology" (which can vary between simple and complex), and the "leadership" style of the leader (which can vary between directive and permissive). The six incongruences possible (taking these criteria two at a time) give rise to distinctive types of conflict which will be experienced: these are anomie, oppression, anarchy, inhibition, frustration and alienation. Figure II shows the combinations of criteria states giving rise to each type of conflict. Note that incongruence does not establish a right or wrong criteria position, but merely indicates that the
two criteria positions held are not congruent with each other. Congruence may be attained by moving either or both incongruent criteria away from their current positions.

\( H_0 \) That no pattern of conflicts emerges from prefects reports related to indicators of incongruent relationships between task "technology", subordinate "motivators" and "leadership" style.

If \( H_0 \) is rejected then one or more of the following may be accepted:

(i) expression of 'anomie' type conflict indicates motivators are materialistic in relation to the permissive leadership;

(ii) 'oppression' indicates idealistic motivators, directive leadership;

(iii) 'anarchy' indicates simple technology, permissive leadership;

(iv) 'inhibition' indicates directive leadership, complex technology;

(v) 'frustration' indicates complex technology, materialistic motivation;

(vi) 'alienation' indicates simple technology, idealistic motivation.
Chapter 4

METHOD

SUBJECTS

The subjects for the work on leadership comprised a number of groups from three medium sized secondary schools, some of whom became more involved than others. At the centre of the work was a group of 12 prefects at a girls' private secondary school (henceforth 'school 1'). Senior pupils from school 1 (i.e. all the sixth and seventh formers other than prefects) were also included in the study, as were staff — both full time and part time teachers involved in teaching the seniors. To a lesser extent, and principally as control groups, seniors, prefects and staffs from two similar schools, ('schools 2 and 3') were also involved. School 3 was of particular significance in that it operated a 'school council' system — a model of leadership different from the prefect system operated in the other two schools.

PROCEDURES

Before any work was undertaken in the school some time was spent with a psychologist at Massey, (my supervisor), and with the Principal and her assistant at school 1, planning the approach to be adopted. It was decided not to plan all the change-agent's time fully, but to develop a general strategy with detailed tactics being introduced as the exercise progressed. This allowed greater flexibility to adapt to needs as they arose.
The plan began with an introduction both of the change-agent personally, and of his goals and proposed activities. After this came some work with the prefects. Initially this was to be concerned with simply encouraging and enabling prefects to come to a clear understanding of the aims and functions of the school and of the purpose of their own role within it: "goal clarification". It was then hoped to begin to promote discussion among the staff by presenting the conclusions of the prefects' discussions to them.

The proposed strategy then suggested a course of human relations training exercises among the prefects - this was aimed at developing in them skills which had been agreed by the team (psychologist, principal, assistant and change-agent) to be leadership functions most important for prefects. These focused on trust, listening, discussion-leading, expressing feeling, influencing and working with staff.

Since N.Z.P.P.T.A. claims no need or likelihood for the teacher's role in management and administration to be transferred to the pupils, no training in these leadership skills was considered appropriate. "The critical items are ones in which teachers are doing things with, rather than to or for pupils". (N.Z.P.P.T.A. 1969 p.11) School is seen as a human relations situation, not as a productive/economic enterprise.

As well as this work with the prefects the change-agent was also to attempt to provoke development in the staff by wha-
ever discussions and involvement he could facilitate in an informal way (generally through informal staff-room discussions).

Towards the end of the year it was proposed that prefects and staff be encouraged to evaluate the year's experience and plan leadership functions in the school for the following year in the light of conclusions that they had come to about the desirable functions of leaders.

INSTRUMENTS

Instruments for the study were selected for their value on three criteria.

1. Their value as indicators of the variables to be examined was considered.

2. Their value was assessed in terms of the way they related to the study's basic aims, and motives.

3. Consideration was given to the reputation of the instrument: factors like the estimates of validity, reliability and the standardization of the instruments were considered.

1. THE LEAD QUESTIONNAIRE:

The LEAD (Leader's Employee-orientation And Differentiation) questionnaire of Dore (1973) was selected because it seemed to best meet the challenges of these criteria: it is a questionnaire that is reasonably short to administer,
requiring only about twenty to thirty minutes for the subject to complete. (This is a particular advantage in the school situation). It is reasonably simple and quite objective to assess. The questionnaire gives scores on scales whose meaning is similar to the consideration and initiating structure items of other tests.

The questionnaire was developed to provide an objective measure of attitudes toward methods of successful leadership, which would be useful in leadership training programmes. The successful leadership methods were identified in a series of studies by the Survey Research Centre at the University of Michigan and consisted of employee-orientation, delegation of authority, differentiation of the leader's role and creation of teamwork.

A separate scale of 30 items was constructed for each of the four leadership methods by item analysis of a longer experimental form administered to 220 college psychology students. The effects of human relations training on scale scores were determined by means of administering the instrument to an industrial psychology class before and after this training, using a general psychology class for a control.

The repeat reliability correlations of the original scales ranged from 0.68 to 0.86, with a repeat reliability of the total score on the questionnaire of 0.85. The inter-correlations of the scales indicated that the scales measure
two relatively independent attitudes: one involving an employee-orientation, a belief in the delegation of authority and a belief in the importance of teamwork — and the other involving a differentiation of the leader's role.

An indication of the validity of the test was demonstrated by the significant correlations of all the scales with student's grades in an industrial psychology course in which the leadership methods were taught. The validity also was shown by the significant increase in mean total score for the students after having completed the industrial psychology course, while the control group of general psychology students showed no significant gain.

"The original questionnaire was later reduced from 120 items to a more practical length of 60 items. The E scale was made up of one-third items from the original employee-orientation scale, one-third items from the original delegation of authority scale, and one-third items from the original creation of teamwork scale, since these three original scales were highly correlated and, therefore, appeared to measure a single variable. The D scale retained all 30 of the original items from the differential role scale". (Dore 1973 p.95)

The questionnaire admits to its respondents that it is a "survey of how you feel about some different methods of leadership". (Introduction to LEAD Questionnaire)

Respondents proceed to make their choices of one of each of
the sixty pairs of statements. (A copy of the questionnaire appears as Appendix 1)

The answer sheets for the LEAD questionnaire are scored and give two independent totals. Each score fits on a scale ranging from one to thirty. People who are high on the 'employee-orientation' scale "tend to agree with the following leadership techniques; being oriented towards your employees as people rather than as a means of production, delegating authority and responsibility for decisions to the employees where possible, and creating an atmosphere of teamwork and co-operation. If you score low on this scale, you agree with these methods; assigning all tasks to employees rather than letting them help decide assignments, making most decisions yourself, supervising closely, stressing rules and work standards, and focusing on individual performance and competition rather than co-operation.

On the differentiation scale a high score means that you tend to agree that a leader's activities are different from those of his employees and include explaining and discussing changes in the work, planning and scheduling the overall groups activities, training employees, explaining their job responsibilities, giving them feedback on good and poor performance, and trying out new ideas. If you score low on this scale, you tend to feel that a leader should stress: doing the same kind of activities as the employees, being a
high individual expert in his field, and working hard personally to get a big share of the work done”. (Dore 1973 p.102)

Briefly stated the E score is a measure of the extent to which a leader regards the workers under him as people rather than a means of production. It resembles Fleishman's 'consideration' factor.

The D score is a measure of the extent to which a leader's function is considered by him to be different from that of his followers. It resembles Fleishman's 'initiating structure' factor. (The scores may be added together to give a total LEAD score, but this is only a summary of the two individual scores).

It was expected that this questionnaire would provide a fairly simple and objective assessment of the attitudes towards leadership of each of the groups who were to be studied. It was applied at the beginning of the year and at the end. By this pre and post test it was hoped that we could detect any movement which occurred, as a result of:

1. experience in the senior school;

2. the experience of being a prefect;

3. the training programme given to one group of prefects;

4. the authority structure operated in one school.
2. THE STYLE QUESTIONNAIRE:

The Personal and Interpersonal Style questionnaire was adopted from a programme of self administered exercises for personal and interpersonal development (Krusell et al. 1971). This questionnaire (see Appendix 2) is a less sophisticated psychological instrument, but it was thought that it might have some value. As the year progressed it seemed that for some groups there would be a movement towards perceived and ideal selves approximating each other more closely. If significant differences occurred among groups in the way they moved, some conclusions might be able to be drawn about the effect that the groups' school leadership experience had had on them in this area, especially when considered along with other indicators.

The importance of subjects perceived and ideal selves can easily be underestimated. "The predictions made in simple direct self-ratings and self-reports generally have not been exceeded by those obtained from more psychometrically sophisticated personality tests, from combined test batteries, from clinical judges, and from complex statistical analyses". (Mischel 1968) (Also see Mischel 1971 pp.204-207)

3. SEMI-STRUCTURED INTERVIEWS:

In addition to these two instruments two others were used. At the end of the year semi-structured interviews were conducted with a randomly chosen sample of the seniors'
teachers. These interviews were conducted with school 1 staff on the assumption that they would be in a position to be aware of the state of leadership practices and attitudes in the school, and to assess any impact the programme had made on it.

Five main areas were explored in the interviews. Methods of selection of the prefects were considered to see what they were, how widely any procedures were understood, and what criteria were used to choose prefects. The way(s) prefects were initiated into their new roles was examined: how they were informed of their 'appointment', what they were told about the position and their responsibilities, and how the rest of the school community was informed.

The amount of guidance and/or support they were given as they took up their new roles was explored. Further areas were the way prefects functioned in their role as the year progressed, and the effect that having the role of prefect had on the girls. (See Appendix 3 for full outline)

The semi-structured interviews were conducted with a randomly chosen group of school 1 teachers. One third of the teachers were chosen (using a random number table and a list of all the teachers who taught in the senior classes to which the prefects belonged). The five interviews were conducted by the change-agent, and took between 20 and 75 minutes. They were held in a disused staff room which proved ideal for quietness, comfort and privacy.
The outline of the topics to be covered had been prepared in consultation with my supervisor at Massey, and another teacher (not one of those interviewed). In each interview this guideline was adhered to, although in a loose way, to allow the teachers a fair amount of freedom to include whatever comments they wished to make, while ensuring the basic core of material was covered. The interviews were tape-recorded and then transcribed, and so preserved fully for analysis.

4. THE DIARY:

The fourth investigative procedure was the use of a diary. This was used regularly to record observations of the change-agent about facts, feelings, approaches, ideas, intentions and experiences of himself and others. The diary was selected as an instrument to cover three major gaps in the kind of data that would otherwise be gathered. A progressing record was desired since the recognition that developing leadership is in some ways akin to social development. "In order to effectively produce change in individual behaviour, some reorganisation of the social environment also seems necessary". (Fleishman 1953 p.206 See also his p.205) The diary would supplement questionnaire information and help approach notions of causality - or at least get a view on these independent of the teachers' possible bias. In addition the diary would serve to detail information about the application of each successive part of the
programme, and record its immediate and obvious effects, or at least the responses to each exercise.

The change-agent spent sixteen Mondays with the group of prefects at school 1. These began on March 14 (when school had already been going for approximately six weeks) and continued through the year until September 26, about six weeks before the end of the school year. In the middle came gaps for the May and August holidays. Also about Easter time consecutive weeks were missed on account of Easter holiday, Anzac day, the prefects school exams, and Queen's birthday. Another day was lost to a mid-term break.

The first three meetings were concerned with clarifying the aims and goals of the school and the functions of prefects within it. (See Appendix 4) Then came ten weeks spent doing various 'human-relations' type exercises aimed at developing different leadership skills. Towards the end of the year a review of what had been achieved by the prefects in the school year was attempted.

The final session of the year with the prefects was in November, in the middle of their exams, when we met more informally.
Chapter 5

PRESENTATION OF RESULTS

The inevitable outcome of having four distinct investigative procedures, is that there are four sets of results to present. These will be treated in the same order in which the procedures (from which the data were gathered) were discussed in the previous chapter; firstly the statistical data obtained from the two questionnaires; next the data from the diary and lastly the interviews.

**STATISTICAL DATA FROM QUESTIONNAIRES**

Data from the LEAD questionnaire were gained from the answer sheets by use of a scoring template which gave, with relative ease (if some tedium) the E and D score for each respondent. These scores were listed for the March and again for the October testing.

For the sake of the statistical analysis, only the data from those respondents who filled in the questionnaire in both March and October were used. Very few staff members at schools 2 and 3 completed questionnaires, and their results had also to be omitted as constituting inadequate samples.

All those who responded only once (most of whom responded in March and not in October) were eliminated. It was hoped that this process might allow us to use a statistical test sufficiently delicate to perceive any changes, and it was assumed that those who responded only once would be spread evenly through the range. Although no statistical valida-
tion of this assumption was made, an examination of the scores of those who responded only once shows that they are spread fairly evenly across the range of scores elicited, and supports the assumption (See table I).

**TABLE I**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q U A R T I L E</th>
<th>One</th>
<th>Whole</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Top</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>Btm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff 1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefects 1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefects 2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefects 3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seniors 1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seniors 2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seniors 3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All groups</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table I: Distribution of subjects who completed the LEAD questionnaire only once and hence were omitted.

**Note:** 77.5% of those canvassed completed both pre and post test.
A comparison was made between pre and post test scores of groups (which might be expected to vary similarly or to influence each other) on each scale of the LEAD questionnaire. (See tables II, III, IV and V).

**TABLE II**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups Compared</th>
<th>Total Number</th>
<th>2 tail t-test</th>
<th>Level of p.*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stf 1 vrs Pre 1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3.492</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stf 1 vrs Sen 1</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1.215</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre 1 vrs Sen 1</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2.607</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre 2 vrs Sen 2</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3.425</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre 3 vrs Sen 3</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>0.901</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre 1 vrs Pre 2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4.275</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre 1 vrs Pre 3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4.248</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre 2 vrs Pre 3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.165</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sen 1 vrs Sen 2</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>2.336</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sen 1 vrs Sen 3</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0.142</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sen 2 vrs Sen 3</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>2.539</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table II:** Various staff, prefects and seniors groups compared in terms of employee-orientation scores at pretest.

**Note:** * Level of p. = level of significance.

N.S. = not significant.
### TABLE III

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups compared</th>
<th>Total Number</th>
<th>2 tail t-test</th>
<th>Level of p.*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stf 1 vrs Pre 1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.467</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stf 1 vrs Sen 1</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>0.052</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre 1 vrs Sen 1</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0.617</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre 2 vrs Sen 2</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0.303</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre 3 vrs Sen 3</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>0.621</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre 1 vrs Pre 2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.473</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre 1 vrs Pre 3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.034</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre 2 vrs Pre 3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.329</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sen 1 vrs Sen 2</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>0.905</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sen 1 vrs Sen 3</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0.288</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sen 2 vrs Sen 3</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>0.698</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table III**: Various staff, prefects and seniors groups compared in terms of employee-orientation scores at post test.

**Note**: * Level of p. = level of significance.

N.S. = not significant
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups compared</th>
<th>Total Number</th>
<th>2 tail t-test</th>
<th>Level of p.*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stf 1 vrs Pre 1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1.559</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stf 1 vrs Sen 1</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>0.640</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre 1 vrs Sen 1</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1.079</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre 2 vrs Sen 2</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0.144</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre 3 vrs Sen 3</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>0.115</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre 1 vrs Pre 2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.300</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre 1 vrs Pre 3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.142</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre 2 vrs Pre 3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.389</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sen 1 vrs Sen 2</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>0.557</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sen 1 vrs Sen 3</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1.431</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sen 2 vrs Sen 3</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>0.628</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table IV: Various staff, prefects and seniors groups compared in terms of differentiation scores at pretest.

Note: * Level of p. = level of significance.

N.S. = not significant.
Table IV: Various staff, prefects and seniors groups compared in terms of differentiation scores at post test.

Note: * Level of p. = level of significance. 
N.S = not significant.

These comparisons show that the significant differences between pairs of groups in E scores all occur in pretest (March) data, whereas for D scores significant differences are all in the post test (October) data. Groups moved closer to one another in their E scores in the course of the year, but become more diverse in their D scores. In no case was a difference between two E scores significant at post test,
and in no case was a D score difference significant at pre test. This alone indicates that some movement in attitudes occurred in the course of the year.

It is interesting to see just which comparisons rendered a statistically significant difference. Considering first the pre test E scores, table II shows that the prefects and the staff in school 1 began the year with significantly different attitudes, even though the staff and senior pupils did not. School 1 prefects may have been an atypical group of prefects, because their attitudes on the E score were also significantly different from the school 1 senior pupils and the prefects at both schools 2 and 3.

The only comparisons which did not show statistically significant differences in pre test E scores were those between seniors 1 and staff 1; between seniors 1 and seniors 3; between prefects 2 and prefects 3; and between seniors 3 and prefects 3. At the later testing in October, on the other hand, there were no significant differences between any of the groups on their E scores.

This trend is reversed when we consider D scores. Here pre test figures show no significant differences between any two groups, but at post test a number of the groups had diverged from one another by statistically significant amounts.

Ranking the seven groups in order from highest to lowest for both E and D scores, at both pre and post test, shows that
the year has caused a degree of 'sorting out' or ordering of the groups. (See Table VI)

**TABLE VI**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>E Score</th>
<th></th>
<th>D Score</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PRETEST</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(March)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre 1</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pre 3</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sen 2</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sen 3</td>
<td>16.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sen 1</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pre 1</td>
<td>16.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sen 3</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pre 2</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre 3</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sen 2</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stf 1</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sen 1</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre 2</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Stf 1</td>
<td>15.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PRETEST</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(October)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sen 2</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pre 3</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre 2</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pre 2</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sen 3</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pre 1</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sen 1</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sen 2</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stf 1</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sen 1</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre 3</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Stf 1</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre 1</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sen 3</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table VI: Staff, prefects and senior groups ranked according to mean employee-orientation (E) and differentiation (D) scores, at both pre and post tests.
With E scores the tendency is towards ordering of groups into their school classification with senior pupils higher than their prefects. This is all the more interesting on account of the absence of statistically significant differences between any consecutive pair of the groups.

With D scores an order is to a fair extent established at the beginning of the year, with most of the prefect groups at one end and the seniors (and staff) at the other. This order is even more distinctly apparent in October, and the one offending group in March (school 3 seniors) is now clearly established at the other end of the scores from the school 3 prefects.

The absolute difference between the overall mean for prefects and the overall mean for seniors is greater at the end of the year than at the beginning for both E scores (0.36 pre test, 0.40 post test) and for D scores (0.42 pre test, 1.11 post test). This increase supports the effect noted in Table VI.

A statistical analysis was made of the differences in each group between pre and post test scores for both E and D. These data are presented in Table VII. The table shows the mean movement of each group's score between the testings, along with the standard deviation of this increase/decrease, and where there was one, the level of significance attributed to the increase/decrease when analysed using a t-test. On the E scale prefects 1, seniors 1, seniors 2 and seniors 3 all moved significantly; on the D scale however, significant movement occurred only in school 3 seniors.
Table VII: Mean increase, standard deviation, and level of significance of change (t-test), for each group's E and D scores.

Note: (1) Positive mean difference indicates post test score exceeded pre test score (mean score increased).

(2) Figures are respectively: mean, standard deviation, significance level.

(3) n = number of subjects in group.
Finally in this section, the correlation between the magnitude of each individual's original (pre test) score and the extent it moved in the course of the year is presented. There was found to be a high correlation between the size of the original score and the size of decrease ($r = 0.81$ for E scores, and $r = 0.80$ for D's).

Locating prefects from school 1 shows their atypical distribution in relation to the whole population, particularly in terms of their E scores. (See Tables VIII and IX).
**Table VIII:** Pretest E score plotted against change in score for all subjects.

**Note:** Number shows individuals falling at that co-ordinate. Dashes following digit indicate prefects at school 1.
TABLE IX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>X</th>
<th>Y</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

X axis = March D score (pretest)

Y axis = Change in score between testing

(October D - March D)

Table IX: Pretest D score plotted against change in score for all subjects.

Note: Number shows individuals falling at that co-ordinate. Dashes following digit indicate prefects at school 1.

Unfortunately the use of the questionnaire of Personal and Inter-Personal Style was not decided on early enough in the programme to allow anyone other than the prefects at school 1 to be given it early in the year. The instrument was
applied to all the groups in all schools at the end of the year. As it turned out individual differences in response style, to which this measure proved particularly susceptible, disguised any differences which might otherwise have been picked up by it. Consequently the instrument was not of any measurable value to this study, although that it had some effects on the subjects remains a possibility. Subjects may have gained insights into themselves from using the questionnaire, and such an eventuality would be indistinguishable from other development shown in the diary.

INTERVIEWS WITH STAFF MEMBERS

The third investigative procedure from which results were collected was the interviews with staff members. These, transcribed, contain a wealth of data which, like the diary, is very difficult to summarize and interpret. They did reveal the following points, which came as responses to the list of areas covered on the interview outline sheet. (See Appendix 3).

It was apparent that even staff who were heavily involved with senior classes were not clear on how prefects were selected. By amalgamating pieces of the stories it seemed that sixth formers, at the beginning of the year, nominated prefects, and that those nominated were voted on by all sixth and seventh formers. Staff then exercised a 'veto' right if they wanted to.
Methods of initiation for prefects were almost non existent. It seemed that the prefects were officially appointed and 'given their badges' in the context of a school assembly. Prefects were given little or no introduction to their role by anyone, and none of the staff knew what, if anything, the prefects were told about how they were expected to behave as prefects. It seemed that the only guidelines for 'prefect-like' behaviour were whatever could be inferred from what was known about the experience of the previous year's prefects. They were given little guidance as to how to go about being prefects by anyone (including the principal). They received no training that any staff members knew of. Staff members assumed that the principal was supervising the group, although only one staff member had any idea of if and when the principal saw the prefects.

Different staff members had different views about how a prefect might reinforce her own authority in a situation where it was challenged. According to the staff members the prefects were fairly much respected and supported by other senior pupils, but only commanded some respect among lower classes when they had themselves earned this through their direct dealings with the group. One staff member could see no place for mutual support among prefects and felt that each should be quite able to continue her perfectly duties without the support of other prefects.
Staff members seemed to be considering the question of the relationship between prefects and staff members for the first time when I broached it with them, and on numerous occasions staff members illustrated their points about the relationship between staff and prefects with incidents that occurred several years before.

It was very clear that the kind of perspective that staff members brought to the issue of prefects was quite different from that of the prefects themselves. For the prefects their year in office is the year in office; but for staff members each year is just another year with another group of prefects; the fact that they are different prefects seemed to have little bearing on the outlook of staff members.

There was no clear consensus among the staff as to whether or not the prefects were useful. Two staff members reported that two or three years before the prefect system had been abolished in favour of 'shared responsibility' where all senior pupils were exhorted to exercise leadership in the school. After one year this system was judged a failure and abandoned. Views were mixed as to why, and some staff members considered it was for lack of a positive staff attitude and perserverence. It was clear from the interviews that the staff did not consider they had to support the prefects, or encourage them in their work.
Questions of the extent to which prefects were expected to conduct policing functions were raised and staff generally felt that expectations in this area were at least somewhat anomalous, and probably far too high, especially considering the general lack of patronage among pupils of dictatorial types of authority, and the absence of similar policing work being done by staff members. While the staff felt that asking prefects to police laws was expecting a great deal, they did not have any ideas of alternative ways of operating a prefect system.

THE DIARY OF EVENTS

Another set of results are those derived from the diary. Perhaps more than any other, this set of results are difficult to paraphrase or present, partly because of the subjective format of many of the change-agent's comments. However the following precis (of his forty five foolscap pages) is presented.

The overall strategy devised at the beginning of the exercise was followed.

The first session with the prefects, Monday 14 March, was devoted largely to an attempt to getting to know one another. I introduced myself and outlined what I hoped to do in the course of the year, and then we spent much of the remaining time talking about them and their school. This discussion was not directed to any great extent. I found the prefects to be a fairly talkative group, and it seemed
important to establish from the staff that our sessions would be marked by a large measure of their participation, rather than by tight control of the discussion by me.

This strategy had been devised so that at each stage we allowed the girls involved as much room for growth and development as was possible. The girls found this rather disconcerting. Their whole school background had geared them to thinking and acting, when there was a teacher figure present, in terms of that person's wishes. When I proved reluctant to spell out what I wanted from them in detail, they had some difficulty in setting their own objectives or in keeping to them.

At the second meeting with them prefects and I very nearly completed the work of defining the goals of the school in a clear and precise manner. The clarification and achievement of consensus about these goals obviously represented a substantial development in the thinking of the prefects. Also by the end of the second session a constructive and warm atmosphere had developed in the group, and the impression apparently held by all the members of the group was that this was to be a fruitful and enjoyable exercise through the year. We finished that week having clearly defined goals of the school, and with an understanding that during the next week we would come to a similarly clear statement of the prefect's function within the school.
Unfortunately the day before my next meeting with the prefects one girl's father died. She was absent from the group and the experience cast a shadow over our meeting. Some progress was made in discussing the prefect's function in the school, but to a large extent the girls were preoccupied in sharing the grief of one of their number throughout the session. Nevertheless I took notes of their discussion, and produced the statement which appears in Appendix 4.

On April 4 I returned to the school and spent a part of my session with the prefects discussing the attempted synthesis I had made of their views, to see if they considered it an accurate and thorough summary of the views they had expressed. In the second part of this session we discussed a possible structure we could invent to improve the functioning of the system. This structural change was suggested by some of the complaints they had been making throughout our earlier discussions, and consisted of a regular meeting of three staff members with three prefects. It was suggested this meeting be weekly, and that at each new meeting one of the prefects should vacate her position in favour of another, so that all the prefects would be involved for three consecutive meetings.

This provision would allow a certain continuity among the prefects, while at the same time allowing all the prefects (and consequently the ideas of each of the prefects) to have some airing with the three staff representatives. The pre-
ffects considered that continuity should be preserved in the staff and that the same three staff members should attend the meeting each week, at least for the first term. I was left to arrange the staff's participation, while the prefects would arrange among themselves their own roster. After this meeting there was a long break because of Easter holidays before we met again.

On June 13 we recommenced. From this meeting on, I set up exercises which all participated in. First was a 'listening triads' exercise. In my introduction I talked about the importance of listening for prefects, and indeed for any 'leader' or helper. The group as a whole chose three discussion topics, and were then formed into groups of three. Two of the members of each triad held a discussion on that topic. The discussion was quite normal except that after each member had made a contribution it was the duty of the other to paraphrase, to the speakers satisfaction, what had just been said, before making her own contribution. The task of the third person was simply to ensure that that rule was enforced; (namely that each 'discussant' paraphrased the other's previous contribution before making their next comment), a task which became difficult when the discussions became heated! After a third of the time had elapsed the 'discussants' and 'umpire' were rotated, so that each member of the triad had a chance to occupy each of the roles. At the end all discussed what they had noticed or experienced in the exercise. Most prominent observations were:
1. that it is extremely difficult to separate listening to a person from planning one's own response;

2. that it is extremely difficult to remember what a person has said if they say too much in one statement;

3. that the discipline of this structure is hard to maintain;

4. and that the exercise feels rather artificial.

I explained that, the feeling of artificiality notwithstanding, what they experienced in the exercise was a fair reflection (if an exaggerated experience) of what happened in ordinary conversations all the time.

The following week most attention was focused on a large house netball competition which was to be held immediately after my session with the prefects. All the prefects were deeply involved in the organisation and running of this event (indeed 4 of them were House Captains). It became obvious very early on in the session that little would be achieved, because of their obvious and exuberant preoccupation. Consequently we spent some time discussing the staff/prefect meeting which had been planned on April 4 but had as yet failed to meet, and new resolutions were made about that.

The following Monday we began an exercise adapted from one entitled "Getting Acquainted" in a course of human relations
exercises. This exercise began with each member of the group listing on a piece of paper five things they would feel comfortable telling other members of the group. These were then shared with the group. After this we discussed the 'Johare Window' model.

Each person was again asked to list three things that they would probably not typically share with a group such as this, but that they would in this circumstance share: (in other words, to list some items of 'private information', known to them but not to others). This information was then shared with the rest of the group. By the end of this exercise we had achieved a strong feeling of fellowship with one another. It seemed that we were achieving some growth in relationships.

Unfortunately a couple of incidents temporarily interrupted further progress. The girls had a mid-term break one week, and the following week the principal decided that they should meet with a traffic officer in the time which was normally used by me. In the interim they completed the questionnaire of Personal and Interpersonal Style.

On the 8th July I began our session asking the prefects to organise themselves into a "line of influence", with the most influential person at one end and the least influential at the other. This exercise was designed to make them think about how influential they, and others, were in the group. It produced fascinating results.
At the beginning of the session all were very vocal and excited because later in the day the school was to have a gala. But on receiving the directions for the exercise deadly silence befell us. After three or four very silent and painful minutes the people who were in the seats which I had indicated were to be occupied by the most influential moved and scrambled for a position lower down the hierarchy. Again silence ensued, and after some time those who had official leadership positions (e.g. the head girl and deputy head) were 'bullied' to the top of the influence scale. For a while then the group distracted itself by discussion of the gala, but after a while one or two members became anxious by their avoidance of it and brought the group back to the topic at hand. Finally without further rearrangements they turned to me to suggest that the exercise was completed. However I pointed out that since I was seated in the position that I had indicated was to be occupied by the person of least influence that obviously the group did not consider me to be able to make any decisions about what it was to do next. This suggestion they greeted by trying to bully me into taking the position of most influence, which I denied I should occupy. The exercise continued with a type of 'cat and mouse' behaviour for a while, and it was clear that they were determined not to seriously discuss the issue of who was most influential among them in any depth. As our time drew near the end, I ended the exercise and tried to
promote a discussion about why they were so afraid of exposing their beliefs and feelings about their influence. The discussion was far from lively, but it seemed that a good deal of thinking was going on among group members.

The following week we explored the concept of trust. At the centre of this concept we used an exercise called "The Trust Walk". At the end of the exercise some time was spent sharing our feelings and considering the concept of trust together. The girls were reluctant to share personal feelings, particularly where any one of them felt they might be unique.

To attack this reluctance rather directly, the following week (August 1) we decided to share some of our 'peak' (best and worst), experiences. To start with the girls listed three 'positive' peak experiences, then in groups of three, discussed these and tried to compile a list of feelings commonly associated with peak experiences. They then reported back to the whole group. Next we considered our worst three experiences. After a few minutes preparing this list the group had quietened and deepened considerably. At someone's request we shared our three experiences with the whole group rather than in small groups of three. (Although it was never mentioned I suspected that the prefect whose father had died was somewhat at the centre of their attention). We shared our discussion of these experiences and many reported
their embarrassment at having to share these experiences with one another. Loneliness was a central element in almost all their experiences.

The following week I had each of the members of the group imagine that they had just been killed, and write an obituary which they would like to see appear in the next day's newspaper. After writing these they each decided to pass their own along and have it read to the larger group by a neighbour. Once more they showed their fear of admitting their own feelings and experiences to the groups. At the end we discussed the feelings of members throughout the exercise. One prefect complained at what she considered a lack of seriousness in the approach of two or three of the others.

After the previous couple of rather intense sessions, (and indeed the last six exercises where I had set the topic and defined the activity), it seemed advisable to allow the group a chance to determine its own path for a session; after telling them what we would have something of a "post-mortem" of the year's work so far I abdicated from leadership and left the group to it. Long silences followed, interrupted only by a couple of specific, quick, and embarrassed questions. After some time in silence I commented on their silence, and slowly they began to thaw. The discussion grew as a criticism of themselves and what they had and had not done through the year. I left it on that
note, asking them to consider how useful a learning exercise the year had been, and what they wanted to see achieved in the few meetings that remained to us in the following term.

At the first meeting of the new term on September 19 the prefects looked back on the year's work and attempted to isolate aspects of their role in the school which had particular advantages, and those which they found unfavourable. Among the ideas that came forward were their appreciation of each having a class of their own to be responsible for, and of their responsibilities in organising and running Gala days and sports activities. On the other hand they disliked the tendency for prefects to be thrust into all the menial and clean-up activities. They disliked being expected to act as 'policemen' but felt unable to make any real alternative work. They considered the occasional meetings they had had with the principal to be valuable and expressed a regret that they had not had more. In this discussion and those that remained a high standard of participation was maintained.

On 26 September we re-examined the statement of the school's goals and the prefect's aims and functions that we had constructed at the beginning of the year. At first, and for a large part of the discussion, the prefects considered that in the light of their original understanding of the situation they had performed very poorly, and they spent some time in recriminating themselves and looking for expla-
nations of their failure to be more active in the areas they had originally intended. Towards the end of the session some expression was also made of the achievements that had been-made, and the group ended on a note, not quite of congratulating, but at least of not condemning one another. Many comments about the aims of the school came out in this discussion. Suffice it to say the prefects were unable to see what they considered to be the aims of the school being constructively approached by the everyday activities of school life.

The next session was to be our last together, because exams began a week later. Using a similar rationale to that adopted at the end of the second term I left them with no directions other than that they should set the ground and decide what activity we should do for our last session. When I arrived on October 3 they had prepared a morning tea for us all. Over the tea the conversation flowed very relaxedly with many of us discussing our plans for the future. Sufficient interest was shown in the form my thesis would take that I undertook to return later in November after the exam pressure was off them, to share what progress I had made and where the thesis was going.

The meeting spent time both doing that, and discussing the future of each of the group members. On the same occasion I led a meeting at which 'leadership' was discussed (quite fruitfully it seemed), with staff in the school.
In this outline focus has only been on the comments that applied directly to the prefects. From before the first meeting with them until after the last one a considerable amount of work was conducted in trying to influence staff members, and some in trying to influence other groups in the school. Those efforts may in the long run prove to have been more consequential in the development of the school's leadership than were dealings with the prefects. But for the sake of limiting the scope of this work references to them have been omitted, although some of them will have a bearing on discussion of the results.

The intention to develop clear and detailed plans for future years was not completed, although many of the prefects' comments about their own experiences suggested some alternatives to, or some support for, existing practices in the school. Although this aim (of planning for future years) was not completed with the prefects, some serious work was done here by the change-agent with the principal for the next year.
Chapter 6 DISCUSSION AND EVALUATION OF RESULTS

The results of this study have emerged from three different sources, each of its characteristic mode. There are:

(i) statistical results derived from a questionnaire;
(ii) conversational results derived from interviews;
(iii) the more subjective results derived from the diary.

The results also bear on many subjects, the complexity of which is only partly embraced by the hypotheses, because the study has been concerned to cover a large area in order to clarify a very complex and substantially unexplored field.

The results provide the basis of an understanding of what goes on in schools in terms of leadership, and of some possibilities, in particular that of using goal clarification and human relations training exercises to develop leadership among prefects. It is hoped to frame the discussion of these results in such a way that value will not be lost to psychologists or teachers (or others) who read it.

First consideration is given to the results that bear upon the three null hypotheses, and the alternatives that their rejections lead to.
DIFFERENTIAL DEVELOPMENT OF LEADERSHIP: $H_1$

It is clear from the statistical results presented in the previous chapter that the first null hypotheses can be rejected. Groups did move differently from one another.

On the measure of 'employee-orientation', the measure of orientation towards people as people, all seniors groups and prefects 1 decreased significantly. On the measure of 'differentiation', the extent to which leaders perceive themselves as different in function from subordinates, only in school 3 seniors did a significant movement occur, again showing a decrease in this attitude.

Ignoring for the moment the D scores, the only way these data may be fitted to the possible options would seem to be by considering one effect to distinguish prefects 1 from other prefects. This would support the proposals of the first and second alternatives under $H_{01}$.

The one D score which proved significant in table VII lends weight to none of the alternatives, and in the absence of further information which might suggest a reason for it, can only be ignored.

More detail speculation on the basis of this statistical data, although necessary to gain a full understanding, would seem inappropriate for a number of reasons.
Firstly this study provides insufficient data to give a picture of what might have been expected. For example, it might be appropriate to analyse the differences including a factor of decrease on E score, because the proximity of exam pressure to post test causes a "normal" uniform decrease in employee-orientation. Such a factor included might show prefects' lack of movement to be more suggestive than the seniors' movement. But this argument cannot be settled on the evidence just of these three schools; instead a large sample of seniors should be tested to provide an adequate and appropriate norm for these conditions.

Secondly further work is necessary to properly relate the scores on each scale of the questionnaire to precise leadership attitudes held by senior secondary pupils. Such work might make the reason for the significant D score of school 3 seniors apparent.

Thirdly the practical influences which may have an effect on questionnaire scores are not known. Could a talk given about leadership differentiation to the seniors the day before the post test affect questionnaire results? What other influences might?

Comparisons were made between various groups in terms of their initial and final E and D scores (Tables II to V). The general trend of results shows that groups are more spread on E scores at the start of the year, and D scores at
the end. Indeed no relationship showed a significant difference between pretest D scores or post test E scores, although a number of significances appear in the other two tables.

The statistical data alone does not and cannot suggest reasons for specific significant relationships (or even for the overall effect), but some possibilities may be suggested.

It may be that staff influence prefects towards themselves. This would explain (though no assertion can yet be made that it is the proper explanation) why staff 1 and prefects 1 are significantly different in initial E score, but no different on final testing.

In both schools 1 and 2, each structured in terms of prefects, it would seem the selection procedure successfully separates prefects and seniors along similar lines as E scores (though perhaps in opposite directions). In any case the distinction has disappeared by the end of the year.

In contrast school 3 prefects and seniors are significantly different from each other on neither initial score. But at the end, D scores distinguish the two groups. Perhaps their council structure increases appreciation in the council members (prefects 3) of the different functions of leaders.
Prefects at school 1 began significantly different from all other prefects (as well as their own school's staff and seniors) in terms of their employee-orientation. By the end of the year they were similar to all these groups in E as well as D scores. Perhaps their unusual initial beginning (helped or obstructed by the training programme?) produced pressures which compelled them nearer to the average.

Just as nearly every initial significant difference involves prefects 1, every significant difference in post tests involves seniors 3 on the D scores. While few variables other than selection procedures seem possible causes of the former significance, it would be fruitful to examine to what extent the structure of school 3 caused, or at least is related to, the peculiar differentiation - or lack of it - of school 3 seniors.

In the light of these comparisons one other factor emerges. If the weight of numbers (two schools against one) is accepted, school 2 seems inappropriate as a control group because of its initial seniors' employee-orientation; significantly different from that of peers in both other schools. Again the need for more extensive normative data from the questionnaire is highlight.

It is clear that leadership attitudes can change. There seems no reason to doubt that the performance of leaders can also be influenced by a deliberate effort. However, as Fleishman observed, "the findings here seem to indicate that
the problem in such training (human relations training)* is much more complex than the simple addition of a little positive and negative values to certain attitudes and ways of doing things". (Fleishman 1953 p. 206) * my parentheses

It was Fleishman's experience, and is ours also, that at the date of concluding the experiment, leadership attitudes had moved in the opposite direction to what might have been expected, and would have been desired. The emphasis on human relations training, one would have thought, would have increased the subjects' score on the employee-orientation scale (a scale on which high scores indicate that subordinates are regarded as 'people' rather than 'a means of production'; that authority and responsibility are delegated to the lowest competent level; and in which a leader's job is principally seen in terms of promoting team work and co-operative atmosphere). In view of this it is hard to see why the statistically significant change in school 1 prefects' E scores is downwards over the course of the year.

Perhaps some of the explanations that Fleishman considers pertinent in his work apply here also, (although our lack of testing for them does not allow us to assert them with any degree of confidence). Fleishman considered that one mitigating factor was the way in which the foreman of his trainee supervisors seemed to operate: in this case the way in which staff (perhaps especially the principal) act towards the prefects. This may exert a powerful influence on the prefects leadership attitudes. Fleishman also con-
sidered that the training programme may, more than anything else, have served to make the supervisors he was training aware of themselves as part of 'management'. Perhaps they understood this concept largely in terms of decreased 'consideration' and increased 'initiating structure'.

It is an unfortunate weakness of the present study that no follow up was made. This was impossible because the students left school at the end of the year.

Fleishman found a tendency for scores at the end of training to differ in the opposite direction from pretesting scores, than did scores taken "back-in-the-plant" when trainees had settled back into the working routine. This study differed from Fleishman's in using a training programme more like 'on-the-job' training than like the training period away from work which he employed. Unfortunately such factors limit our confidence in relating his findings to our own.

**INITIAL AND SUBSEQUENT LEADERSHIP: H₂**

The evidence of tables VIII and IX clearly refutes the second null hypothesis which proposed no relationship between initial leadership indices and subsequent movement. In both E and D, a substantial correlation existed (−0.81 and −0.80 respectively). Being a negative correlation, this result does not allow a distinction between the very useful suggestion that time at school improves poor leaders leadership more than it improves good leaders, or the unhelpful result that explains the results as (an almost
inevitable) regression towards the mean. Nor does it put us in a strong position to appreciate why prefects 1, so clearly above the mean in employee-orientation initially moved to group furtherest below it finally.

PATTERN OF CONFLICTS: H₃

While statistical results can do no more than point to correlations between variables (and then only partially clarify the picture) the diary and interviews fill out a discussion and evaluation, and in particular illucidate the third hypothesis.

Ho₃ proposed that no pattern of conflicts would emerge indicative of incongruent relationships between Halal's 'task technology', 'subordinate motivators' and 'leadership style'.

On the contrary, all the evidence in the work of the change-agent with prefects and reported in the diary, and in the interviews, indicates that the prefects may fairly be described as experiencing 'inhibition' and 'oppression'. These indicators correspond to idealistic motivators of the subordinates, directive leadership style of the leader, and a complex task technology.

Relating this finding to Halal's further propositions about the usual movement of variables on these dimensions, the leader's leadership style would seem to be the limiting variable. According to Halal's proposal there is a natural
tendency for this to become more permissive, and with the added pressures caused by incongruence with the technology and motivators, that would seem a likely outcome, especially if only prefects and principal are involved.

Of course in a school many more people than just principals and prefects are involved, and a fuller analysis would also consider incongruences between technology, motivators and leadership among principal and staff, staff and pupils at each level, principal/staff and parents, and principal and Education Department. In private schools other relations may also be important (e.g. religious and their religious superiors). This analysis might show the incongruences found when considering prefects, to be outweighed in the broader pattern.

Nevertheless the present work has identified two incongruences within the milieux of principal and prefects, and the conflicts experienced by prefects at least (oppression and inhibition) are unlikely to disappear, until congruence between technology, motivators and leadership is, for them at least, achieved.

Following this discussion of results as they specifically relate to hypotheses, important issues also need to be discussed which relate more to the general aims of this exploration. Although not expressed in terms of precise hypotheses in the present work, these issues may provide useful consideration for hypotheses in future works.
PREFECTS AND TRADITION

Prefects in the school tend to be used to tradition, and warm only slowly to new situations and new experiences. This is particularly true in considering their attitudes to authority.

The conclusion is drawn from an examination of the diary data. Prefects in school 1 were very slow, or unable, to adjust to the situation created by the change-agent in their group. They were very slow to develop any alternative strategies for leading and promoting group life, and even when it was clearly apparent that their expectation of a 'teacher' figure who would fulfill the normal leadership functions (e.g. set agenda) was not to be fulfilled by the change-agent. Several times reported in the diary the group were extremely slow to work on the problem or situation presented to them, and were particularly loathe to enter into any consideration of their own personal experiences; their feelings about various subjects or about experiences they were having together.

INTEGRATED SCHOOL EXPERIENCE

Secondly, any training that is given as a specific part of the formation of prefects should, in the experience of the prefects, be integrated into school life to a large extent. This applies to the conceptual work of clarifying and establishing goals, and to the 'human relations' exercises,
as well as to anything else. In the course of the diary it was repeatedly noted that prefects were reluctant to offer their contributions to the life of the group, and indeed the life of the school. This seemed to be in part because of the change-agent being seen as an 'outsider' to the school's life, but particularly occurred because there was to the prefects little relationship between the training that occurred in his meetings with them, and what otherwise happened in their life in the school system.

The specific human relations exercises chosen seemed to be of relevance because they served to broaden the experiences of the prefects concerned, more than because of their specific relevance to leadership. It is an aim of the school, (one which the prefects defined when clarifying its aims) that the school should "provide a mature education - this consists of deepening our awareness of what is going on around us; giving us a broad range of experiences or range of ideas of experiences ..." (from 'Prefects Aims and Functions', Appendix 4).

While this aim of broadening pupils' experiences in the school context may seem at first to have little to do with leadership, a greater range of experience would contribute to the exercise of leadership by girls in two ways: first it would allow girls to develop more fully a clear understanding and appreciation of who they are, and how they function, a well as to gain a clearer understanding of the
personalities of other school members. On this basis (of a clear self perception) they would be better equipped to realistically assess situations and to act as leaders. Secondly it would provide the girls with a greater number and variety of social environments in which different types of leadership could be exercised.

Much of what was done in school 1 in an attempt to train prefects could be a normal part of the development of senior pupils. The leadership of prefects would then grow in a natural way as part of their growth in school, and many forms of leadership, or the exercise of many leadership functions, could develop where the needs of a particular environment and the talents of an individual met. This might also alleviate what seems to be an unhealthy emphasis on the policing functions of prefects, an emphasis apparently caused mainly by the paucity of alternative ideas of 'leadership'.

STAFF INTEREST IN PREFECTS

A third conclusion, shown most clearly in the interviews, is that staff members tend to be abysmally ignorant of prefects and the way their leadership system operates. Staff members could be relied on with some degree of confidence to know which girls were prefects, but it was amazing how little most staff members knew about how prefects were selected and chosen, what they were told their function in the school
was, what their real job in the school was, what activities
they engaged in, what gatherings they held, what powers they
exercised, what authority they had, and so on.

This should imply no personal criticism of the staff in the
schools; they have more than enough aspects of school life
to concern themselves with. But in the schools prefects are
expected by staff to be a significant force. They are
expected to be at the forefront in regulating pupils' beha­
viours in every sphere of school life, as well as acting in
a semi-official capacity at a number of school functions,
some of which involve the general public. In addition to
this, prefects are expected to maintain their own (usually
high) standard of academic work, and to at least compete in
many sporting activities. To place this burden on so small
a group and expect real results suggests that considerably
more effort be invested in the prefect system by the staff
than was the case in schools 1 and 2 at least. Some of this
energy could be spent profitably in ensuring that there was
a well defined and generally accepted understanding among
the staff members of what a prefect's function is.
Chapter 7 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Arising out of this experience of an attempt to examine and develop leadership in a secondary school, some important conclusions may be drawn, and recommendations about the direction and nature of future work can be made.

CONCEPTUAL RE-EXAMINATION

Perhaps the single most important conclusion to be drawn from the work of this thesis has to do with a basic understanding of leadership. Work has made it clear that fundamental variables are at least threefold (each of which may vary along a continuum between two very different points). But any precise statements about the values of variables and the effects related to these are very crude. This is particularly true in the school setting, in spite of what seems an ideal arena for study, with potentially large numbers, captive subjects, stable situations and scope for controlling variables.

In the psychological literature and in practice, leadership seems always to be conceived as something that can be developed through simple addition. This is most apparent in leadership training programmes, which are generally solely concerned to give leaders skills, understanding, attitudes etc. What needs to be 'given' or added, and how, is stated differently by different authors. The present work challenges the notion that simple addition is responsible for development of leadership.
Instead it has become clear that complex interactions surround leadership. These interactions are such that it is unlikely that a similar exercise as this would have gained much more ground, because of the narrow focus of the work (predominantly on one small group of prefects).

While it is true that the development of leadership in secondary schools requires a total conceptual overhaul, a number of slightly less daunting tasks are also suggested by this study.

**IMPROVED PSYCHOMETRIC MEASURES**

The first area we are a considerable need for further work exists is that of psychometric techniques. Psychologists cannot hope to make a significant contribution to a situation if they cannot assess what the situation is before they enter it, and objectively assess their impact on the situation. Psychology has always considered it desirable for this measuring to be clearly objective, and it has usually been spelt out in statistical terms.

The LEAD questionnaire was well constructed to serve at least part of this purpose. But some difficulties were uncovered which should be avoided in future use of it. This study had insufficient respondents, ideally, to give good results from the questionnaire; particularly teachers.

This was in part due to planning difficulties; work in schools is under particular pressure towards the end of the
year, and any thought of doing post tests at this time needs careful consideration to ensure that they can properly be fitted into the school programme, especially the programme of staff members. Otherwise difficulties arise in getting forms distributed, completed, returned and collated, as well as in interpreting results.

Perhaps the major difficulty with the use of the LEAD questionnaire as an instrument was the lack of normative information that it has, especially in New Zealand conditions and especially in schools.

More work also needs to be done on the precise implications that are to be drawn from various scores or changes of scores on each of the scales. At present the questionnaire serves more as a descriptive than an analytical device, because the effects of typical school variables (e.g. 'exam pressure') on the scores—if any—are unknown.

Perhaps what is needed is an altogether new psychometric measure to be used in this environment. To create such an instrument would however be a major undertaking, considering the amount of development work required to build such a measure and to norm it adequately. Meanwhile future workers will be in the same dilemma in which the present study began, namely that of deciding whether to work at developing a new measure thoroughly appropriate to the interests of the research, or to use the less appropriate or inadequately backed measures that already exist.
INDICES OF LEADERSHIP

Related to the issue of improved psychometric measures, comes a more careful examination of exactly what it is that should be measured.

The only psychometric measures which could be found that seemed at all appropriate in the school were measures of leadership attitudes. There may be considerable and significant differences between attitudes to leadership and actual behaviour as leaders. This area is one which demands a great deal more work.

In her study Campbell (1978) attempted to overcome this difficulty by asking respondents to her questionnaires what they considered to be the ideal, and what they considered to be the state of practice. Even this method is not fully adequate because it only assesses what respondents say the state of reality is, and this may not accurately reflect the real state of the situation. Nevertheless her results show significant differences between what respondents claim is the ideal, and what they claim is the practice in many areas. Her results show that teachers considered democratic classroom leadership to be exercised in practice much less than they considered it ideally should be. This suggests that while teachers may recognise scope for leadership by pupils exists, they tend not to allow, or generate, anywhere
near as much pupil leadership as they consider to be ideal. The relationship between the attitudes of both pupils and staff to various leadership issues, and their practice in those areas, deserves more work.

This is all the more important where devices like the LEAD questionnaire are being employed to try to help us understand something about leadership in the school. Current understanding of what constitutes a particularly high or low score on either of the E or D scales, and what any score represents in practice, is far from clear.

**GENERALITY OF RESULTS**

The extent to which results discovered in one school or one group of schools may be generalized to other educational environments also deserves further consideration. It may be that the choice of three private schools severely limits the applicability of this work's results, or it may be that things discovered in these environments apply equally to all schools. At present there is no way of knowing.

Indeed no confident assertion can be made that results produced in one particular school may be reproduced in any other school. While clear differences existed between leadership attitudes in schools 1 and 3, schools with significantly different leadership structures, we do not know what effect applying the structure of school 3 in school 1, or vica versa, would achieve.
LEADERSHIP AND SCHOOL STRUCTURE

The issue of the generalizability of results leads to another area which is deserving of further study and consideration; namely the relationship existing between the leaders in the school and the organisational structure of the school. It has been more or less assumed in this study that the organisational structure of the school would have a definite bearing on the leadership offered by prefects.

Such factors as opportunities to exercise leadership functions earlier in their life in the school, and the extent to which pupils experience themselves as having had a hand in shaping the organisational structure of the school, could be expected to have a very definite impact on the way prefects perform their leadership function. (Morrison 1974) The way authority functions within the staff may also have an impact on the way prefects function as leaders, even though prefects may not gain a clear awareness of how leadership is exercised among staff. (Keeler and Andrews 1963)

Leadership exercised in school 3 seemed to exhibit some quite different qualities than in the other two schools. This has appeared to be as a consequence of the schools 'council' structure, but further work to validate this proposition and to understand the way in which it works would be most profitable.
Arising out of the areas we have listed already come a number of other areas deserving of study with specific reference to leadership at prefects’ level.

SUPPORT OF PREFECTS

Prefects in schools need help to lead effectively. This help could come in a number of forms. In the first place better results might be gained from telling the prefects in some detail exactly how they should proceed in their 'prefectly' duties; or better still, giving them a good understanding of responsibilities and school goals, and the extent of their authority for achieving them.

When set a specific task, or one with some clarity of goals, prefects were able, indeed were quite creative and enthusiastic, in their leadership. But where the prefects found themselves without a precedent to follow, or without any staff approval and support of their ideas, they were almost completely paralysed. A good illustration of this may be seen in one incident that occurred in the middle of the year.

From very early in the year one of the acknowledged duties of prefects was to police a rule which stipulated that jewellery was not to be worn at school. In the middle of the year the prefects decided that they would have a "blitz" on jewellery and confiscate any they could find girls wearing at a regular school assembly (a task which was cer-
tainly within the scope of their charter). Much enthusiasm was generated on this topic; one suspected that the whole exercise was something of a token gesture of their 'prefectship' in the school, and was in part designed to ease the 'guilty consciences' of those who felt their contribution thus far had been inadequate. The prefects discussed at length the logistics of the exercise, and carefully anticipated all the sorts of reactions they could foresee from the girls, and discussed strategies for dealing with them.

Unfortunately the occasion chosen for this blitz happened to be one on which the school principal already had a particularly full agenda. When told about the proposed blitz by the head prefect she stopped the exercise, on the grounds that it would use up more time.

The girls' plans were squashed and, without the support or encouragement of any staff members, the whole project was abandoned, rather than, as it might very easily have been, being transferred to another assembly (perhaps just one or two days later).

Prefects need the help of the staff to perform their duties well. In particular they need staff help and approval to give some authority, and some impetus, to the many creative and constructive ideas they propose. On a number of occasions girls suggested school dances, gala days, lunch-making and selling schemes, and many other proposals for improving
school life, but in the end none of them were adopted simply because the girls on their own could not persevere with the idea, adapt it as much as was necessary to make it feasible, and see it through against any opposition that may have arisen.

Some encouragement from the staff would have served to make this more likely. The girls themselves recognised a need for this when they proposed to set up an organised regular meeting of staff with prefects, but too much of the initiative and responsibility was again left with the prefects, and the meetings never eventuated.

**SELECTION AND INTRODUCTION OF PREFECTS**

It seemed that at school 1 the prefects were given a very poor introduction to their role and instruction in what their function was to be. The effects of this, or different types of introductions to 'prefectship' should be studied to enable the most to be made of future prefect systems (where used). There seemed to be some confusion in school 1 about the methods by which prefects were chosen. It would be worthwhile to examine different methods of selecting prefects; the criteria, - implicit or explicit - on which selection is based; and the ramifications of each of these, especially in view of the high correlation found between the initial E and D scores of prefects and the subsequent movement.
LEADERSHIP AMONG PREFECTS

Consideration should be given to the selection of head prefects. In school 1 it appeared that the choice of head prefect was not quite appropriate to ensure the best leadership of the prefects: because of an arrangement combining some advanced subject classes with a nearby boys school the head prefect spent between a third and a half of her week absent from her school. This detracted, probably quite significantly, from her performance.

In addition to this consideration, personality characteristics may have had a considerable impact on the head prefect's effectiveness or ineffectiveness. Examination of what personality and other factors contribute to making a head prefect more or less suitable as a leader is an area deserving work; work that could be particularly helpful in schools.

PLACING A CHANGE-AGENT

It seems appropriate here to consider the level at which an external change-agent should work in a school system. One of the difficulties of working with prefects is that to a large extent the work, however successful, is lost to the school at the end of the year, and the benefits that can be produced over the course of one year are lost to everybody else.
This suggests two alternatives. One is that the change-agent should attempt to work throughout the whole school. To a limited extent in the present case this was done, if one admits taking a few classes at different levels throughout the school to teach some human relations skills. The value of this work is extremely difficult to assess, but no doubt the impact of whatever was done with specific groups in the school was lessened by the infrequency of the encounter.

The other strategy a change-agent might adopt is to work more directly with the staff. This would seem to be the most appropriate strategy. An outside agent with a background in psychology has a background and expertise which may be much valued by school teachers, but one which they are not in a position to acquire for themselves. Some teachers expressed their envy of this background in discussions.

In order to be of some influence an external agent must first, of course, somehow establish credibility. This is not too difficult when one is associating with the staff under the guise of working with their prefects, but it could be a little more difficult to achieve in the absence of such a convenient excuse.

The role of outside observer or consultant is one which the change-agent may quite profitably adopt if the services and advice offered are sufficiently respected that they can and
will be utilized and produce some results. To varying extents staff members individually, and on one occasion as a group, discussed leadership in the school with the present change-agent with a definite view to improving school leadership. On one particularly rewarding occasion at the end of the school year the principal for the following year came, spontaneously, to discuss 'leadership'.

Evaluation of such work is difficult. Feedback gleaned since the beginning of the new year suggests that it has been valuable, and has had some impact. The extent to which ideas adopted in the school arose from the change-agent's suggestion or from other sources remains a mute point.

One practical expression of this approach (a change-agent working among staff) would be to develop the training of teachers in leadership. It seems at present that few have much conceptual understanding of the nature of leadership, and even fewer have any experience of the interpersonal approaches and methods that can be used to develop leadership in pupils.

In the three schools this study dealt with, it seems that teachers adopt a task-centred approach, aiming specifically at accomplishing the task of pushing students successfully through the full examination curriculum, and through examinations where these operate. If teachers were more orientated to what are frequently called 'group maintenance' con-
cerns, and more concerned with developing the human potential of their pupils, school leadership might be dramatically improved. An educational system which places such a large quota of work in the curricula may be largely responsible for the lack of focus on group concerns. However the situation is somewhat circular, and may only be improved when individuals take it upon themselves to try and develop in this direction. Perhaps a change-agent could profitably work teaching teachers about leadership.

CONCLUSION

Almost all of the suggestions made for further study suggest a need for more psychologists studying more schools, with more and different organisational structures; more and different organisational structures; more and different types of relationships between principals, staff, and pupils; and clearer and more precise objectives. The work conducted by Campbell (1978) and to a lesser extent the present work, have produced a wealth of material, but have perhaps gone as far as can or should be gone with this type of broad general study.

It would now seem time for New Zealand education to focus in more depth on a number of specific areas, and for more resources to be channelled into the study of at least some of the issues specified above. It is this author's hope that his work may serve, at least in the preliminary stages
of future studies, to indicate some of the possibilities, and some of the pitfalls, which are apt to be encountered in this type of work. And in the absence of further work it is hoped that the present study may provide principals and staff members in schools with some guidelines towards solutions for the specific leadership development problems which have been investigated here.
This is a survey of how you feel about some different methods of leadership. In each of the 60 questions below there are two statements of things a leader can do or ways he can act. For each question, mark your answer sheet (1 or 2) for the statement that you feel is the more important way for a leader to behave. Sometimes you may feel that both alternatives are unimportant for a leader; in that case you should still choose the statement you think is more important.

You will quickly notice that there are no right or wrong answers; we are interested only in your opinions.

Don't spend too much time on any particular item. Your first impressions are usually best.

It is important for a leader:

1. (1) To make decisions independently of the group. (2) To really be a part of his group.

2. (1) To let workers take time out from the monotony when they wish. (2) To allow workers to make decisions only when given explicit authority by the leader.

3. (1) To take an interest in the worker as a person. (2) To maintain definite standards of performance.

4. (1) To have his workers do their work in the way they think is best. (2) To rule with a firm hand.
5. (1) To make decisions independently of the group.
   (2) To be proud of his work group.

6. (1) To decide in detail how the work shall be done by
      the workers.
   (2) To let workers make decisions whenever they feel
       competent.

7. (1) To have the loyalty of his workers.
   (2) To maintain definite standards of performance.

8. (1) To act as he thinks best regardless of the views
      of his workers.
   (2) To stress being ahead of competing work groups.

9. (1) To make it clear that he is the leader of the
      group.
   (2) To have workers settle by themselves most of the
       problems they meet on the job.

10. (1) To have his group meet together to set group
      goals.
    (2) To prefer workers who work well alone.

11. (1) To have the workers settle by themselves most
      problems they meet on the job.
    (2) To have scheduled rest periods.

12. (1) To discourage talking between workers on the job.
    (2) To feel like "one of them" in the work group.

13. (1) To give detailed instructions on just the way to
      do each job.
    (2) To let workers take time out from the monotony
        occasionally.

14. (1) To have his workers do their work the way they
      think is best.
    (2) To assign responsibilities and duties daily in the
        form of specific tasks.

15. (1) To have his workers take pride in their work
      group's accomplishments.
    (2) to discourage talking between workers on the job.
16. (1) To do the important jobs himself.
    (2) To have workers take their rest periods when they wish.
17. (1) To see that people are working up to capacity.
    (2) To have the confidence of his workers.
18. (1) To set up all projects himself.
    (2) To let his workers make all routine daily decisions.
19. (1) To feel he belongs in his group.
    (2) To reward a good worker.
20. (1) To have his workers do the work the way they think is best.
    (2) To have the worker dependent upon him.
21. (1) To get the work done on time.
    (2) To be friendly toward his workers.
22. (1) To act as he thinks best, regardless of the views of his workers.
    (2) To be proud of his group.
23. (1) To give the workers the power to act independently of him.
    (2) To assign workers to particular tasks.
24. (1) To speak in a manner not to be questioned.
    (2) To create a pleasant work atmosphere.
25. (1) To see that the group produces.
    (2) To let the workers decide how to do each task.
26. (1) To do the important jobs himself.
    (2) To let the workers decide how to do each task.
27. (1) To get his men to work together.
    (2) To draw a line between himself and the work group.
28. (1) To approve each task before permitting the worker to start another.
    (2) To let workers make decisions when they feel competent.
29. (1) To go back on a decision if one of the workers shows him where he was wrong.
    (2) To emphasize getting the work done.
30. (1) To set up all projects himself.
   (2) To leave it up to each worker to take his share of the work and get it done.

31. (1) To be an authority in the type of work the group does.
   (2) To explain in detail the reasons for changes.

32. (1) To call the group together to discuss the work.
   (2) To work right alongside the workers.

33. (1) To pitch right in with the workers.
   (2) To plan the work carefully.

34. (1) To be the most skillful member of the group.
   (2) To meet regularly with the workers to consider proposed changes.

35. (1) To teach his workers new things.
   (2) To work along with the men as much as possible.

36. (1) To spend a great deal of time in scheduling the work of the group.
   (2) To make prompt, firm decisions.

37. (1) To explain carefully each worker's duties to him.
   (2) To spend some of his time helping get the work done.

38. (1) To spend considerable time planning the work of his men.
   (2) To be respected as a man of high technical skill in the field.

39. (1) To work hard himself.
   (2) To schedule the work of the men carefully.

40. (1) To be an authority in the type of work the group does.
   (2) To tell poor workers when their work isn't measuring up to what it should be.
41. (1) To do the same work as his men whatever time allows.
   (2) To plan how his men will do the job.
42. (1) To call the group together to discuss the work.
   (2) To attempt to make his work not too different from the work of his men.
43. (1) To be respected as a man of high technical skill in his field.
   (2) To spend over half his time in supervisory activities such as planning and scheduling.
44. (1) To be the most technically skilled member of the work group.
   (2) To explain the reason for changes.
45. (1) To let his workers know how they are doing on their jobs.
   (2) To spend some of his time helping get the work done.
46. (1) To make prompt decisions.
   (2) To spend a great deal of time organising the work for the group.
47. (1) To pass along to his workers information from higher management.
   (2) To help get the work done.
48. (1) To be known as a man of great technical skill in the field.
   (2) To schedule the work to be done.
49. (1) To train his workers to do new things.
   (2) To help get the work done in an emergency.
50. (1) To constantly organize new practices and procedures.
   (2) To encourage one worker in the group to speak up for the men.
51. (1) To meet with the workers to consider proposed changes.
   (2) To pitch right in with the workers to help make changes.
52. (1) To realise that a worker generally knows when he is a slacker without being told.
(2) To explain the responsibilities of each worker's job to him.

53. (1) To set an example by working hard himself.
(2) To spend a considerable percentage of his time planning.

54. (1) To be a respected authority in the type of work the group does.
(2) To pass along to his workers information from higher management.

55. (1) To have the worker find out the best job methods by experience.
(2) To meet with the workers to consider proposed changes.

56. (1) To explain the duties of each worker's job to him until he really understands them.
(2) To pitch right in with the workers.

57. (1) To plan his day's activities in considerable detail.
(2) To perform the same work as the workers whenever possible.

58. (1) To study new procedures that might apply to his job.
(2) To make his job similar to the jobs of his workers.

59. (1) To be known as a skillful trainer.
(2) To set an example by working hard himself.

60. (1) To work right alongside his workers.
(2) To try out new ideas on the work group.
LEAD QUESTIONNAIRE

Answer Sheet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Last</th>
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<th>E</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>Total</th>
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Appendix 2

PERSONAL AND INTERPERSONAL STYLE QUESTIONNAIRE

Date ......................
Name ......................

The questionnaire which follows will give you a chance to look at some aspects of your personal and interpersonal styles. It will take about 15 minutes to complete.

For each of the characteristics listed you will find a continuum of numbers from one to nine. After you have read each scale, write in the first left column that number, from one to nine, which best describes your behaviour as you now see it, (that is, your present actual behaviour). Then, in the right column, write the number which best describes your behaviour as you would like it to be (that is, the way you would prefer it to be). If the meaning of some of the characteristics or terms on the questionnaire are not clear to you, decide for yourself how you wish to interpret them. (Read carefully each description of the continuum in the questionnaire, because in some instances, what you deem the most desirable behaviour may not be on the extremes of the scale (1,9).)

Example: The first scale on the questionnaire is:
Closed 1.2.3.4.5.6.7.8.9 Open

If you see yourself now as a fairly closed and withdrawn person you may wish to enter a 2 or 3 under "Actual". If, on the other hand, you would like to become more open, then you may want to enter a 6 or 7 under "Preferred".
## PERSONAL STYLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Actual (the way you see yourself now)</th>
<th>Preferred (the way you'd like to be)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Closed</strong></td>
<td>123456789 Open</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spend most of</strong></td>
<td>123456789 Spend most of</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>my time alone</td>
<td>my time with others</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Seek help from</strong></td>
<td>123456789 Always solve problems</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>others</td>
<td>for myself</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Feel I have</strong></td>
<td>123456789 Feel I have little</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>much control</td>
<td>control over what</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>over what happens to me</td>
<td>happens to me</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rigid</strong></td>
<td>123456789 Flexible</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vague</strong></td>
<td>123456789 Clear</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do not finish</strong></td>
<td>123456789 Finish tasks</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tasks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Find many</strong></td>
<td>123456789 Find little to become involved with</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>things to become involved with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Am loveable</strong></td>
<td>123456789 Am not loveable</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Not confident</strong></td>
<td>123456789 Selfconfident</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>Preferred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not listening</td>
<td>Listening</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submissive</td>
<td>Dominant</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indifferent</td>
<td>Caring</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warm</td>
<td>Cold</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phoney</td>
<td>Sincere</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not trusting</td>
<td>Trusting</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influential</td>
<td>Not influential</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not comfortable with conflict</td>
<td>Comfortable</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never act unless I feel sure others reactions will be favourable</td>
<td>Always act even when I am unsure about others reactions</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not co-operative</td>
<td>Co-operative</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 3

OUTLINE OF INTERVIEWS

Methods of selection
- who
- how
- when

Methods of initiation
- ceremonial
- public
- private
- by whom
- what they're told

Establishment of role
- who says
- how
- when
- limits defined
- amount of guidance

Performance in the role
- supervision
- training
- authority
- means of reinforcing authority
- what was done
- pupils attitudes
- peers attitudes (classmates)
- relations among selves
- relations with staff
- apparent usefulness
- encouragement from staff
- encouragement from pupils
- policing (task)
- relationships (with pupils/staff /each other)

Role's effect on prefect
- personal development (vrs others)
- leadership skill development
Appendix 4

AIMS & FUNCTIONS OF THE PREFECTS

The following are some aspects of the understanding the prefects had of the Aim of the School, and of their own function in it. They were presented for the consideration and comment of the staff in the following form.

++++++++++++++++++++

AIM OF THE SCHOOL:

In conjunction with our families to prepare us for a christian life

++++++++++++++++++++

Some aspects of this aim are:
To provide opportunities to get S.C. & U.E. - these allow us to get jobs and take our place in adult life.
To provide a mature education - this consists of deepening our awareness of what's going on around us; giving us a broad range of experience, or range of ideas of experiences; teaching us to live up to our own standards and expectations, letting society teach us what society requires us to know.
To provide a christian background - to give us knowledge of Jesus, his church and of what it is to be a christian; to provide opportunities for, and support in, expressing our christianity on a practical level.
To develop in us a critical ability.
To facilitate a real knowledge of ourselves, and an ability to stand up for ourselves.
To develop friendships and an ability to relate to others.
FUNCTIONS OF PREFECTS:

Provide liaison between school pupils and staff
   (suggested tactic - set up a structure for Staff/Prefect meeting)
Provide help for members of their class - in getting changed
   what needs to be changed - in developing as people
   (overcoming personal difficulties etc.)
Be involved deeply in all aspects of school life
Be a good P.R.O. for the school with the public
Provide good example for school mates - obedience to the rules
   - exercise of initiative
   - being true to own convictions and claims
   - christian team work

Accept responsibilities and carry them well.
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