Primis

Educational Administration

McGraw-Hill Primis
ISBN: 0-390-93551-4

Text:

The UCEA Document Base — Front Matter
Educational Administration

Course:
Seminar on Leadership Theory
ED AD 739

Instructors:
Gary M Crow and Ann Weaver Hart

University of Utah
Educational Administration

McGraw-Hill
A Division of The McGraw-Hill Companies

The cover photograph is courtesy of Intel® Corporation and was created from a color photograph of Intel's Pentium™ chip.*

* Pentium™ is a trademark of Intel.

This book was printed on recycled paper.

Educational Administration

http://www.mhhe.com/primis/online/

111 UCEA ISBN: 0-390-93551-4

Educational Administration

Contents

Domain IV: Leadership and Management Processes

Taxonomy and Overview

Robert O. Slater
Texas A&M University

Ellen Goldring
Vanderbilt University

Lee Bolman
Harvard University

Paul W. Thurston
University of Illinois

Gary M. Crow
Louisiana State University

Taxonomy

I. Paradigms and frames: second-order perspectives of leadership in educational administration
II. Structural functionalism and leadership in educational administration
  A. Structural-functional antileadership theory
    1. Reductionist theory
  B. Structural-functional leadership theory
    1. Leadership and traits
    2. Leadership as position
    3. Leadership as behavior
III. The political-conflict perspectives of leadership in educational administration: leadership as a power relation
  A. Conservative political-conflict perspectives
  B. Radical political-conflict perspectives
  C. Feminist theory
IV. The constructivist perspectives of leadership in educational administration
  A. Constructivist antileadership theory
    1. Attribution theory

Overview

▶ INTRODUCTION

Four Questions and Four Perspectives

What is leadership? How do we come to know it? Why is it important? What are the conditions of its existence and effectiveness?

These four questions have played long-standing and central roles in leadership research and theory. They underlie a large literature that is, in the social sciences, generally, and in educational administration, in particular, uneven in quality and marked by ambiguity (Pfeffer, 1977). This essay is an attempt to help educational administration students make some sense of this literature. Obviously, given the size and complexity of the task, an effort such as this would stand little chance of producing anything useful if it were not subject to strict limitations. Accordingly, the discussion to follow will be limited mainly to studies done within the field of educational administration, and, within this context, to those that have been done within the last twenty-five years or so. No effort will be made to cover all the major works on leadership that have been done outside of the field, save for those that not only seem to have been among the most influential, but also happen to exemplify main currents of thought in leadership research that educational administration students might find particularly helpful. Nor is there any effort to be comprehensive with the leadership literature in educational administration. The main purpose of this essay is to suggest how different views of leadership both imply and are implied by broader and more comprehensive theories and perspectives of society. We have cited, therefore, only those relatively few pieces that seemed most suited to this task.

This essay is also limited to a sociological framework. A major assumption behind it is that leadership, whatever else it may be, always occurs in the context of the human group. The term "leadership" is slightly misleading because it seems to refer to one thing when, in fact, it must always refer to two things: leaders and followers (Yukl, 1981). Logically, leadership is a relationship, a social dyad between "leader" and "follower." Without followers there can be no leaders; without followership, no leadership. Leadership, therefore, is not only a psychological but a sociological phenomenon, and how we answer the four questions of leadership depends in no small way on how we answer related questions about what a human group or organiza-

tion is. Put more formally, theories of leadership always imply or are "nested" within broader images (Morgan, 1986) or theories of social organization and vice versa.

What, then, are the leading theories of social organization, and what responses does each imply for the four questions of leadership posed at the outset? To what degree does work on leadership in educational administration reflect the basic principles of these broader theories? These questions inform the following review and interpretation.

There may be many theories of social organization but three or four have proven especially influential. Collins (1985) refers to them as the Durkheimian, the conflict, and the microinteractionist traditions. For others, they are the structural-functional, conflict, and social-construction theories. For still others (Bolman & Deal, 1992), there are not just three but four "frames": the structural, human relations, political, and cultural frames (their first two categories being essentially an elaboration of structural functionalism). Finally, Burrell and Morgan (1979), also maintain that four paradigms are important: the functionalist, the interpretive, the radical structuralist, and the radical humanist. Their last two frameworks, it is important to note, are not simply theoretical frameworks. They are not only attempts to explain why social organizations are the way they are, how they got that way, and the consequences they have for their members. They also take a position.

Drawing eclectically from these theorists, we will look at leadership in educational administration from the perspectives of the functionalist, constructivist, political-conflict, and critical-humanist perspectives. Each of the four paradigms used here highlights aspects of society—and leadership—that the others fail to emphasize. It is not very useful, therefore, to argue that one perspective is in some sense "right" and the others "wrong." It is rather more productive to take Bolman and Deal's suggestion: think of each "frame" in terms of its strengths and weaknesses. One perspective may be stronger than another for calling attention to some particular aspect of social organization. For example, the functionalist paradigm is particularly strong when one wants to call attention to the role that rationality plays in human behavior and social life; it emphasizes social stability and consensus. The constructivist paradigm, on the other hand, plays down the function of rational action in human affairs and stresses instead the role that myths, storytelling, and culture play in social life; the roots of social cohesion, it suggests, lie not in reason but in ritual.

The general purpose of this essay, then, is to suggest that how one answers the four questions of leadership depends upon the basic assumptions about social organization that one brings to each question. What leadership looks like from a functionalist perspective is not how it looks from a political, constructivist, or critical-humanist perspective. The ontological and epistemological status of leadership changes as one moves from paradigm to paradigm.

What Is Leadership?

Consider, for example, the problem of defining leadership. What is leadership? This seems to be a perfectly natural question to ask of leadership but, unfortunately, it has not been very productive. Bennis and Nanus write:

> Decades of academic analysis have given us more than 350 definitions of leadership. Literally thousands of empirical investigations of leaders have been conducted in the last seventy-five years alone, but no clear and unequivocal understanding exists as to what distinguishes leaders from non-leaders. . . . (Bennis & Nanus, 1985)

Observing the great number of different definitions of leadership, Hoy and Miskel (1991) have been prompted to remark that "definitions of the concept are almost as numerous as the researchers engaged in its study." Holt (1990), in his widely used management text, laments, "After centuries of study of leaders, we still do not have an unambiguous definition of leadership."

Perhaps part of the problem is that we have focused too much attention on the first-order problem of saying what leadership means and not enough to the second-order question of what assumptions we make when trying to say what leadership is. In other words, instead of being caught up in saying what leadership is we might instead turn attention to what kind of thing it is, that is, to its ontological status. The ontological status of leadership is influenced by the perspective from which we view it.

Structural functionalists are rationalists, and from their perspective leadership is often thought of in terms of some kind of measurable behavior. Structural-functional theories of leadership in educational administration are more or less sophisticated. The less sophisticated the theory, the greater the tendency to argue that leadership consists of some specific and finite set of behaviors regardless of the situation. In the more sophisticated theories leadership is assumed to be situational. There is also less of a tendency to limit it to some specific set of behaviors.

Structural functionalists also believe that leadership can make a difference in group performance; it is important because it can make collective effort more effective. As rationalists, they also believe that, through the use of reason (science), it is possible to understand how leadership works, and through this understanding, make it more effective. Through research, it is possible to reach some general and fairly reliable conclusions about what leadership is, how it works in most schools most of the time, and how its effectiveness varies according to the situation. This knowledge of the nature of school leadership, they maintain, can then be used to inform education policy decisions.

Political-conflict theorists tend to share the structural functionalists' belief in the objectivity of leadership. The perspectives differ in two important ways, however. First, while political-radical structuralists may agree with the structural functionalists that some behaviors qualify more than others as leadership behaviors, unlike the structural functionalists their focus is not so much on leadership as a behavior but on leadership as a relationship,

particularly a power relationship. Leadership, for them, is a situation wherein some dominate and others are dominated. Leadership behaviors emerge out of and are always informed by this relationship. Also like the structural functionalists, they tend to think of leadership more as an objective than a subjective phenomenon. Their questions have mainly to do with how power relations are perceived and are made to seem legitimate, that is, fit, proper, and right, and the conditions under which legitimacy breaks down. The second point on which the political-radical structuralists differ from the structural functionalists, and on this they come closer to the critical humanists' position, is that they are not merely content with theoretical discourse about leadership. They also want social change. In other words, they are not only interested in theory but also take a normative position.

Where the structural functionalists and political-conflict theorists believe in the objectivity of leadership, often claiming that it consists of a finite number of specific behaviors, the constructivists stress the subjective side of leadership. They believe that leadership consists not in specific behaviors but lies in the meaning behind behavior. Perhaps this point can best be illustrated by reference to a rather mundane behavior that would not normally be taken as leadership, say, the act of turning out lights when leaving a room. Structural functionalists do not usually put "turning out the lights when leaving a room" on their lists of leadership behaviors. Nonetheless, from the constructivist perspective there could be circumstances under which this kind of behavior might well qualify as leadership. Suppose, for example, that, under a site-based management plan, schools were allowed discretion over funds for operating their plant and facilities. Suppose further that school members decided to cut facilities' expenses and put the money saved into school curriculum development, the reorganization of instruction, or toward the hiring of additional classroom aides. In the interest of these goals, principals and teachers launch a schoolwide campaign to conserve energy. Accordingly, to set a good example and reinforce their message, they themselves take pains to do little things to conserve energy, such as turning out the lights when they leave a room. They do so knowing that others will observe their actions and see that they are behaving in a manner which is consistent with one of the school's major goals. In this situation the behavior itself, not normally thought of as having anything to do with leadership, might qualify as such because of the explicit intention and meaning behind it.

Critical humanists tend to agree with the constructivists that leadership is more of a subjective than an objective phenomenon, that is, socially constructed. But they also tend to be critical of existing social constructions and strongly committed to social change. This last point they share with the more radical proponents of the political-conflict perspective.

So, how we answer the question of what leadership is depends on our assumptions about the nature of social organization. This is also true of the other questions of leadership. Our response to each is influenced by the

broader framework within which we are operating. In what follows, we elaborate some major points of each of four perspectives of social organization, and attempt to articulate their implications for theories of leadership in educational administration.

▶ STRUCTURAL-FUNCTIONAL PERSPECTIVES OF LEADERSHIP IN EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION

Structural Functionalism

The structural functionalist, as already noted, stresses the role of rationality and reason in social life. Reason is believed to be both an important aspect of social life and a means of understanding social life; human behavior involves the use of reason, and reason can be used to understand human behavior and make it more effective.

In an effort to use reason to understand human behavior and social life, the structural functionalist focuses on social structure. Indeed, structural functionalism may be roughly understood as a theory of social structure. It addresses the following sorts of questions: What is social structure? Why does it exist? What are the consequences of its existence? The general idea is that through the systematic use of reason (science) one can answer these questions and have some notion of how society, in general, and schools, in particular, work.

Social structure or, more technically, structural differentiation, is said to emerge out of the application of various criteria of differentiation in the group or organizational setting. Two common criteria of differentiation in schools, for example, are age and ability. Students are differentiated or separated according to their ages, as in the case of the graded school. They are also differentiated according to their abilities, as in the case of reading groups. So, age and ability are used as criteria for differentiating students into subgroups and the creation of these subgroups produces age and ability structures. Another common structure in schools is the formal power or authority structure. In this case, students, teachers, and administrators are differentiated according to their decision-making authority. This criterion of differentiation produces a hierarchical structure.

The various structures of differentiation at work in a school tend to interlock and influence who deals with whom on what basis, that is, they influence communication patterns and face-to-face interactions. Out of these interactions, values become shared and eventually crystallize into social norms, that is, common expectations about how people ought to behave (Blau & Scott, 1963: 3–4). A shared system of beliefs and orientations arises. The network of social interactions constitutes the social organization's structure. The shared orientations and beliefs make up its culture.

Structural functionalists tend to believe that social structure and culture evolve over time in a manner best suited for the survival of the group or organization. In other words, the criteria that are used to differentiate the members of a society, creating social structures, are assumed to be the criteria (and structures) that are most likely to contribute to a stable and smoothly functioning social order. Each structure is believed to perform some needed function and to contribute to the overall stability of the whole. Every society, for example, somehow needs to initiate its young into the ways in which people cope with the various exigencies of life. Generally, this function is performed by an educational system through which knowledge and values are passed on from one generation to the next. From the structural-functionalist perspective, then, structure is rooted in the nature of things. Similar assumptions are made of culture. Structural functionalists believe that a society's members view the various social structures as appropriate and necessary for the general social order. For this reason, perhaps, structural functionalism is also often referred to as "consensus" theory.

The structural functionalist's language tends to reflect these assumptions. As Burrell and Morgan (1979) point out, structural functionalists like to talk in terms of "the status quo," "social order," "consensus," "social integration," "solidarity," "need satisfaction," and the like. When structural functionalism is married to organizational theory, moreover, one often sees such terms as "coordination," "control," "formalization," "centralization-decentralization," "complexity," "organizational effectiveness," "organizational efficiency," "structure," "restructuring," "problem solving," "decision making," "motivation," and "rationality," to mention some of the main ones. These concepts comprise an essential part of the vocabulary of the structural functionalist.

Structural Functionalism and Reductionist Leadership Theory

From the structural functionalist point of view, leadership is necessary if group or collective effort is to be effective and efficient, and one of the most long-standing and central structural-functional propositions about leadership is that it is important for the accomplishment of group purpose or organizational performance (Gardner, 1990: xii). But there are some theorists who either deny that leadership has the effects it is supposed to have on group or organizational performance or they claim that whatever effects leadership has they can be had by other means which are more desirable. Those who hold the first position we call "attribution" theorists and those who advocate the second are "reductionists." We will deal with attribution theory in the section devoted to the constructivist perspective. But because we have just finished a discussion of the natural of social structure and because this concept, which is central to the structural-functionalist perspective, plays such an important role in the reductionist theory, we will now briefly focus on the main point of the reductionists' position.

The reductionists (Kerr & Jermier, 1978; Freeston, 1987; Pitner, 1986)

claim that there are certain things that can "substitute" for leadership. Some of these things have to do with socialization or are the results of socialization (e.g., experience, education, professional orientation, incentives). Others have to do with group tasks and the organizational structure (e.g., rules and regulations, the division of labor, centralization and decentralization, spatial arrangements). These and other similar substitutes are felt to act in place of leader behaviors, particularly behaviors that are meant to be supportive of individual efforts and behaviors that are task-oriented. These things influence or control the behavior of the group's members in much the same way that leadership influences it or at least to the same or better effect.

While leadership, then, may be important as a means of social control and direction, there are alternative ways of controlling and directing individual and group behavior. This is the central theoretical-empirical proposition of the reductionist perspective.

For our purposes it is important to note that the reductionist case ultimately rests on an interpretation of leadership that most scholars operating from the constructivist and critical-humanist perspectives would probably find excessively narrow. The reductionists assume that leadership is mainly a form of social control. Given this assumption, it is easy for them to argue for an alternative form of control, that is, social structure. As Pitner puts it, "The theory suggests that leadership may come from other sources and efforts on the part of the administrator to supply it may be unnecessary" (1986: 28). But constructivists and critical humanists would probably not agree that leadership is just a matter of social control. They would likely argue that leadership is far more than simply a mechanism for controlling human behavior; it is most importantly a source of values and, through the revitalization of culture, a means of human uplift. In the words of one critical humanist, " . . . administration, particularly educational administration, involves the alignment of people in an educative and transformative fashion" (Foster, 1986: 10).

In defense of their position, the reductionists might counter that they really want to substitute structure for leadership because, while it may have the potential for uplifting human beings, it is just as likely to become an instrument of oppression. Accordingly, why take the risk? Better to substitute for leadership something that does not involve a power relation and the subordination inherent in such relationships.

At this point, the conflict theorist might well enter the debate and attack the reductionist from a different direction. The main trouble with the reductionist approach, they might argue, is that by wanting to substitute structure for leadership the reductionists will simply obscure (and thus prolong) the real problem, namely, that power relations in modern societies are lopsided and false consciousness and domination are the rule (Collins, 1985: 47ff.).

In their defense, the reductionists might say that the conflict theorists are too cynical and imagine power relations to be more oppressive than they really are. After all, in schools for example, increased litigation, as in the

case of students' rights, is redistributing power in favor of students, reducing the role of hierarchical leadership. The critical humanists, they might also claim, are hopelessly romantic and naive. Both the critical humanists and the critical theorists, they might argue, are extremists and have no genuine interest in finding practical solutions to real-world problems.

Before leaving the discussion of the reductionist position, it should be observed that when some leadership theorists use the term "substitutes for leadership," they do not mean the same thing that most reductionists mean by it. Sergiovanni (1992), for example, has an essay entitled "Why We Should Seek Substitutes for Leadership," giving the initial impression that he subscribes to the reductionist position we have just outlined. In view of Sergiovanni's long-standing interest in leadership, such a position seems contradictory. But when one examines what he has to say, it turns out that he does not want to substitute structure for leadership like most reductionists. He rather wants to substitute *culture* for leadership. The leadership that Sergiovanni wants to replace with culture is a traditional type of leadership, what he calls a "direct" leadership, that is, a top-down type of leadership. His basic point is that this traditional form of "external" or direct leadership is oriented mainly toward external control. What we need instead is behavior guided by community norms and values and professional ideals.

So where Schein (1985) and others (Deal & Peterson, 1990; Sashkin, 1988) maintain that leadership is a matter of building new cultures and destroying old ones, Sergiovanni suggests that culture can substitute for leadership.

Nonreductionist Structural-Functional Theories of Leadership

Opposed to the reductionists, but still structural functionalists, are those scholars who believe that leadership makes a difference for group unity and performance. On the question of what kind of thing leadership is, that is, on the ontological status of leadership, most of these scholars are of the view that leadership consists of some number of behaviors or skills.

Precursors of Behavioral Theories of Leadership: Leadership Traits The idea that leadership consists of certain behaviors or skills evolved out of what has come to be known as "trait" theory. One of the oldest ideas in leadership research, trait theory is a theory of why certain people manage to become leaders and exercise leadership. It says that people become leaders or gain leadership positions by virtue of certain individual traits that they possess and which enable them to exercise leadership. Some common traits thought to underlie leadership are intelligence, physical stature, appearance, facility with language, and the like.

Trait theory is usually said to have originated with Thomas Carlyle, the nineteenth-century essayist and historian who spent much of his life trying to reconcile religion and science, and who ultimately turned to German idealism and romanticism as a source of personal strength. Carlyle, in the

tradition of Edmund Burke, and along with Coleridge, Wordsworth, and a handful of other English romantics, steadfastly opposed science and the enlightenment influence, and argued that the history, the world's destiny, was determined by a few great men. Science, from Carlyle's point of view, was antihero and antileadership. In his mind, the hero, the great man, and the artist were one and the same to the degree that they all possessed a genius, an intuition, a "sixth sense," a vision that enabled them to "see" order in a world where others saw only disorder and chaos. The scientist's agenda was completely different from the artist's. The scientists approached a chaotic world and sought to discover an underlying order, painstakingly over time, and with plodding methods. The artists, too, approached a chaotic world but unlike their scientist counterparts, they did not seek to discover order but to impose it with sheer strength of will.

Trait theory is structural functionalist in orientation because it assumes that the criteria (personal traits) that differentiate leaders from nonleaders are somehow rooted in the nature of things. Some people are born with special abilities that make them fit to be leaders, that is, they are born to rule. These people then make the important decisions that keep society moving in the right direction and maintain social order. These elites perform a much needed and valuable social function. Society could not survive without them and their special talents, or so the theory goes.

Trait theory's academic fortunes have been mixed. It influenced early social science research on leadership, and led to many attempts to isolate leadership traits. But no single factor could be shown to be consistently associated with individuals occupying leadership positions. Finally, by the late 1940s and largely because of work by Stogdill, trait theory fell into bad academic repute. Most scholars now insist that "leadership is not a matter of passive status nor of the mere possession of some combination of traits, as trait theory would suggest. It rather appears to be a working relationship among members of a group, in which the leader acquires status through active participation and demonstration of his capacity for carrying cooperative tasks through to completion" (Bass, 1985: 68).

Nonetheless, while trait theory itself may be dead, there still seems to be some interest in the empirical correlation between personal qualities and hierarchical status. Kouzes and Posner (1991) surveyed nearly 1500 managers from around the country in a study sponsored by the American Management Association. They asked the following open-ended question: "What values (personal traits or characteristics) do you look for and admire in your superiors?" Over 225 different traits, values, and so forth, were identified but some were consistently mentioned. The authors concluded:

> . . . It appears that there are several essential tests that a person must pass before we are willing to grant him or her the title leader. According to our research, the majority of us admire leaders who are: honest, competent, forward-looking and inspiring. (1991:16)

So, while trait theory itself no longer commands respect, the empirical correlations between individual qualities and leadership are still of some interest.

In a more theoretical vein, there is work now being done that one could argue is a more sophisticated version of trait theory. We are thinking here of recent studies of charisma. Influenced by Weber's concept of charismatic leadership, this theory is mainly being constructed and tested at the macrosocial level, as in, for example, Madsen and Snow's (1991) study of the charismatic bond between Juan Perón and Argentina's industrial workers and farmers.

Leadership as Position or Role Another structural-functionalist approach associates leadership with a person's official position or role. "Leaders" are those who occupy superordinate positions in an organizational hierarchy.

This view is part of what Bolman and Deal (1992) call the "structuralist" perspective or frame. This view "emphasizes rationality, efficiency, structures, and policies. Structural leaders value analysis and data, keep their eye on the bottom line, set clear directions, hold people accountable for results, and try to solve organizational problems with new policies and rules—or through restructuring" (Bolman & Deal, 1992: 315–316). This view also assumes that whatever gets done in an organization is the result of decisions by those at the top. In other words, it has a hierarchical bias; the only people who are supposed to be able to exercise leadership are those in positions of authority. As we shall see, this is not one of the assumptions of the constructivist and critical-humanist frameworks wherein leadership can be diffused throughout the organization.

Leadership as Behavior The chief problem of educational leadership, from the structural-functionalist perspective, is to figure out how schools and school systems work and then to use this knowledge to make them work in the most efficient and effective way possible. To do this, one must first discover the school's underlying structures. This is where the scientific method comes in and research informs practice. The aim is to use science to understand and gain intellectual and practical mastery of the social and educational processes associated with the structures (see Smith & Blase, 1991 for a critique of this view). Once one figures out what these underlying structures are, one can manipulate them to produce the desired results.

Because of its emphasis on scientific method and rationality, structural functionalism assumes that leadership is something that can be measured and operationalized. Accordingly, within this framework, leadership is mainly conceived in terms of overt "behaviors" or "skills," and structural functionalists are often making lists of the various behaviors that are supposed to constitute leadership.

A widely circulated example of the skills orientation to leadership is *Skills for Successful School Leaders* by Hoyle, English, and Steffy (1985), published by the American Association of School Administrators, the nation's largest association of educational administrators. The book presents and articulates eight "skill areas" felt to be critical for school administrators to master

and apply if they wish to be successful leaders. The skills are (1) designing, implementing, and evaluating school climate; (2) building public support; (3) developing a curriculum; (4) delivering the curriculum; (5) evaluating staff; (6) developing staff; (7) allocating human, material, and financial resources; and (8) conducting research and using research findings.

The manner in which the authors present and articulate these eight skills or skill areas reflects structural-functionalist assumptions. For example, while power and politics are discussed in the chapter on building public support, the emphasis is less on conflict and legitimacy and more on consensus. Conflict is discussed only for the purpose of suggesting how it can be mediated. Tips are offered on "coalition building," "winning at the polls," "the art of lobbying," and "collective bargaining." The point of the whole thing is to give working school administrators some practical tips on how to make their schools and school systems more efficient and effective, and to justify the practical suggestions with brief references to some of the relevant research.

The skills orientation to leadership is also the organizing rationale for the 1993 publication of the National Policy Board for Educational Administration. *Principals for Our Changing Schools: The Knowledge and Skill Base* (Thompson, 1993). The knowledge and skill base are organized into 21 domains in four broad categories. The functional domains which address the organizational processes and techniques by which the mission of the school is achieved include leadership, information collection, problem analysis, judgment, organizational oversight, implementation, and delegation. Programmatic domains, which focus on the scope and framework of the educational program, include instruction and the learning environment, curriculum design, student guidance and development, staff development, measurement and evaluation and resource allocation. Interpersonal domains, which recognize the significance of interpersonal connections in schools, include motivating others, interpersonal sensitivity, oral and nonverbal expression and written expression. The contextual domains reflect the world of ideas and forces within which the school operates and include philosophical and cultural values, legal and regulatory applications, policy and political influences and public relations.

Both of these works also reflects the structural-functionalist focus on hierarchical leadership. Because of the perspective's emphasis on technical rationality and expertise, it tends to make one think of leadership as something exercised primarily by elites or people in positions of power. The framework assumes that the higher the position in the organization, the greater the knowledge of how the organization works. As previously noted, the other perspectives, particularly the constructivist and critical humanist, do not make this assumption and may even explicitly make the case that leadership ought be diffused throughout the organization, maintaining that teachers and students can and should provide leadership in the school as well as administrators.

This is not to say, of course, that a nonhierarchical view of leadership is impossible within the structuralist-functionalist framework. Ann Lieberman's (1988) work on teacher leadership, for example, is mainly structural functionalist in its assumptions but does not assume that the exercise of school leadership is confined to administrative roles. Nonetheless, while the perspective accommodates a non-hierarchical view of leadership it does not encourage it.

In addition to its skills orientation, structural functionalism also emphasizes control and coordination of group action. Ables and Conway (1973), for example, say that the leadership is largely a matter of controlling flows of rewards within teams, and interaction patterns. Cawelti, Brandt, Mortimore, and Sammons (1987) believe that important leadership behaviors include the setting of goals and the provision of strong incentives. For Brown (1967) leadership is representing the group, reducing conflict, tolerating uncertainty, arguing effectively, exhibiting strong convictions, and so on.

Consideration versus Task Leadership Behaviors Given the ontological position that leadership consists of a finite set of behaviors, the natural tendency for the scientifically minded structural functionalist is to try to put in more general categories the behaviors found to be empirically associated with those in leadership positions. Research to obtain descriptions of leader behaviors that could be classified into more general categories or classes of behavior began in 1947 when the Personnel Research Board of Ohio State University hired Ralph Stogdill to do a series of studies on leadership. Stogdill found that from the perspective of followers, leader behaviors seemed to be of two types. The things leaders did either showed concern for people, the workers, or for the organization and getting the job done. Stogdill later called these two basic categories of leader behaviors "system-oriented" behaviors and "person-oriented" behaviors.

Stogdill's finding that followers tend to think of leadership behaviors in terms of two basic categories has been replicated by many other studies since. The labels for the two categories change (e.g., consideration-initiating structure; instrumental-expressive; goal-emphasis support, etc.), but as Hoy and Miskel (1991: 260ff.) suggest, the idea is essentially the same: leadership behavior seems to have two basic dimensions.

At first, scholars assumed the two categories of behavior to be extremes on a continuum. This led to rather fruitless arguments over which type of behavior was "better," that is, most likely to result in increased organizational performance or group success. Later, however, the two types came to be thought of as independent. This led to the conclusion that the most effective leaders are those who practice both types, knowing when and where each is appropriate. The research on school administrators tends to bear this out, though Brown (1967) has argued that some school principals who are weak on one dimension can compensate by being unusually strong on the other.