CHAPTER ONE

ORIENTATION TO THE STUDY

1.1 INTRODUCTION

It is generally accepted that the principal plays a decisive role in initiating and maintaining a school climate, a term which refers to the collective perceptions of feelings of the people in the school towards a variety of aspects of the school (Hoy and Miskel 1987:247). A wide range of tasks and activities which a principal can carry out to influence the school climate positively can be identified. The following points can be regarded as basic components of a principal’s tasks as initiator and caretaker of a particular school climate (Kruger 1999:18):

- Regulating the organizational structure.
- The leadership role of the principal.
- Establishing a mission for the school.
- Professionalising the education profession.

Among the many tasks of a principal in a school, the influence of his/her leadership style on the school climate is a very important issue that needs to be discussed and investigated. According to Kruger (1999:18), there is a direct connection between a principal’s leadership style and school climate. To foster and maintain a school climate where the majority of the staff are committed to their work, an efficient, outstanding leadership style is essential and should be characterized by, inter alia, the following (Kruger 1999:18):

- Flexibility and adaptability to the situation.
- The ability to setting a personal example which is linked to a vision that inspires emulation.
- The ability to increase the staff’s professional autonomy.

Moreover, in the extrapolation of Black’s instructional leadership (1998:34), Parker and Day (1997:87) point out clearly that instructional leaders perform five functions among which one deals with promoting instructional climate. This implies the creation of a positive school climate in which teaching and learning can take place. It also implies the creation of a
situation where learning is made exciting, where teachers and learners are supported, where there is a shared sense of purpose and where learning will not be difficult (Parker and Day 1997: 87).

As a complement of Kruger’s findings on school climate and a principal’s leadership style, this research examined the relationship that existed between the leadership style of principals and school climate that prevailed in private secondary schools in Mauritius. The study was conducted only in private secondary schools because it was presumed that in most of these schools principals adopted different leadership styles and that each school had a unique climate. However, it was assumed that in state secondary schools there was some uniformity as regards the leadership styles since the principals were given clear rules and regulations by the Ministry of Education about the way they had to administer the schools (Dept of Education 2000: 12). This assumption could be investigated by applying the same method used in this study.

In order to confirm that principals of private secondary schools adopted different leadership styles and that different climates prevailed in the schools, some teachers had been informally consulted and they had revealed that this fact was true. They were willing to participate in the research in order to relate in detail how they were treated in these schools. Some teachers had related that they had worked with different principals who had adopted different leadership styles in the same school and they had witnessed how different school climates prevailed with each principal. These teachers could compare between different types of leadership styles and they could give descriptions of different types of school climate. Thus, this research looked for both teachers and principals who expressed their opinions clearly on the two important issues of the research, that is, on the leadership styles of principals and school climate. Of course, all information was kept confidential and anonymity was assured.

By and large, the idea of conducting such a research in private secondary schools arose after having completed four modules on Educational Management in the BEd course at the University of South Africa and also after reading some articles in daily newspapers of Mauritius about complaints of teachers regarding their principals. One teacher complained that his school was like a real hell and that the managing body, the teachers and the students were just acting like in George Orwell’s “Animal Farm” (News on Sunday 2003: 2).
Moreover, after consultation of all the dissertations at the Mauritius Institute of Education (MIE) and the University of Mauritius (UoM), no research had been found on the relationship between leadership styles of principals and school climate in private secondary schools of Mauritius.

Not to forget, it is hoped that the study will be of interest not only to the managers and principals of private secondary schools but also to the PSSA that controls these schools as well as the Ministry of Education and Scientific Research (MoESR). The PSSA is aware of the types of management styles adopted by principals of private secondary schools and although some complaints have reached the Ministry of Labour, in so far as employer-employee relationship is concerned, nothing is being done to address the issue.

1.2 BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY

Before delving deeply in the topic, it is very convenient to give a brief description of the history of education in Mauritius and a profile of the actual education system of Mauritius. So far as the history of education is concerned, according to Bissoondoyal (1982:4), schools always existed in Mauritius since the Dutch settlement in 1598 until the British left the country in the hands of Mauritians in 1968 after the accession of the country to independence. The Dutch occupied Mauritius from 1598 to 1703. Then came the French in 1715 who occupied the Island for a century or so. Finally the British occupied the country from 1810 to 1968. According to Bissoondoyal (1982:30-31), it was in the British period that the history of schooling could best be traced in Mauritius.

The development of education in Mauritius in the British period started in 1813 when the ‘Ecole Centrale’, formed by the French, was styled into the Royal College which was serving only the white people. It was only in 1829 that coloured people were being admitted in the Royal College. However, only the white people were benefiting the English scholarship. In 1836, all restrictions in the opening of schools were removed and from then on many landmarks in the Mauritian education occurred and continued until now. For instance, in 1869, almost all existing private secondary schools became associated with the Royal College. In 1906, twenty-five private secondary schools were associated with the Royal
College. By that time, many coloured Mauritians had benefited from English scholarship (Selvon 2001:21).

With the accession of the country to independence in March 1968, definite educational priorities had been recognized. The most recent reform in education in Mauritius was the “regionalisation system” which englobed both the primary and secondary sectors of education. Actually, schooling in Mauritius is based on a 2+6+5+2 system similar to the British system (Kulpoo 2002: 304). Pupils enter the system at the age of three for two years of pre-primary education, followed by six years of study in primary schools leading to the CPE examinations. After passing the CPE, the pupils join a secondary school in their respective region and those who fail enter the pre-vocational schools where they study technical subjects for three years. Those who have joined the secondary schools have to spend five years in order to take part for the Cambridge school certificate (SC/GCE ordinary level examination). Finally, they have to spend two more years in the secondary school in order to sit for the Cambridge higher school certificate (HSC/ Advanced level examinations). Those who do not opt for HSC have to follow technical courses offered by Industrial and Vocational Training Board (IVTB). After the HSC level, pupils either enter the job market or the tertiary sector for further studies (MoESR 2003: 1-14).

For the past few years, Mauritius had witnessed significant changes in all sectors of its economy, and the education sector was no exception. The provision of free education at secondary level since 1976 had called for great challenges and the main aim of the Government was to provide more equality of educational opportunity (Bunwaree 2002: 178).

In Mauritius, we can roughly classify secondary schools into two broad categories:

- State secondary schools
- Private secondary schools (confessional, Government-aided and non-aided private schools).

As at March 2002, secondary education was dispensed in one hundred and forty three schools. Forty of them were state administered while the others were either confessional, Government-aided or non-aided private secondary schools (CSO 2002:3). State secondary schools are dictated by Government policies and influenced by external examination boards.
like Cambridge and London. These schools are managed by rectors and deputy rectors and they fall under the administration of six regional directorates - now converted into four zones in the “regionalisation system”. Private secondary schools, on their part, are controlled by the Private Secondary Schools Authority (PSSA). Each private secondary school has a manager who is the owner of the school (Bunwaree 2002: 145). In case of confessional school, the manager is comprised of a board of directors, which is elected by all its members. The manager of a private secondary school is responsible for the provision of educational facilities, maintenance and upkeep of school infrastructure, financial matters, and is accountable to the PSSA for the running of the school in accordance with national educational regulations. The manager appoints a principal who monitors the work of all staff, controls internal examinations, assists in the preparation of the time table, maintains discipline, looks after staff and students’ welfare and coordinates inter-departmental activities. The staff is accountable to the principal and appraisal is done by him and also by the inspectorate of the PSSA (PSSA Report 2002:2-5).

By and large, the system of education in Mauritius is directed to ensure that all pupils are provided with similar facilities to develop their potential to the full. It has to endow them with values, knowledge and skills to think critically, to innovate and be creative in the face of change. They must be equipped with the qualities important for themselves, for society, and for the world of work that is being revolutionized with the advent of information technology and greater competition due to globalisation. Moreover, aspects of education such as aesthetic appreciation and the importance of learning to live together in a multicultural society as responsible citizens cannot be left the way side (MoESR 2003:10).

1.3 PROBLEM FORMULATION

The previous sections now lead to the main research problem, which is derived from the title of the research. It reads as follows:
“Is there a relationship between the leadership styles of principals and school climate in private secondary schools in Mauritius?”
This problem can now be sub-divided into two sub-problems that were investigated. They are:
• What types of leadership styles are adopted by principals of private secondary schools in Mauritius?
• What types of school climates prevail in these private secondary schools?

1.4 AIMS AND SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

This research is focusing on two sub-problems in order to find out the relationship between the leadership styles of principals and school climates in private secondary schools in Mauritius. These problems lead to the following aims of the study:

• To assess the types of leadership styles adopted by principals in private secondary schools.
• To evaluate the school climates that prevail in these private secondary schools.
• To find out the relation (if any) that exists between the leadership styles and school climates in private secondary schools in Mauritius.

The first aim is meant to find out the types of leadership styles adopted by principals in private secondary schools in Mauritius. In the literature study, in chapter two, a clear description of different leadership styles and different studies related to this topic are presented. In chapter three, on research design and methodology, the techniques used to assess the types of leadership styles adopted by principals are elucidated. The main techniques used were interviews and observations on both teachers and principals.

The second aim of the research is concerned with evaluating the types of school climate that prevailed in private secondary schools. Again, in the chapter on literature study, all studies related to this topic are presented. Moreover, in chapter three, on research methodology and design, the techniques used to evaluate the types of school climates are described in detail. In this case also, interviews and observations were used on both students and teachers in the private secondary schools.

Finally, the third aim deals with finding out the relationship that existed between the leadership styles of principals and school climates in private secondary schools in Mauritius.
This is the focus point of chapter four which deals with the presentation and analysis of all data gathered during the research in private secondary schools.

1.5 METHODS OF RESEARCH

Research methods are the ways one collects and analyses data. These methods have been developed for acquiring knowledge by reliable and valid procedures. The methods used are systematic and purposeful. The procedures are not haphazard activities; they are planned to yield data on a particular research problem (McMillan and Schumacher 1997: 9). In the topics that follow, a brief explanation on the techniques used to collect data is presented.

1.5.1 Type of research

The research used in this study was a qualitative one based on interviews and observations. According to Fraenkel and Wallen (1993:380) a qualitative research refers to research studies that investigate the quality of relationships, activities, situations or materials. In this type of research there is greater emphasis on holistic description –that is, on describing in detail all of what goes on in a particular activity or situation.

The two concepts investigated in this research were leadership styles of principals and school climates in private secondary schools. The techniques used to gather information on these concepts were mainly interviews and observations. Interviews are essentially vocal questionnaires. It involves direct interaction between individuals in order to gather data on a particular topic. Both teachers and principals were interviewed in this research in order to gain information on the types of leadership styles and school climates. The choice of interviews can be justified by the fact that (McMillan and Schumacher 1997:263):

- It is flexible and adaptable.
- It can be used with many different problems and types of persons.
- Responses can be probed, followed up, clarified and elaborated to achieve accurate responses.
As far as the observation technique is concerned, the non-participant naturalistic observation was used. This involves observing individuals in their natural settings. In this method, the researcher made no effort whatsoever to manipulate variables or to control the activities of individuals, but simply observed and recorded what happened as things naturally occur.

**1.5.2 Site selection and sampling**

In Mauritius there are one hundred and three private secondary schools that are well distributed in all regions of the island (CSO 2002:13). The research could not be conducted in all of them but only nine of them were selected at random in the nine districts of Mauritius. In each of them, two teachers and the principal were interviewed in order to obtain answers for the sub-problems mentioned in section 1.3.

As far as the observation is concerned, once in the site, the researcher observed the behaviours of the teachers and the principal and also some physical aspects of the school in order to assess the types of leadership styles of principals and to evaluate the school climates.

**1.5.3 Research role**

In order to conduct the research, permission was granted by the managing bodies in order to gain entry in these schools. A letter of permission was presented in person to the principal as well as to the two teachers selected to be interviewed. The aim of the research and the researcher’s role were highlighted in the letter. The researcher’s role was that of an interviewer and an observer.

**1.5.4 Data collection strategies**

As mentioned in topic 1.5.1, the two main strategies used to collect data on the leadership styles of principals and school climates were interviews and observations.

As far as interviews with teachers and principals are concerned, the standardized interviews were chosen in which the participants were asked the same questions in the same order, thus reducing interviewer effects and bias. The primary data of the interviews were the verbatim
accounts of what transpired in the interview sessions. The interviews were even tape-recorded to ensure completeness of the verbal interactions and could provide materials for reliability checks. Of course, permission was asked before taping the conversations.

Data about the leadership styles of the principals and school climates were gained by interviewing the teachers and the principals. The teachers were asked to give their opinions on the behaviours of their principals towards them, the inter-personal relationships that existed, about discipline, safety, security, and their commitments to their works. More explanations on the questions asked in the interviews are presented in more detail in chapter three on research methodology.

By and large, information about leadership styles of principals and school climates were also obtained by observation technique. In fact, the non-participant naturalistic observation method was used. This was done simultaneously while on site visit for the interview sessions. The behaviours of principals, teachers and the inter-personal relationships as well as the way they communicated with each other were observed and described thoroughly. Moreover, all the physical infrastructures of the schools also were observed and noted in order to have a good picture of the climates of these schools. This technique is described in detail in chapter three section 3.8.

1.6 CLARIFICATIONS OF CONCEPTS

Leadership
It is the ability to influence members of an organization to work towards the attainment of its objectives (Gabriel 2003:251).

Leadership styles
They are the different approaches to dealing with people when in a position of authority (Borrington and Stimpson 2005: 194).
Types of leadership style

(a) The ‘power’ concept of leadership: This consists of three styles of leadership. They are:

- The authoritarian leadership style
- The democratic leadership style
- The laissez-faire leadership style

(b) The ‘relational’ concept of leadership deals with the initiating structure and consideration. The initiating structure reflects the extent to which the leader attempts to organize work and sees to it that the followers are working up to capacity whereas consideration includes leadership behaviour that indicates friendship, trust, warmth, interest and respect (Hoy and Miskel 1982:226).

School climate

(a) According to Halpin and croft (Silver 1983:50), in their conceptual foundation study, school climate is defined as the ‘feel’ of a school.

(b) According to contemporary study, school climate is considered as the shared perceptions and feelings of the people in the school about various of its facets (Hoy and Miskel 1987:247).

Private secondary schools in Mauritius

They are the confessional, Government aided and non-aided schools which are not dictated by Government policies. Each one is owned by a manager and is supervised by a principal. They are controlled by the PSSA.
The principal of a secondary school in Mauritius

He or she is a person appointed by the manager of a secondary school and is responsible for the internal organization, efficient administration and supervision of all the aspects of a school; that is, he or she should ensure that there is effective dispensation of education to the pupils in the school and that all the teaching and non-teaching staff are conducting their work properly (Dept of Education 2000:12). The basic requirements for a principal actually is a post-graduate certificate in education (PGCE) plus a minimum of five years experience in teaching prior to the date of appointment as principal.

1.7 CHAPTER DIVISION

This dissertation consists of five chapters. In chapter one, the introduction gives an overview of the two main concepts which were studied. They were the leadership styles of principals and school climates in private secondary schools. The introduction also explains on the relevance of the study so that readers can have an overview of how private secondary schools in Mauritius were managed and also the reason why the research was conducted in private secondary schools only. In the topic “background of the study”, a brief history of education in Mauritius and a profile of the actual system of education in Mauritius are presented. After reading this topic the reader already has an idea of the context of the research and how the secondary education sector operates in Mauritius, paying particular regard to the private secondary schools. The next part of chapter one deals with the problem formulation, aim of the study, and the method of research. The chapter ends with the clarifications of concepts and an overview of chapters.

Chapter two reviews the literature in which knowledge and insights obtained from various sources are integrated. The chapter focuses on some theory works on leadership styles of principals and school climates so that the readers can have an idea of what they will come across in the following chapters. The chapter also reveals some researches that had been conducted in private secondary schools and those that had certain relationship with the actual topic.
Chapter three deals with the research design and methodology. In this chapter, an explanation of why the research based on interviews and observations were chosen in order to find the influence of leadership styles of principals on school climate in private secondary schools of Mauritius. An explanation of the site selection and sampling together with the research role and the data collection strategies are also explained in detail. An explanation of the data analysis is also presented.

Chapter four deals with the presentation, analysis and interpretation of data.

Finally, chapter five deals with the summary, findings, recommendations and conclusion.

1.8 SUMMARY

This chapter lays the foundation for the dissertation. It gives the reader the appropriate context of the research, an overview of the whole study, and an idea of what follows in the forthcoming chapters. While going through this chapter, the reader already has in mind the problem that is being studied, the method the research was conducted and how the data were collected, presented and analysed. A brief history of education in Mauritius and the actual education system of Mauritius are presented so that foreign readers can understand the context in which the research is conducted.

In the next chapter on literature study, theories on leadership styles and school climates are expounded.
CHAPTER TWO
THE LEADERSHIP STYLES OF PRINCIPALS AND SCHOOL CLIMATE:
A LITERATURE REVIEW.

2.1 INTRODUCTION

A literature study is usually a critique of the status of knowledge of a carefully defined topic and if it is conducted carefully and presented well, it adds much to an understanding of the selected problem and helps place the results of a study in a historical perspective. It also enables a reader to gain further insights from the study. Without a literature study, it would be difficult to build a body of accepted knowledge of an educational topic (McMillan and Schumacher 1997: 119).

In the context of the present research, this chapter treats the theories on the two main concepts found in the title of the research. These are the leadership styles of principals and school climate. A thorough description of the two concepts is presented in order to make the reader understand the various styles of leadership that are adopted by leaders and the different types of school climate that prevail in schools and hence he or she can easily understand the relationship that exists between them. Some prior research studies related to the above two concepts are also presented in order to place the present study in an historical and relationship perspective.

By and large, according to Power and Lemon (1988:30), there is a very strong relationship between the leadership of the principal and the organisational climate. They refer to a study by George Litwin (Kruger 1999:8) in which it is demonstrated that a leader, by varying leadership styles, can create distinct organizational climates in a short period of time and that these climates have a dramatic effect on followers’ personalities and behaviour. In general, it could be said that the most influential member in establishing the climate of the school is the principal. In fact, this is what the present research has tried to find out in the Mauritian context in private secondary schools.

In the following section, the concept of leadership styles of principals will firstly be discussed.
2.2 LEADERSHIP STYLES OF PRINCIPALS IN SECONDARY SCHOOLS

According to Greenberg and Baron (1993:444), “leadership is the process whereby one person influences individual and group members towards goal setting and goal achievement with no force or coercion”. Bush and West-Burnham (1994:55) pointed out clearly that organizations” are linked with the existence of leadership”. Consequently, the principal’s qualities and behaviours determine to a large degree how the subordinates feel about their organization (Eblen 1987: 190). These qualities and behaviours are broadly considered as the leadership styles of principals. These styles have been conceptualized as leadership based on “power”, or based on” relationships”. Since both concepts are employed in the present study, thorough explanations of them seem very important.

The “power” concept of leadership, researched by Kurt Lewin and his associates at the University of Iowa (Lunenberg & Ornstein 1991: 130), has identified at least three basic styles of leadership: authoritarian (autocratic), democratic, and abdicratic (laissez-faire). These are described as follows:

According to Van Wyk and Van der Linde (1997:15), the authoritarian leadership style is leader-oriented and dictatorial to a variable degree. Leaders of this type want to impose their own will to followers. They take all the decisions and adhere to a fixed and rigid schedule. This type is the best one when immediate action is called for because there would probably be no time to consult other people. This style would not be appropriate in all circumstances, although there are certain leaders who are not adaptable and use this style of leadership all the time. With the authoritarian leadership style, initiatives are taken at the top and communication flows from the principal down the organizational ladder. Followers have little or no say. Only certain tasks are delegated to the staff, on the instructions of the principal. Therefore, communication takes place only in one direction since the leader gives instructions while the followers are required to execute the assignments. Such principals are extremely task-oriented but take full responsibility for the exercise of their authority (Davar 1993:116). They make demands on their subordinates on the grounds of their position as leaders and they frequently use fear, threats and force as a power base. They rely heavily on control of individual behaviour.
Again according to Van Wyk and Van der Linde (1997:15), the **democratic** leadership style is group-centred, with decentralized authority and decision-making. Principals who adopt this style are flexible and able to exercise leadership skills as the context dictates. They try to lead or guide their subordinates through persuasion. They support their groups in their pursuance of communal goals and involve all members of the group in determining objectives, planning and executing activities. They share responsibilities, involve their followers in planning and they engage in discussions with workers before taking decisions (Stimpson 2004: 249). All the members are treated with respect. The principals follow an open-door policy and they listen to their opinions. These opinions are valuable input for decision-making. This style gives rise to a positive group spirit.

Under the **laissez-faire** style, the organization moves along under its own stream without specific direction from the principals. It relies on a “let everyone do their own thing” philosophy. No vision of the organisation’s mission is projected. Planning has little or no approach. In fact, laissez-faire literally means “let them do it” (Stimpson 2004:250). Explicit goals are rarely set, and problems are solved adhoc by whoever is on hand. Teachers are expected to motivate themselves with little or no feedback on their performance. Leadership is practised through suggestion and delegation (Van Wyk and Van der Linde 1997:19). The principals do not attempt to influence the group. Blau (1975:88) calls this style of leadership: “retired on the job”. The individuals try not to interfere in the affairs of others on the assumption that they will do better on their own. In this type of leadership, the principals actually remain in the background allowing his followers free rein to assert themselves. This approach may work where the followers are highly motivated.

The "relational" concept of leadership, which is also employed in the present study, began with the idea that poles of task-priority and people-priority were at opposite ends of a single continuum, and that a balance between both extremes made for strong, supportive, and respected leaders (Tartar 1989:132). However, according to Hoy and Miskel (1982:226), leadership studies conducted at the Ohio State University in the late 1940s, found that various combinations of these two concepts were obvious in leaders and that the approaches to leadership were best represented in terms of two dimensions: initiating structure behaviours and consideration behaviours.
Initiating structure includes any leadership behaviour that delineates the relationship between the leader and the subordinates and, at the same time, establishes defined patterns of the organization, channels of communication, and methods of procedure (Hoy and Miskel 1982:226). It also reflects the extent to which the leader attempts to organize work and sees to it that the followers are working up to capacity (Lunenberg and Ornstein 1991:134).

Consideration includes leadership behaviour that indicates friendship, trust, warmth, interest, and respect in the relationship between the leader and members of the work group (Hoy and Miskel 1982:226). Moreover, a leader high in consideration listens to staff members and is very approachable (Lunenberg and Ornstein 1991:134).

The items for initiating structure and consideration are shown in table 2.1 below (Hoy and Miskel 1982:226) and these are used in chapter three to formulate questions on leadership styles of principals. These questions are presented in an interview schedule.

Table 2.1: Sample LBDQ items (Hoy and Miskel 1982:226).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiating structure items</th>
<th>Consideration items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S/he makes his/her attitudes clear to the staff.</td>
<td>S/he clearly explains his/her actions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/he maintains definite standards of performance.</td>
<td>S/he acts after consulting the staff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/he works with a plan.</td>
<td>S/he treats all staff members as equals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/he lets staff members know what is expected of them.</td>
<td>S/he is willing to make changes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/he sees to it that staff members are working up to capacity.</td>
<td>S/he is friendly and approachable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/he sees to it that the work of staff members is coordinated</td>
<td>S/he puts suggestions made by the staff into operation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The leadership studies at Ohio State University (Hoy and Miskel 1982:228, Lunenberg and Ornstein 1991:134) ultimately suggested that leaders exhibiting consideration and initiating structure behaviours could be grouped into four quadrants (see Figure 2.1 below).
Researchers like Hemphill and Coons developed the Leader Behaviour Description Questionnaire (LBDQ) which was later refined by Halpin, Winer and Stogdill (Hoy and Miskel 1982:226). The LBDQ items ask subjects to describe the behaviours of their leaders on a five-point scale: always, often, occasionally, seldom or never. The items are divided into two subscales, one for each of the two dimensions of leader behaviour the LBDQ measures. Separate scores of these two dimensions, initiating structures and consideration, are determined by summing the items responses relating to each subscale.

According to Hoy and Miskel (1982:227) early studies using the LBDQ indicated that the consideration and initiating structure factors seemed to be separate and distinct, not opposite ends of the same continuum. Therefore, four quadrants of leadership styles can be formed by cross-partitioning on the mean score values of each scale (see Figure 2.1 below). Each subscale is divided into high and low groups and is then combined with another to yield four groups, or quadrants.

### Figure 2.1: Leadership behaviour quadrants (Halpin, Winer and Stogdill in Hoy and Miskel 1982:228).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consideration</th>
<th>High (+)</th>
<th>Low (-)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Initiating</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>High (+)</strong></td>
<td>Quadrant I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High Consideration (+)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High Initiating Structure (+)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I = (+, +)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Low (-)</strong></td>
<td>Quadrant II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low Consideration (-)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High Initiating Structure (+)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>II = (-, +)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Structure</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Low (-)</strong></td>
<td>Quadrant III</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low Consideration (-)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low Initiating Structure (-)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>III = (-, -)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>High (+)</strong></td>
<td>Quadrant IV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High Consideration (+)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low Initiating Structure (-)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IV = (+, -)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 2.1 is interpreted as follows:
Given a set of people who occupy leadership positions and their respective LBDQ scores on initiating structure and consideration, those who score above the mean on both dimensions are in quadrant I, the (+, +) quadrant; such leaders are efficient and effective in managing both people and tasks. Those below the mean on both dimensions are in quadrant III, the (-, -) quadrant; these leaders’ management is accompanied by group chaos and ineffectiveness. Those who score below the mean consideration, but above the mean in initiating structure are in quadrant II, the (-, +) quadrant; these leaders are productions oriented and interested in getting the work done, often forgetting in the process that they are dealing with human beings. While those in quadrant IV, the (+, -) quadrant, exhibit the opposite relationship; these leaders maintain a friendly relationship with the subordinates and are concerned about subordinate welfare, but are ineffective in getting things done. Consequently, using these two dimensions, four leadership styles are possible (Hoy and Miskel 1982: 228).

Apart from these above, other theories on leadership styles are also discussed in the literature. Owens (1995: 125-126) discussed, for example, the transactional and the transformational leadership approaches. The transactional leadership can be seen as a “contract” between the leader and his followers. The leader gets an agreement from his followers that they will work towards the achievement of organizational goals while the leader agrees to good working conditions or the satisfaction of his followers’ needs. This approach is more task-oriented than people-oriented. The transformational leadership ensures “commitment” from the followers. Both leader and followers want to become the best and are united in pursuit of higher-level goals common to both. Both want to shape the school in a new direction. This approach is more people-oriented.

Another important approach on leadership styles which is related to those that are already discussed above are the task-oriented and people-oriented leadership styles. Leaders who are task-oriented are mainly interested in results while those who are people-oriented are mainly interested in relationship. Moreover, task-oriented leaders are good at goal setting, planning and organizing while people-oriented leaders try to have good interpersonal relationships and to achieve a position of personal acceptance to the exclusion of the task. They contribute towards attaining goals through enthusiastic team effort. These two styles of leadership lie on a continuum as shown in Figure 2.2 below:
Some leaders are more inclined to over-emphasise the task (the so-called task-oriented leader) while others concentrate much more on interpersonal relationships (the people-oriented leader).

By and large, there is another approach on leadership styles which is developed by Blake and Mouton in 1964 (in Bush and West-Burnham 1994:57). This is a more sophisticated analysis of styles of leadership which allows the positioning of leadership styles along nine point axes labelled “concern for people” and “concern for production”. In this approach, it is theoretically possible to identify eighty-one leadership styles, but the analysis generally places leaders into one of the five main styles (Bush and West-Burnham 1994:57):

Figure 2.3: Blake and Mouton’s Managerial grid (Bush and West-Burnham 1994:57).
The five types of management shown in figure 2.3 are interpreted by Bush and West-Burnham (1994:57) as follows:

9, 1: Results rated high, Relationships rated low. This type of leadership is identified as “achievement orientated” and as personifying “the entrepreneurial spirit”.

1, 9: Results rated low, Relationships rated high. In this type of leadership, the leaders encourage their workers and for them, the group rather than the individual is the key unit of the organization.

1, 1: Results rated low, Relationships rated low. This approach indicates a passive one which may apply “to those who have accepted defeat”

5, 5: Results rated moderate, Relationships rated moderate. This middle range approach means that “satisfactory solutions are found through equilibrium or compromise processes”.

9, 9: Results rated high, Relationships rated high. For this leader the basic aim is to “promote the conditions that integrate creativity, high productivity, and high morale through concerted team action”.

Before concluding with the topic on leadership it would be unfair if the approach developed by Fiedler (Bush and West-Burnham 1994:60) is not discussed in this dissertation. His approach is important because it combines an analysis of the leader’s style with an analysis of the situation in which he or she is working. The style of the leader is analysed in terms of the familiar results/relationship orientation. The situation is analysed in terms of three variables and to what extent they favour the leader (see Table 2.2 below).

**Table 2.2:** Fiedler’s variables (Bush and West-Burnham 1994:60).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Favourable situation for leader</th>
<th>Unfavourable situation for leader</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Good relationship with subordinate</td>
<td>Poor relationship with subordinate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task clearly stated</td>
<td>Task not clearly stated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High level of formal authority</td>
<td>Low level of formal authority</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2.2 explains clearly that a leader is more effective when there is good relationship with subordinate, when the task is clearly stated and when there is high level of formal authority on his or her part.

Fiedler’s research has shown that when the situation is particularly favourable or unfavourable to the leader, a task-orientated leader is more effective and when the situation is neither particularly favourable nor unfavourable, a people-orientated leader is more effective.

The major innovation in Fiedler’s work is that he takes into account the situation, including the relationship with subordinates as well as the style of the leader (Bush and West-Burnham 1994:61).

Having discussed various models of leadership styles that leaders normally adopt, this research did not use all of them to investigate on the leadership styles that principals adopted in private secondary schools of Mauritius. Therefore, for more convenience, practicality and manageability, only the “power” concept and the “relational” concept of leadership styles were investigated in the research. As far as the “power” concept of leadership is concerned, the questions in the interviews were formulated in such a way that the answers given by the respondents, the two teachers and the principal in each school, indirectly indicated whether the principal adopted the democratic, authoritarian, or laissez-faire style or a combination of two or all three of them. As regards the “relational” concept, the two leadership behaviour dimensions, namely the consideration and initiating structure, were chosen to classify the principals in one of the four leadership quadrants. The items for initiating structure and consideration used by Halpin, Winer and Stogdill in their LBDQ (Hoy and Miskel 1982:228) were adapted in the present context in the private secondary schools of Mauritius. These items were easily be formulated into research questions that were presented in the interview schedule. More details on the interview schedule will be given in chapter three on research methodology.

In the next paragraph the concept of school climate is discussed.
2.3 SCHOOL CLIMATE IN SECONDARY SCHOOLS

While reviewing the literature on school climate, many definitions and explanations have been found. These can be classified into two main groups; the first one is a landmark study by Halpin and Croft in 1963, which can be termed as the conceptual foundation study on school climate. The second group is a number of more recent studies conducted by eminent researchers that can be termed as the contemporary theories on school climate. In the work that follows, a detailed explanation on school climate is presented because the present research study will take all these factors into consideration.

Halpin and Croft (Silver 1983:50), in their conceptual foundation study of organization climate, defined school climate as the “feel” of a school. They generally described the climate of an organization as the tone, ambience or atmosphere of an organization- the sense that a place has a quality uniquely its own. They explain further how the notion of climate is analogous to the climate of a geographic region.

Geographic climate results from the interaction of two important dimensions of nature: the atmospheric conditions such as prevailing winds, air pressure, and moisture; and the geological conditions such as latitude, altitude, topology, and ocean currents. The weather pattern or climate of a particular area is always a result of the blend of atmospheric and geological conditions.

By analogy, the social climate of an organization can be viewed as a blend of two important dimensions of interpersonal interaction. They explain further how the social climate of schools is conceived as a blend of two dimensions namely: the principal’s behaviour and the teachers’ interactions. The group interactions of the teachers in a school might be regarded as analogous to the geographic contours of a region, and the principal’s behaviour style could be equated with the atmospheric conditions; in combination, the two result in a unique social texture in each organization, which has been called its climate.

According to Hoy and Miskel (1982:188) the social climate of a school results from the reciprocal effects of the teachers’ behaviour pattern as a group and the principal’s behaviour pattern as a leader. Four aspects of principal’s behaviour and four aspects of teachers’ interactions were selected as the conceptual foundation for the analysis of school climates.
The four aspects of the principal’s behaviour are aloofness, production emphasis, thrust, and consideration; and the four aspects of teachers’ behavior are disengagement, hindrance, esprit and intimacy. The four elements of “atmospheric” conditions (the principal’s behaviour) and the four key elements of geographic conditions (teachers’ behaviour) merge to form the prevailing “weather”- the climate- of the school.

The most well known conceptualization and measurement of the organizational climate in school is the pioneering study of elementary schools by Halpin and Croft in 1963 as described by Hoy and Miskel (2001:190). They developed an Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire (OCDQ) composed of sixty-four items to identify important aspects of teacher-teacher and teacher-principal interactions (in Hoy and Miskel 2001:190). The OCDQ is usually administered to the entire professional staff of each school, with each respondent asked to describe the extent to which each statement characterizes his or her school. The responses to each item are scaled along a four-point continuum namely: rarely occurs, sometimes occurs, often occurs and very frequently occurs.

The sixty-four items were grouped into eight factors or subtests. Four of the subtests referred to the characteristics of the faculty behaviour and four described various components of principal behaviour. These eight subtests were named the eight dimensions of school climate. These are described below (Hoy and Miskel 1982:188):

CHARACTERISTICS OF TEACHERS’ INTERACTIONS.

- **HINDRANCE**: This refers to the teachers’ feelings that the principal burdens them with routine duties, committee work, and other requirements that the teachers perceive as unnecessary “busy work”.
- **INTIMACY**: This refers to the teachers’ enjoyment of warm and friendly personal relations with one another.
- **DISENGAGEMENT**: This refers to the teachers’ tendency “to go through the motions” without an actual commitment to the task at hand.
- **ESPRIT**: this refers to morale growing out of a sense of both task accomplishment and social needs satisfaction.
CHARACTERISTICS OF PRINCIPAL’S BEHAVIOUR.

- PRODUCTION EMPHASIS: This refers to close supervisory behaviour on the part of the principal. The principal is highly directive and not sensitive to teachers’ feedback.
- ALOOFNESS: This refers to formal and impersonal principal behaviour; the principal goes by the book and maintains social distance from his or her staff.
- CONSIDERATION: This refers to warm, friendly behaviour by the principal. The principal tries to be helpful and do a little something extra for the teachers when he or she can.
- THRUST: This refers to dynamic principal behaviour in which an attempt “to move the organization” is made through the example that the principal sets for the teachers.

The study by Halpin and Croft gave rise to six distinct climates in the school. These are: open climate, autonomous climate, controlled climate, familiar climate, paternal climate, and closed climate. The characteristics of the six types of climate are represented in table 2.3 below.

In sum, these six types of climate range along a continuum from the most open to the most closed. According to Hoy and Miskel (1982:189-190) an open climate is characterized by high degree of thrust and esprit but low disengagement. This combination suggests a climate in which both the principal and teachers are genuine in their behaviours. The principal sets good examples by providing the proper direction, support and consideration. Teachers work well together and are committed to the task at hand. Moreover, there is no burdensome paperwork (hindrance), close supervision (production emphasis), or impersonality and a set of rules and regulations (aloofness). Acts of leadership emerge easily and appropriately, as they are needed. The open school is not preoccupied exclusively with either achievement of tasks or the satisfaction of social needs but both emerge freely. In brief, the behaviour of both the principal and the teachers is authentic.

The closed climate is just the contrary of the open climate. Thrust and esprit are low and disengagement is high. The principal and teachers simply appear to go through the motions, with the principal stressing routine trivia and unnecessary busy work (hindrance), and the
teachers responding minimally and exhibiting little satisfaction. There is close supervision on the part of the principal (production emphasis), formal declarations and impersonality (aloofness), as well as a lack of consideration for the teachers and an inability or unwillingness to provide a dynamic personal example. These behaviours produce frustration and apathy in teachers. The behaviours of both principal and teachers in the closed climate is least genuine when inauthenticity pervades the atmosphere of the school.

As far as the four climates in between the open and closed ones are concerned, their characteristics are presented in table 2.3. For instance, in a controlled climate, there is high hindrance characterized by burdensome paper work, high production emphasis due to close supervision, and high aloofness due to a set of rules and regulations. All these characteristics are also the qualities of a closed climate but the factor that makes the difference is the high esprit that prevails with high morale on the part of teachers. This gives the teachers a sense of satisfaction and encourages them to continue on working.

**TABLE 2.3:** Characteristic profiles of school climate (Hoy and Miskel 1982:190).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Climate Dimension</th>
<th>Open</th>
<th>Autonomous</th>
<th>Controlled</th>
<th>Familiar</th>
<th>Paternal</th>
<th>Closed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hindrance</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimacy</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disengagement</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esprit</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production Emphasis</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aloofness</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consideration</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thrust</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to contemporary studies on school climate, the latter is considered as the shared perceptions and feelings of the people in the school about various of its facets (Hoy&Miskel 1987:247). In schools, there are two participants in the work of teaching-learning activities,
namely the teachers and the learners. Therefore, a school’s climate has the following two facets (Mentz 1996:103, Basson, Van der Westhuizen and Niemann 1995:631):

- Organisational climate, which refers to the teacher’s experience of the management factors that influence the climate in the school.
- Educational climate, which refers to the learner’s experience of the climate in the school, particularly as a result of their interaction with the teachers.

Moreover, according to Kruger (1992:95), the factors that affect school climate can be grouped under one of the following four areas. These are:

- The management and leadership of the principal.
- The behaviour of the teachers.
- The instructional culture and prevailing school culture.
- The physical character of the school.

The characteristics that can be placed within these areas will be unique for every school, and their interdependent interaction will produce a unique school climate in each school.

As far as the principal is concerned, Kruger (1992:95) posits clearly that his behaviour in the school has a decisive role in initiating and maintaining the school climate. A wide range of tasks and activities which a principal can carry out to influence the school climate positively within each of the above-mentioned areas can be identified. According to Kruger (1992:95) the following points can be regarded as basic components of the principal’s tasks as initiator and caretaker of a particular school climate. These are:

- Regulating the organizational structure.
- The leadership role of the principal.
- Establishing a mission for the school.
- Establishing relationships.
- Professionalising the education profession.

When we consider the principal’s role in regulating the organizational structure of the school, Kruger (1999:18) finds that there is a clear connection between the school’s organizational
structure and teachers’ attitudes toward their work. Professional organizational structures produce increased job satisfaction and teachers experience the climate of such schools as open and healthy. By contrast, teachers in schools with bureaucratic organizational structures experience the climate as closed and unhealthy.

By and large, Kruger (1999:18) explains further that there is a direct connection between a principal’s leadership role and school climate. To foster and maintain a school climate where the majority of the staff are committed to their work, an efficient and outstanding management and leadership is essential and should be characterized by flexibility and adaptability to the situation, the ability to setting a personal example which is linked to a vision that inspires emulation and the ability to increase the staff’s professional autonomy.

Another important issue that needs discussion is the principal’s role in establishing a mission for the school and its contribution to a positive and sound climate. According to Leithwood and Aitken (1995:280), determining the mission of the school is the first step in the strategic planning process which ensures that all organizational activities are in harmony with one another. Mission envisages what the school intends to achieve and is essential for the formulation of the strategy for the school. Thus, the principal should give special attention to establishing the mission and he or she should get all staff members to participate in this process.

Furthermore, for a positive and healthy school climate, the principal must establish good relationship with the staff, learners and parents and must help in professionalising the education profession in his or her institution. In this context, Maeroff (1988:4) explains that the principal has an important role in regarding the teachers’ contribution as meaningful to themselves and the school.

Having considered lengthily the contribution of the principal to the school climate, Kruger (1999:19) lays much emphasis on the role of teachers on the school climate. He explains that teachers who are not committed to the task of teaching, do not get along with themselves and who perceive the principal as hindering them in their professional duties can have a negative influence on the school climate. However, those who treat their colleagues and learners with respect, are committed to teaching, have high morale, share feeling and establish friendships help to create a positive climate.
Another factor which contributes to a healthy school climate is the organizational culture of the school. According to Peterson (1988:252), organizational culture is defined as the shared convictions, values, norms, temperament, assumptions and expectations that bind the individuals in an organization. Purkey and Smith (1983:445) stress that the organizational culture can be regarded as a specific dimension of the school which, in interacting with other facets of the organization, contributes to the uniqueness, effectiveness and excellence of the school. The continued expansion and strengthening of the organizational culture is one of the factors that contributes to the formation of a particular climate within the school, fostering effective teaching and learning.

Not to forget, the physical appearance of the school can also influence the school climate. Kruger (1999:20) enumerates some factors on the physical facilities that could have a positive influence on the school climate. These are:

- An attractive school entrance.
- A clearly signposted reception area.
- A comfortable waiting area.
- Tidy and neat buildings.
- Tidy and neat gardens.
- Clear hallways.

All the explanations provided by Kruger above are supported by Litwin and Stringer (in Sergiovanni and Starrat 1988:83) and Kelley (1980:1). According to Litwin and Stringer, school climate refers to the observable effects of many aspects of the school on the attitudes, motivation and academic achievement of all people who work there. These aspects are:

- The nature of the work.
- The people
- The architecture of its buildings and environment.
- Its history and culture
- The organizational structure
- The management and leadership style
- Its interpersonal relationships.
All these aspects are also treated by Kruger (1999:19-20) and have already been discussed above. According to Kelley (1980:1), a school’s climate is a reflection of its particular nature and personality and reflects the feelings the people in the school have towards it. It also forms the basis for the expectations that they cherish concerning the school and for their interpretation of events and activities within the school. He goes further by admitting that a school’s climate has a strongly directive influence on the motivation and achievement of teachers and learners.

School climate, therefore, is a very important factor that influences the teaching environment of the teachers and the learning environment of the students in a school. Having discussed lengthily on both the conceptual foundation study and the contemporary theories on school climate, it is worth mentioning that for the purpose of the present study, the conceptual study of school climate was adapted in the Mauritian context to investigate on the school climate that prevailed in private secondary schools. The structured questions presented in the interview schedule were adapted from those present in the Organisational Climate Description Questionnaire (OCDQ) developed by Halpin and Croft in 1963 as described by Hoy and Miskel (2001:190).

The next section now treats some prior research studies on school climate and leadership styles of principals.

**2.4 PRIOR RESEARCH STUDIES ON SCHOOL CLIMATE AND LEADERSHIP STYLES OF PRINCIPALS AND THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THEM.**

During the past three decades, a substantial amount of research has been conducted on the importance of school climate. According to Hoy and Miskel (1982:186), Halpin and Croft, in their landmark study of organizational climate in 1963, have yielded the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire (OCDQ), an instrument to assess the climate of organizations. According to Hoy and Miskel (2001:195), Hoy and Clover revised the OCDQ in 1986 for use in elementary schools. The revised versions of the OCDQ are relatively recent developments. Nevertheless, a consistent body of research is beginning to emerge. For example, it is well known that the openness index from the original OCDQ is highly correlated with the new and refined sub-tests that measure openness. Moreover, openness in
climate is positively related to open and authentic leader and principal behaviour (Hoy, Hoffman, Sabo and Bliss 1994: 41-59).

Those earlier OCDQ studies demonstrated that the openness of a school’s climate was related to the emotional tone of the school in predictable ways. Schools with open climates have less sense of student alienation toward the school and its personnel than those with closed climate (Hartley and Hoy 1972: 17-24). As one might also suspect, studies that examine relationships between characteristics of the principal and the climate of the school often indicate that, in comparison to schools with closed climates, those with open climates have stronger principals who are more confident, self secure, cheerful, sociable and resourceful. Moreover, the teachers who work under principals in open schools express greater confidence in their own and the school’s effectiveness (Andrews 1965:317-334).

More recent research (Reiss and Hoy 1998:4-21) with the climate measuring instruments such as the OCDQ also shows that open school climates are characterised by higher levels of loyalty and trust, both in the principal and in colleagues, than closed climates. Principals in open schools also generate more organizational commitment to school-that is, identification and involvement in school- than those in closed climates (Tarter, Hoy and Kott Kamp 1990:236-243).

The research conducted by Brown (1967:43-44) regarding school climate is worth mentioning here because it tries to provide an answer to the question: Do students perform better academically in schools with open climates? As Brown suggests, such a question traps us in “the cognitive fallacy.” In other words, it does not necessarily follow that positive teacher-principal relations lead to better cognitive results on student achievement tests. In an open and healthy organizational climate, when a sound new method is introduced, openness and achievement go together. If the method is not sound, however, the openness of the climate will not enhance learning. Healthy and open organizational dynamics have a contributing impact because they facilitate the processes of the organization, not necessarily its product. Openness cannot make a poor program good.

In prior researches, an analysis of the perceptions of parents, teachers, and students regarding the school climate of their schools was conducted biannually in the United States form 1979
to 1982 and discussed that the climate of schools was a function of several school related factors (Freiberg 1983: 5-15). These factors included leadership qualities of principals, teacher colleague-relationships, parent-teacher relationships, student-teacher interpersonal relations, student-teacher instruction-related interactions, school buildings and facilities, and student-peer relations.

As far as leadership is concerned, there are many early and pioneering researches which have been conducted since 1940 and many of its approaches have already been discussed in paragraph 2.2 above. For instance, researchers on the leadership studies conducted at the Ohio State University in 1940 found that consideration is typically related to subordinate satisfaction with work and with the leader. While the evidence is somewhat mixed, initiating structure has been identified as a source of subordinate performance (House and Baetz 1979:341-423). As for Fiedler’s research, which has also been discussed in paragraph 2.2 above, the salient finding is that when the situation is particularly favourable or unfavourable to the leader, a task-orientated leader is more effective. When the situation is neither particularly favourable nor unfavourable a people –orientated leader is more effective (Bush and West-Burnham 1994:61).

It is quite evident from prior research that significant relationships could be expected between leadership styles of principals and school climate. Al-Gasim (1991: 100), for example, found a strong relationship between an open climate and principals who were high in both consideration and initiating structure dimensions. Similarly, Bailey (1988: 57) concluded that school principals who desire to improve their school climate need to exhibit both high task-oriented behaviours and high relationship-oriented behaviours with their teachers.

Overall the evidence seems quite strong that since the school climate is the reflection of the quality of human interactions in the school, the leadership behaviour of the principal is an important factor in building an open, facilitative climate at an educational level.
2.5 SUMMARY

After having discussed the theories on leadership styles of principals and school climate, the reader is now aware of what the present study is about and is in a good position to understand how data on these two concepts were obtained in private secondary schools in Mauritius. Based on this literature study, it was hypothesized that significant relationships would exist between principals’ leadership styles and school climate. Was this true in the Mauritian context? This is the main aim of the present study.

The next chapter deals with the research design and methodology. In this chapter, the techniques used to gain information on leadership styles of principals and school climate are discussed. A qualitative research was conducted by means of standardized interviews and observations. In the interviews, both structured and semi-structured questions were asked to teachers and principals. Each question aimed at finding about the type of leadership style or the school climate in private secondary schools in Mauritius. As regards the observation technique, the non-participant observation method was used. Finally, all the data were analysed and interpreted in order to find the relationship between the leadership styles of principals and school climate in private secondary schools.
CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH DESIGN

3.1 INTRODUCTION

The present chapter deals with the research design, which refers to the plan and structure of the investigation used to obtain evidence to answer research questions. According to McMillan and Schumacher (1997:162), the design describes the procedures for conducting the study, including when, from whom, and under what conditions the data will be obtained. In other words, the design indicates how the research is set up, what happens to the subjects and what methods of data collection are used.

Since this study is based on qualitative research method to investigate on the relationship between the leadership styles of principals and school climate in private secondary schools in Mauritius, all the fundamental principles involved in designing such a study will be addressed in detail. Moreover, important ethical and legal considerations in planning and conducting such a research will be discussed thoroughly as the research deals with two sensible topics of a school. According to McMillan and Schumacher (1997:392), a qualitative research is based on a naturalistic-phenomenological philosophy that views reality as multilayered, interactive, and a shared social experience interpreted by individuals.

By and large, the study is concerned with understanding the social phenomenon from the participants’ perspectives and valid data from the research can be gained from the methods of phenomenologists. According to Van Rensberg and Landman (1988:442), phenomenology is a method that a researcher follows to disclose or verbalise a phenomenon as it essentially is in itself. Phenomenologists tend to elicit the participants’ knowledge of the situation because human beings make sense of the world by imposing meaning and classifications upon it.
3.2  RESEARCH METHODS

In line with the above principle, the present research relied on two main qualitative techniques in order to collect data on the leadership styles of principals and school climate in private secondary schools in Mauritius. These techniques were interviews and observation.

As far as the leadership styles of principals are concerned, both the “power” and “relational” concepts of leadership, described in chapter two, were investigated. For the “relational” concept, questions similar to those in the Leader Behaviour Description Questionnaire (LBDQ), designed by Halpin, Spiner and Stogdill as described in Hoy and Miskel (1982:226) were prepared to collect data on leadership styles of principals. As for school climate, the interview schedule contained questions similar to those in the Organisational Climate Description Questionnaire (OCDQ), designed by Halpin and Croft as described in Hoy and Miskel (2001:190). Standardised interviews were used to collect data on these two topics and all the questions related to leadership styles of principals and school climate were presented in an interview schedule. As far as the observation technique is concerned, this method acted as a supplement to the interview phase. A justification of these two techniques is presented in section 3.4 on Instrumentation.

3.3  SAMPLING

The target population of this study consisted of all private secondary schools in Mauritius, which amounted to one hundred and three. Since the research could not be conducted in all these schools, a sample was selected. According to Fraenkel and Wallen (1993:79), sampling refers to the process of selecting the individuals. There are many types of sampling methods that can be administered in qualitative studies.

In the context of the present study, the simple random sampling method was chosen in order to obtain a sample that was representative of the population of interest. In this method the subjects were selected from the population so that all members of the population had the same probability of being chosen (McMillan and Schumacher 1997: 166). As far as Mauritius is concerned, all the private secondary schools are distributed over nine districts. Thus, one school was randomly selected from each district. In this way, nine
private secondary schools in both urban and rural areas of the island were chosen. An official list of all the private secondary schools in Mauritius was available at the PSSA.

After gaining entry in each school, two teachers and the principal were interviewed in order to collect data on leadership styles of principals and the types of climates that prevailed in these schools. Thus, in the nine schools that were selected for the study, a total of twenty-seven interviews were conducted; that is, three in each school.

Moreover, since nine schools were randomly selected for the interviewing process, these same schools were selected for the observation process.

3.4 INSTRUMENTATION

Instrumentation implies the techniques to be used to collect data. The two most common techniques used in qualitative studies are standardized interviews and observation. In the present study, both standardized interviews and observation were used.

As far as interviews are concerned, these are essentially vocal questionnaires. The major steps in constructing an interview are the same as in preparing a questionnaire—justification, writing questions, defining objective, deciding general and item format and pre-testing. The obvious difference is that the interview is performed on smaller samples and involves direct interaction between individuals, which has both advantages and disadvantages as compared with the questionnaire. The choice of interviews in the research can be justified by the following advantages (McMillan and Schumacher 1997:263):

- It is flexible and adaptable.
- It can be used with many different problems and types of persons.
- Responses can be probed, followed, classified and elaborated to achieve specific accurate responses.
- Non-verbal as well as verbal behaviours can be noted.
- The interviewer has an opportunity to motivate the respondent.
- Interviews result in a much higher response rate than questionnaires, especially for topics that concern personal qualities or negative feelings.
In spite of all the advantages that the interview technique presents for qualitative research in general, the present research, with sensible issues like leadership styles and school climate, made the researcher somewhat sceptical on its application. Since teachers might be uncomfortable and unwilling to give information about their principals’ behaviours and their schools in general, the element of confidentiality had to be clearly demarcated and stressed, but, still, there was always the potential for faking, or for being less than forth right and candid, because the subjects might believe that sharing certain information would not be in their best interest (McMillan and Schumacher 1997:264). This problem occurred in only one school where one teacher refused to give information on his principal for fear that he could be reprimanded. Finally, he accepted to participate after the confidentiality of the research was made clear to him. Apart from this incident, everything went on smoothly as planned. Moreover, interviewing is costly and time consuming because it is labour-intensive. For this reason, fewer subjects were selected for interviews than could be obtained with questionnaires.

Despite all the above-mentioned disadvantages of interviews, the salient reasons for choosing the standardized interviews was that it resulted in a much higher response rate than questionnaires. Furthermore, in order to mitigate potential bias, the researcher, as the sole interviewer in the study, was thought of as a neutral medium through which information was exchanged. This aspect of interviewing is essentially one of reliability, which is discussed in more details in section 3.6.

As far as the observation technique is concerned, as already stated above, it was applied to obtain some more information on the leadership styles of principals and the school climate of private secondary schools of Mauritius. This technique is discussed in more details in section 3.8.

3.5 THE INTERVIEWING STAGE

Before starting with the fieldwork, two interview schedules (see Appendices 1 and 2) were prepared; one for the teachers and one for the principals. The interview schedule of a standardized interview contained a set of questions to investigate on the leadership styles of principals and school climate. Thus, the questions that were asked to teachers were different
from those asked to the principals but had the same objectives. Two pilot interviews were conducted with a teacher and a principal in order to see whether the approaches were suitable and whether the important issues had been covered. Following these pilot interviews, certain modifications and amendments were made before entering the first school selected in the sample.

Gaining entry into the field required establishing good relations with all individuals at the research site. Research permission was not a guarantee that the participants would behave naturally before an outsider who took field notes or that the participants would share their perceptions, thoughts and feelings with the interviewer. The researcher’s skill was reflected in whether the participants saw him/her as an interested, respectful, non-judgemental person who maintained confidentiality, or whether they viewed the researcher as a rude, disruptive, critical person who could not be trusted. The researcher had to attend to maintaining the trust and confidentiality of the participants constantly throughout the data collection period. The participants at any time might decline to share their perceptions, feelings and thought with the researcher (McMillan and Schumacher 1997:434).

In the school, an informed consent was obtained from the principal before contacting the teachers. A letter was presented to the principal of each school (see Appendix 5). The teachers were allowed the choice of the place where to hold the interview, as they needed to feel free and relaxed during the interview. The success of the research depended, among other factors, upon the presentation of the data in full and in an unbiased form. To control bias, the qualitative researcher had to enter the field without any preconceived ideas and tried to be neutral during the interview. He or she aimed at obtaining complete and accurate information in the course of the interview and played an active role and recorded both the interviewee’s responses as well as their contributions.

By and large, a verbatim account of all the interviewees’ responses was noted and the whole interviews were also taped. Considering ethical principles, the interviewees’ permissions were asked before taping. The tape recorder was placed unobtrusively on the table.
3.6 CREDIBILITY, VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY OF DATA.

The aim of a good research design is to provide results that are judged to be credible. According to McMillan and Schumacher (1997:162), credibility refers to the extent to which the results approximate reality and are judged to be trustworthy and reasonable. Credibility of research also takes into consideration potential sources of error that may undermine the quality of the research and may distort the findings. Throughout the research, precautions were taken to minimize errors and hence to ensure credibility.

As far as validity is concerned, a frequently used (but somewhat old-fashioned) definition of valid instrument is that it measures what it is supposed to measure. A more accurate definition of validity revolves around the defensibility of the inferences researches make from the data collected through the use of an instrument (Fraenkel and Wallen. 1993:102). Hammersley’s (1990:57) view about validity is clear and convincing: “By validity, I mean truth: interpreted as the extent to which an account accurately represents the social phenomena to which it refers”. Any concern with validity implies that the researcher should investigate what s/he is supposed to investigate and s/he should, therefore, address validity at different stages of the research. In simple terms, validity refers to the appropriateness, meaningfulness and usefulness of the inferences researchers make based on the data they collect.

By and large, there are two types of design validity in qualitative research: Internal validity and external validity. Internal validity expresses the extent to which extraneous variables have been controlled or accounted for. External validity refers to the generalisability of the results, the extent to which the results and conclusions can be generalized to other people and settings (McMillan and Schumacher 1997:190).

Another important term that needs elaboration is reliability. According to McMillan and Schumacher (1997:178), it refers to the consistency of measurement; that is, the extent to which the results are similar over different forms of the same instrument or occasions of data collecting. Another way to conceptualise reliability is to determine the extent to which measures are free from error. If an instrument has little error it is reliable, and if it has a great
amount of error it is unreliable (McMillan and Schumacher. 1997:239). It is also possible to obtain a stability estimate of reliability by correlating the results of an original interview with results obtained a second time by the same interviewer.

3.6.1 Reducing threats of validity and reliability of data.

In order to reduce threats of validity in the research, the following techniques were applied: first and foremost, at the beginning of the study, during the preparation of the research proposal, the opinions of different colleagues were sought to make sure that the relevant issues of the topic were being focused. At a second stage, when selecting the instruments to be used to collect data, the use of interviews and observations were found to be the most appropriate to obtain enough data on leadership styles of principals and school climate. Again, at the stage of instrument design, the opinion of colleagues were sought to find out whether the prepared instruments could attain breadth and depth of the content (content validity).

Furthermore, the use of two instruments in this research was a way to enhance validity. It was a way to cross-check and find regularities in the data to ensure that the study represented the views and perceptions of the respondents. This technique is called triangulation. The rationale for this was that each method had restrictions and by using several methods in the same study, the restrictions of one were often the strengths of the other. Denzin (1989:101-103) argues that the greater the triangulation in a research, the greater the confidence of the researcher in his findings.

Moreover, the questions asked to the teachers during the interviews were well planned and written in an interview schedule to ensure that each one was not irrelevant but was related to the leadership styles of principals or the school climate. Not to forget, it was important to learn to understand and where appropriate, speak the vocabulary of the sample being studied. If researchers do not understand what informants mean when they use certain terms or if they take such terms to mean something which they do not, the recording of invalid data will surely result.
At the data analysis stage, an appropriate methodology to analyse the data was chosen. As the study was a qualitative one, analysis was conducted through texts, interpretations and descriptions. At the final stage, all the findings were shown to the respondents to check that the interpretation was fair and acceptable and that they were accurate, thus providing a measure of respondent validity (Lincoln and Guba 1985: 25).

Just like validity, reliability also was considered at every stage of the research. When designing the research instrument, the questions asked in the interview were well formulated to meet the understanding of the respondents. Words and terms, which were familiar to them, were used. Leading questions that might influence the respondents were avoided. At the data collection stage, once having obtained the permission to conduct the interviews, it was ensured that the subjects chosen in the sample were key informants in the study. Reliability was further enhanced by applying the same procedures to all the participants in the interviews and establishing a rapport with each and every one. At the data analysis stage, reliability was further considered by consulting colleagues in the coding of responses.

Before indulging in another topic of the research design, it is worth-mentioning that Kvale (1996:231) contends that not all qualitative researchers have the same attitudes towards the question of validity and reliability. Similarly, Creswell (1994:157) states that there is a lack of consensus on the topic of validity and reliability in qualitative studies. However, he posits that the two concepts should be addressed in a qualitative plan.

3.6.2 Ethical considerations.

Although conducting of interviews generally require nominal manipulation of settings, preemptive measures on ethics were nevertheless, considered. At the first stage of the negotiation with the participants, their informed consent was sought. Homan (1991:46) emphasizes on the principles of democratic procedures that enlist the collaboration of the respondents not only in the collection of data but also in the interpretation of data and in giving clearance for their release. The rights of all the participants were protected, and they were free to withdraw from the study at any time.
Moreover, obtaining the consent of teachers did not mean clear access to the schools. The principal of the school was approached in a formal way and even a letter was presented to him (see Appendix 5). Besides, assurance was also given to all participants that their privacy would be protected. During the interviews, teachers had to divulge information on sensible issues on their schools like leadership styles of principals and school climate. Thus, the participants were left free to decide what information they would like to withhold and what they would like to communicate.

Besides obtaining the consent of the participants, other ethical issues, like confidentiality and anonymity were also considered. Before starting the interviews, the respondents’ confidentiality and anonymity were assured as emphasized by Brown and Dowling (1998:102). In order to protect the anonymity of the teachers, pseudonyms were used. However, it is worth mentioning that the law does not protect researchers if the government compels them to disclose matters of confidence. The researcher as well as the participants can be subpoenaed.

3.7 PREPARATION OF THE INTERVIEW

Once the interview was chosen to collect data, an interview schedule was constructed. The schedule listed all the questions that were asked, giving room for the interviewer to write answers. The questions were related directly to the objectives of the study and followed a given sequence that was adhered to in each interview. In the context of the present study, the questions asked were directed towards finding the type of leadership styles adopted by the principals and about the school climate in each school.

In so far as the interviews were concerned, the standardized interviews were chosen in which the participants were asked the same questions in the same order, thus reducing interviewer effects and bias. The questions asked were a mixture of both structured and semi structured ones. The structured questions (also called limited response questions) were followed by a set of choices and the respondent selected one of the choices as the answer. The Semi structured questions had no choices from which the respondent selected an answer. Three sets of questions were presented in the interview schedule: The first set dealt with the demographic questions; that was, questions involving the gender, age, educational attainment and teaching
experience of the respondents. The second set dealt with the leadership styles of principals and the third set dealt with the school climate.

By and large, as far as the structured questions were concerned, for each question on leadership style and school climate, four answers were given. They were: Always, Sometimes, Rarely and Never.

It is reckoned that while preparing the questions, all leading questions were avoided. A leading question was one in which the respondent was more aware of one answer than another, or contained information that might bias the response. In order to avoid such problem, feedback was solicited from an expert and the questions were pre-tested in a pilot study. This pilot study was necessary as a check for bias in the procedures, the interviewers or the questions. During the pilot study, the procedures were identical to those that were implemented in the study. The interviewer took special note of any problem suggesting that the respondent was uncomfortable or did not fully understand the questions. The pilot study provided a means of addressing the length of the interview and gave the researcher some idea of the ease with which the data could be summarised.

A final consideration in preparing the interview was to think about the way personal characteristics of the interviewer might influence the responses. Being the sole interviewer in this present research, the researcher had taken Sax (1979:243-244) variables into consideration. The first two variables were the age and sex of the interviewer. Being a male interviewer in his late thirties, the researcher had found himself appropriate to conduct the interview as Sax points out that interviewers between twenty-six and fifty years of age do a better job of interviewing than either younger or older interviewers. Moreover, the interviewer tried not to interview female teachers of the same age as him because Sax posits that most inhibition in responding occurs with persons of the same age but different sex. While interviewing, the researcher was cautious and use appropriate probes in order to obtain the least inhibition in responding since Sax points out clearly that males obtain fewer interview responses than do females.

A third variable which needed consideration while preparing the interview was the educational level of the interviewer and the interviewees. As a MEd student, the researcher
did not encounter problems with the interviewees because most of them were diploma and degree holders. Moreover, Sax also considers the variables of race and religion to be determining factors in interviews. These variables did not have much importance in Mauritius particularly in the private secondary schools controlled by the PSSA. However, such problem could arise in certain private religious schools, which were not supervised by the PSSA.

3.7.1 Interviewing behaviour

It is a fact that what happens during the interview sessions was more important than how much the interviewer has prepared himself or herself. An interviewer can read about theories on interviews from books and can even prepare a good interview schedule but if he/she did not possess some personal qualities and some good manners during the interview, the whole process may flop. According to McMillan and Schumacher (1997:266-267), some important points that the interviewer must took into consideration during the interview were:

- Good physical appearance: dress according to existing norms or in a fashion similar to the respondent.
- Friendly, relaxed and pleasant appearance: appear interested in the welfare of the respondents.
- Good relationship and rapport with interviewee: should spend a few minutes with small talk in order to establish a proper relationship.
- Respect the individual being interviewed.
- Explain the purpose of the interview before starting.
- Stress on the confidentiality of the study.
- Ask the questions in the exact words indicated on the interview schedule.
- Start and end at the scheduled times.
- Be fluent: Read the questions without error or stumbling, in a natural, unforced manner.
- Ask the same questions in different ways.
- Use probes carefully.
- Ask the interviewee to repeat an answer or statement when there was some doubt.
• Tell the interviewee that he/she has the right not to answer a question.
• Pick up on cues given by the interviewee to know whether the latter is bored, insulted, annoyed or simply wanted to leave.
• Vary who controls the flow of communication.
• Learn how to wait: silence is a valuable strategy to employ in an interview.
• Learn to be patient: allow the interviewee to think well before answering.
• Good recording: record the answers by tape recording or by means of written notes.
• Give a final assurance of confidentiality before leaving.
• Thank the respondent.

It is worth mentioning that all these personal qualities and good manners on the part of the interviewer were very important but if the questions themselves were not well prepared or that they were aiming at the interviewees’ private lives, then the whole process of interviewing would be in vain. Thus, the questions asked in the interviews were prepared very cautiously and carefully as described in the topic that follows.

### 3.7.2 The interview schedule (Types of interview questions)

Before entering the field where the interviews were conducted, the questions were already prepared in an interview schedule. According to Fraenkel and Wallen (1993:386), the questions were based on six types:

• Background or demographic questions: these were routine sorts of questions about the background characteristics of the respondents. They included questions about education, previous occupations, age, income and the like.
• Knowledge questions: these were questions to find out about factual information that respondent possess.
• Experience or behaviour questions: these were questions about what a respondent was currently doing or had done in the past. Their intent was to elicit descriptions of experience, behaviours or activities that could have been observed but (for reasons such as the researcher not being present) were not.
- Opinion or values questions: questions to find out about what people think about some topic or issue. Answers to such questions called attention to the respondent’s goals, beliefs, attitudes, or values.
- Feelings questions: these were questions to find out how respondents felt about things. They were directed towards the emotional responses of people to their experiences.
- Sensory questions: these were questions a researcher asked to find out what a respondent had seen, heard, tasted, smelled, or touched.

In the present study, both teachers and principals were interviewed. Thus, two different interview schedules were prepared by taking the six types of questions discussed above into consideration. Not to forget, the questions asked to the teachers and the principals had approximately the same objectives; that is, to find out the relationship between the leadership styles of principals and school climate.

3.8 THE OBSERVATION TECHNIQUE

In order to obtain more information on the types of leadership styles of principals and school climates that prevailed in private secondary schools of Mauritius, the observation technique was chosen. As discussed in chapter one, this technique was applied simultaneously with the interviewing process. Thus, the same nine schools chosen for the interviewing process were selected for the observation stage.

As regards the type of observation method that was used in the study, the non-participant observation method was chosen. In this method, according to Fraenkel and Wallen (1993:391), the researcher did not participate in the activity being observed but rather “sat on the sidelines” and watched: he was not directly involved in the situation he was observing. Among the different types of non-participant observation method that researchers normally used, the naturalistic observation method was chosen. This method involved observing individuals in their natural settings. The researcher made no effort whatsoever to manipulate variables or to control the activities of individuals, but simply observed and recorded what happened as things naturally occur.
As far as observation was concerned, an important factor that needed discussion here is observer effect. According to Fraenkel and Wallen (1993:401), the presence of an observer will definitely have a considerable effect on the behaviour of the subjects, and hence on the outcomes of the study. Moreover, the data reported (that which the observer records) reflect more the biases and viewpoints of the observer than of those being observed.

The presence of a stranger in the school compartment can cause two things to happen, particularly if the observer is unexpected: first, s/he is likely to arouse curiosity and result in a lack of attention to the task at hand, thus producing other than normal behaviour. An inexperienced researcher who records such behaviour might easily be misled. The second thing that can happen is that the behaviour of those who are being observed might be influenced by the researcher’s purpose. For this reason, many researchers argue that the participants in a study should not be informed of the study’s purposes until after the data have been collected.

Another problem about observation is observer bias. According to Fraenkel and Wallen (1993:402), this refers to the possibility that certain characteristics or ideas of observers may bias what they ‘see’. It is probably true that no matter how hard observers try to be impartial, their observation will possess some degree of bias. No one can be totally objective, as we are all influenced to some degree by our past experiences, which in turn affect how we see the world and the people within it. A related concern here is observer expectations. If researchers know they are to observe subjects who have certain characteristics, they ‘expect’ a certain type of behaviour, which may not be how the subjects normally behave.

3.8.1 What was observed?

As mentioned in topic 3.6.1, the importance of observation in this study was to enhance validity. It was a way to cross-check and find regularities in the data. In other words, it was a way to confirm whether the data gathered during the interview on leadership styles and school climate were consistent. In this phase also the leadership styles of principals and school climate were observed.
As far as the observation of the leadership styles of principals are concerned, the behaviours of both the principal and the teachers in each school were observed. That is, the relationship between the principal and the teachers and the way they behave and interacted with each other were investigated thoroughly in order to obtain ample information on both the ‘power’ and ‘relational’ concepts of leadership of principals in private secondary schools of Mauritius.

As regards the observation of school climate in private secondary schools, again the behaviours of both teachers and principal were considered in order to categorise the schools as either ‘open’, ‘closed’ or ‘others’. The observation technique was used in order to study the physical aspects of the school that affected the school climate. According to Kruger (1999:20), there are many factors on the physical facilities of a school that can have a positive influence on the school climate. These are:

- An attractive school entrance.
- A clearly sign-posted reception area.
- A comfortable waiting area.
- Tidy and neat buildings.
- Tidy and neat gardens.
- Clear hallways.

Thus, as far as the observation technique used in the present study is concerned, all these factors mentioned above were observed in order to have a clear picture of the school climate of the school. An observer schedule was prepared and a copy is presented in Appendix 3.

3.9 CRITERIA FOR DATA ANALYSIS

The topics that follow explain clearly how the data collected from the interviews and observations were analysed.
3.9.1 Data analysis of teachers’ interviews

a) Investigation of the ‘power’ concept of leadership

There were nine questions in the interview schedule dealing with the “power” concept of leadership and they were meant to find out whether the principals adopt the authoritarian, democratic, laissez-faire or a combination of these styles. The table that followed serves as a guide to analyse the nine questions present in the interview schedule based on the “power” concept of leadership.

Table 3.1: Guide to analyse the “power” concept of leadership.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question number</th>
<th>If the answer is “Always or sometimes”</th>
<th>If the answer is “Rarely or Never”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Authoritarian</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Authoritarian</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Authoritarian</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>Authoritarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>Authoritarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>Authoritarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Democratic or Authoritarian</td>
<td>Laissez-faire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Laissez-faire</td>
<td>Democratic or Authoritarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Laissez-faire</td>
<td>Democratic or authoritarian</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Questions one to six clearly demarcated whether the principal of a school was authoritarian, democratic or both. Questions seven to nine showed clearly whether the principal adopted the laissez-faire style or not.
- **b) Investigation of the ‘relational’ concept of leadership**

In this part, two sets of questions were answered. They were the initiating structure items and the consideration items. Each set contained five questions. These questions were meant to situate the principal in one of four quadrants. In each quadrant the initiating structure and consideration were graded as either high or low. The high grade was obtained in the initiating structure or consideration when the answers ‘Always or Sometimes’ appeared in three, four or all the five questions. The low grade was obtained when the answers were ‘Always or Sometimes’ in one or two of the questions. The questions asked were adapted from the LBDQ developed by Hemphill and Coones which was later refined by Halpin, Winer and Stogdill (Hoy and Miskel 1982:226). The figure below shows the four quadrants.

**Figure 3.1**: Leadership behaviour quadrants in Hoy and Miskel (1982:228)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consideration</th>
<th>Low (-)</th>
<th>High (+)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Initiating</strong></td>
<td>Quadrant II</td>
<td>High Initiating Structure (+)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High (+)</td>
<td>Quadrant I</td>
<td>High Initiating Structure (+)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Structure</strong></td>
<td>Quadrant III</td>
<td>Low Initiating Structure (-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low (-)</td>
<td>Quadrant IV</td>
<td>Low Initiating Structure (-)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **c) Investigation of school climate**

The questions in the interview schedule were arranged in two sets. The first set of four questions was based on teachers’ behaviours, which were categorized as hindrance, intimacy,
disengagement, and esprit. The second set also consisted of four questions, which were based on the principals’ behaviours, and these were categorized under the headings production emphasis, aloofness, consideration and thrust. These eight questions were meant to categorise the school climate as either “open”, “closed” or “others”. The term “others” could be autonomous, controlled, familiar or paternal as described in chapter two. For the purpose of the present research, it was difficult to categorise the school climate as autonomous, controlled, familiar or paternal but these types were grouped as “others”; that is, school climate which was neither completely “open” nor “closed” but in between. The table that follows showed the combination of answers in order to categorise the climate of the school as either “open”, “closed” or “others”. The questions asked were adapted from the Organisational Climate Description Questionnaire developed by Halpin and Croft as described by Hoy and Miskel (1982:190). The table below serves as a guide in order to categorise the climate of the school as either ‘open’, ‘closed’ or ‘others’ as described above.

**Table 3.2: Guide for analysis of school climate from interviews.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of items</th>
<th>Answers for “open” climate</th>
<th>Answers for “closed” climate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hindrance</td>
<td>Never or rarely</td>
<td>Always or Sometimes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimacy</td>
<td>Always or Sometimes</td>
<td>Never or rarely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disengagement</td>
<td>Never or rarely</td>
<td>Always or sometimes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esprit</td>
<td>Always or Sometimes</td>
<td>Never or rarely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production emphasis</td>
<td>Never or rarely</td>
<td>Always or Sometimes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aloofness</td>
<td>Never or rarely</td>
<td>Always or Sometimes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consideration</td>
<td>Always or Sometimes</td>
<td>Never or rarely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thrust</td>
<td>Always or Sometimes</td>
<td>Never or rarely</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PS: Any other combinations of answers different from those in the “open” or “closed” type of climate were considered as “others”; that is, a type of climate which was neither completely “open” nor “closed” but in between. Now, if more answers corresponded to the “open” climate than to the “closed” climate, then the climate was considered as “others” but closer to the “open” climate. If, however, more answers corresponded to the “closed” climate than to the “open” climate, then the climate was considered as “others” but closer to the “closed” climate.
As far as the five general questions are concerned, they were meant to allow the teachers to express themselves freely and clearly on certain issues regarding themselves, their schools and their principals. From their answers, deductions were made about the leadership styles of the principals and the school climate. For instance, by asking them whether they had problems with the principal of their school and whether they were provided with all the facilities to do their work, a glimpse of the leadership style of the principal could be obtained. Questions on whether they liked their profession and whether they had problems of indiscipline could give us an idea about the climate of the school.

3.9.2 Data analysis of principals’ interviews

As far as the interviews of principals are concerned, almost the same questions asked to the teachers had been rephrased for the principals to answer. Thus, the questions had the same objectives and so, the same method of analysis used for the teachers was also applied for the principals. The only difference was about the school climate. Only four questions on the principals’ behaviours were considered. Therefore, deductions about the school climate were made on only four items, which were production emphasis, aloofness, consideration and thrust. The same tables used for the data analysis of the teachers’ interviews were used for the analysis of the principals’ interviews.

As regards the five general questions addressed to the principals, they were meant to have a glimpse of the types of leadership styles adopted by them and the types of climate that prevailed in the schools. For instance, by asking them about the problems that they encountered with their staff, one could easily deduce why these problems occurred; that is, whether they were related to the leadership styles of the principals or not. The analysis of the problems that arose in the school could also lead to the deduction about the climate of the school.

It is worth-mentioning that since almost the same questions were asked to both teachers and the principals, this technique served as a means to check the credibility and validity of the results. Frankly speaking, it was expected that in some schools the results obtained from
teachers might not be similar at all as those of the principals. So, in such a case, care was taken before giving a final conclusion.

3.9.3 Data analysis from observation

a) Observation of leadership styles of principals.

Observation of the ‘power’ concept of leadership.

In order to know whether the principal of a school adopted the authoritarian style, democratic style or laissez-faire style, both the principal and the teachers were observed. The way the principal treated and talked to the teachers and the way the teachers behaved when they saw the principal were observed.

- If the principal treated the staff in a very strict and formal manner, talked to them seriously and the teachers played hide and seek and were scared when they saw the principal, it could be deduced that the principal was adopting the authoritarian style of leadership.
- If the principal treated the staff politely, respectfully, talked to them politely and softly and the teachers came to meet and shook hand with the principal, then it could be deduced that the principal was adopting the democratic style of leadership.
- If the principal ignored the staff, did not talk to them, did not bother about what they were doing and even the teachers also ignored him, then it could be deduced that the principal is adopting the laissez-faire style.

Observation of the ‘relational’ concept of leadership.

Here also, as in the interview phase, both initiating structure and consideration items were considered. Three factors in each item were observed.
However, it is to be noted that it was difficult to classify the principal in one of the four quadrants as was done during the analysis of data collected in the interview phase. So, this technique was applied only to confirm whether the principal scored high or low in initiating structure and consideration items. If the answers for two or more questions were “yes” then the principal was classified as “High” in that category. If only one answer is “yes”, then the principal was classified as “Low” in that category.

b) Observation of school climate.

Observation of teachers’ and principal’s behaviours.

As in the interview phase, the items observed were arranged in two sets. The first set of four items was based on teachers’ behaviours, which were categorized as hindrance, intimacy, disengagement, and esprit. The second set also consisted of four items which were based on the principals’ behaviours, and these were categorized under the headings production emphasis, aloofness, consideration, and thrust. These eight items were meant to categorise the school climate as either ‘open’, ‘closed’, or ‘others’, similarly as in the interview phase. However, the only difference was that only ‘yes’ or ‘no’ was stated for each item but not ‘always’, ‘sometimes’, rarely or ‘never’ as was done in the interview phase. The table that follows served as a guide in the analysis.

Table 3.3: Guide for analysis of school climate from observation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of items</th>
<th>Answers for ‘open’ climate</th>
<th>Answers for ‘closed’ climate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hindrance</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimacy</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disengagement</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esprit</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production emphasis</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aloofness</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consideration</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thrust</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PS: Any other combinations of answers different from those in the ‘open’ or ‘closed’ type of climate were considered as ‘others’.

**Observation of physical aspects of school climate**

The analysis of these physical aspects of the school gave a brief idea of the climate of the school. The analysis of these aspects confirmed whether the climate is open or closed. The place where the school was situated was an important factor that had a great influence on the school climate and hence on the learning process. A description of the school entrance, reception area, waiting area, the building and the gardens also contributed in identifying the school climate.

### 3.10 SUMMARY

This chapter explains clearly how the research was conducted in order to find out the types of leadership styles adopted by principals and the school climates that prevailed in private secondary schools of Mauritius. It provides ample justifications about the techniques used to gather data on these two sensible topics so that the relationship that existed between them could be found. Finally, a guide is provided on how the data collected was analysed.

In the next chapter, all the data collected is presented, analysed and interpreted thoroughly.
CHAPTER FOUR

PRESENTATION, INTERPRETATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

4.1 INTRODUCTION

Chapter three described lengthily the research design of this study, which included main topics like sampling, instrumentation, credibility, validity and reliability of data as well as a detailed explanation of the interviews and observation techniques together with the criteria for data analysis. This chapter deals with the presentation, interpretation and analysis of the data gathered in the interview and observation stages held in nine private secondary schools of Mauritius.

As the research was a qualitative one involving interviews and observation techniques, the analysis of the data adopted the qualitative technique which primarily involved an inductive process of organizing the data into categories and identifying patterns (relationship) among the categories. It was a systematic process of selecting, categorizing, comparing, synthesizing and interpreting to provide explanations of the single phenomenon of interest (McMillan and Schumacher 1997:501). According to Hitch Cock and Hughes (1995:95), analysis involves discovering and maintaining patterns in the data, looking for general orientations in the data and trying to sort out what the data are all about. In simple terms, data analysis is the process of making sense out of data. It involves consolidating, reducing and interpreting what people have said and what the researcher has seen and read. It is the process of making meaning and systematically searching and arranging the interview transcripts, field notes and other materials that the researcher accumulated to increase his/her own understanding and to enable him or her to present what he or she discovered from others (Bogdan and Bicklen 1992:153).

The present chapter, therefore, tries to make sense out of all the data gathered during the interviews and observations in the nine private secondary schools of Mauritius.
4.2 FEEDBACK ON THE DATA COLLECTION STAGE

As explained in chapter three, nine private secondary schools were selected for carrying out the research process in order to investigate on the leadership styles adopted by their principals and the school climate that prevail in them. The nine schools were found in nine different districts of Mauritius and in each school, two teachers and the principal were interviewed. For the purpose of confidentiality and anonymity, the nine schools were named A, B, C, D, E, F, G, H and I and in each school, the two teachers were named X and Y.

In the site of each school, permission was asked from the principal in order to conduct the interviews with two teachers and himself. In all the nine schools the principals were very cooperative and helped the researcher to choose two teachers for the interviews. As far as the observation is concerned, this was done in complete secrecy. This was started before entering the school compound because the physical aspects of the school had to be investigated. In the school yard, the observation schedule was filled while waiting for either the teachers or the principal to be interviewed. Thus, the task of the researcher was not that easy because he had to conduct two tasks simultaneously; that is, he had to observe certain phenomena and characteristics of the school and at the same time interview two teachers and the principal.

As far as the interviews of teachers are concerned, the letter of permission was first presented to them before the questioning process began. In all the schools the teachers who were selected accepted to be interviewed except in one school where one teacher refused to give information on his principal for fear that he could be reprimanded. Finally, he accepted to participate after the confidentiality of the research was made clear to him. Apart from this incident, every thing went on smoothly as planned. Another problem which was encountered was the taping of the interviews. In some schools, the teachers requested not to have their interviews be taped and their request was granted.

By and large, interviewing the principals was not a big problem as they were all very keen to answer the questions. However, the only problem was that, in some cases, their answers did not match with those given by the two teachers and so, their answers were not neglected but were dealt with very cautiously during the analysis stage. This problem occurred with two
principals of two different schools. For instance, in one school, both teachers stated that they were not treated with respect and that the principal did not listen to their opinions but the principal answered just the contrary for similar questions. So, in this case, the answers of the two teachers were considered as more valid than those given by the principal. Furthermore, almost all principals had answered ‘Always’ for the question ‘Do you set good examples by working hard?’ However, in one school, school B, both teachers answered the contrary for that question regarding their principal. So, again, the answers of the two teachers were taken into consideration in the analysis stage.

In the topics that follow, the data gathered in the interviews and the observations in the nine schools are presented, interpreted and analysed. Not to forget, the aim of the study is to find the relationship between the leadership styles of principals and the school climate. Thus, for each school, the data gathered in the interviews and observations on the leadership styles and the school climate are presented in different tables and are analysed separately.

In the table on the ‘power’ concept of leadership, in the answer column, A stands for always, S for sometimes, R for rarely and N for never. In the type of leadership column, A stands for authoritarian, D for democratic and LF for laissez-faire. In the table on the ‘relational’ concept of leadership also, the symbols A, S, R and N stand for always, sometimes, rarely and never respectively. In the table on school climate, the answer column also contains the symbols A, S, R and N and the column dealing with the type of school climate contains the symbols C and O which stand for closed and open respectively. Under each table of results, deductions are made. In chapter five, all these deductions will be used to compile the findings, recommendations and conclusion of the research.
4.3 PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA FROM SCHOOL A

4.3.1 Data obtained from interviews

4.3.1.1 Profiles of teacher X, teacher Y and the principal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Teacher X/A</th>
<th>Teacher Y/A</th>
<th>Principal P/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>51-60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital status</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Married</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational attainment</td>
<td>Master’s degree</td>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>Master’s degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience (years)</td>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PS: Teacher X/A stands for teacher X of school A.
Teacher Y/A stands for teacher Y of school A.
Principal P/A stands for the principal of school A

Deduction: The two teachers interviewed had different teaching experiences, different qualifications and had different ages. The principal was very experienced and qualified.

4.3.1.2 The ‘Power’ concept of leadership

Data obtained from teachers X and Y and the principal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q</th>
<th>Ans</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Ans</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Ans</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D/A</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>D/A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>D/A</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>D/A</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>D/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>D/A</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>D/A</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>D/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Deduction:** Both teachers X and Y as well as the principal stated that a combination of the democratic and the authoritarian styles of leadership were adopted. Since teacher X and the principal stated that the democratic style was much more used, it could be deduced that the democratic style was more common.

4.3.1.3 The ‘Relational’ concept of leadership

Data obtained from two teachers X and Y and the principal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiating structure items</th>
<th>Consideration items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Teacher X/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Deduction:** Both teachers X and Y and the principal categorized the principal in the High-High quadrant; that is, someone who was effective in managing both people and task. In fact, the responses given in the interviews confirmed that statement.

4.3.1.4 The school climate

Data obtained from teachers X and Y and the principal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items on teachers’ behaviour</th>
<th>Items on Principal’s behaviour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher X/A</td>
<td>Teacher Y/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Ans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Deduction:** Both teachers X and Y as well as the principal considered the climate in the category of ‘others’; that is, showing a combination of both open and closed climates. However, it was more open than closed.

4.3.1.5 Answers to general questions

(a) For teacher X/A
For the question “Do you like the teaching profession?” he stated, “Yes, this is the only job I have always liked to do”. He also stated that he did not have any problems with the principal. He said that he was given all the necessary facilities to do his work and that he did not encounter any problem of indiscipline in his class.

(b) For teacher Y/A
The teacher stated that he liked his work and found the principal very strict and severe but did not have problems with him. He was given all necessary facilities. He stated that he had some problems of discipline in the class.

(c) For the Principal P/A
The principal stated that he liked his work because he was well remunerated. He did not have problems with the staff and he was given all facilities to do his work. He did not have problems of indiscipline.

4.3.2 Data obtained from observation

4.3.2.1 The ‘Power’ concept of leadership

In the staff room, the principal was seen talking to the teachers in a very serious and formal way and the teachers appeared very scared while addressing him. This showed that the principal was somewhat authoritarian. In another instance, in the yard, he approached two other teachers in a very polite and respectable way and he even shook hand with them, proving that he was also democratic. Thus, the principal was proved to adopt both democratic and authoritarian styles of leadership in different instances.
4.3.2.2 The ‘Relational’ concept of leadership

The principal was categorised in the High-High quadrant because all the three questions in the initiating structure were ‘Yes’ and two in the consideration were ‘Yes’

4.3.2.3 The School climate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q</th>
<th>Items on teachers’ behaviour</th>
<th>Items on principal’s behaviour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ans</td>
<td>Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Open</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Deduction:** The observation showed that the climate was in the category of ‘others’ and was more open than closed.

4.3.2.4 The Physical aspects of the school

School A was situated in the southern part of Mauritius and in a rural region. It was found in a very isolated and calm region. The school had a large and attractive gate with good fencing. The yard was very tidy and contained a garden with attractive flowers. Moreover, the whole building was made up of concrete and contained all the infrastructures and physical facilities. The reception area was very large, tidy and well ventilated.

4.3.3 Conclusion

In both the interviews and the observation, the principal was deduced to adopt the democratic and authoritarian styles of leadership, but was more democratic. He was rated in the high-high quadrant as far as the ‘relational’ concept of leadership was concerned. The climate was in the category of ‘others’ but was more open according to the teachers. As far as the
physical aspects were concerned, the school proved to be a good working environment with all facilities available.

4.4 PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA FROM SCHOOL B

4.4.1 Data obtained from Interviews

4.4.1.1 Profiles of teacher X, teacher Y and the principal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Teacher X/B</th>
<th>Teacher Y/B</th>
<th>Principal P/B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>51-60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital status</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Married</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational attainment</td>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>Bachelor’s degree</td>
<td>Master’s degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience (years)</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Deduction:** The two teachers were not of the same gender, had different ages, different qualifications and there was a slight difference in their teaching experiences. The principal was in his fifties, was very experienced in management and was very qualified.

4.4.1.2 The ‘Power’ concept of leadership

Data obtained from teachers X and Y and the principal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q</th>
<th>Ans</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Ans</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Ans</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>D/A</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>D/A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>D/A</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>D/A</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>D/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>D/A</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>D/A</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>D/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Deduction: Teacher X considered the principal as authoritarian. The democratic style must be neglected for questions 7, 8 and 9 because the first six questions have not shown that the principal adopted this style. According to teacher Y, the principal adopted a combination of the authoritarian and democratic styles of leadership but since the answers to four out of the first six questions corresponded to the authoritarian style of leadership, it could be deduced that the principal was more authoritarian than democratic. The principal himself confirmed that he adopted both the authoritarian and democratic styles but was more authoritarian. Thus, it could be deduced that the principal was more authoritarian.

4.4.1.3 The ‘Relational’ concept of leadership

Data obtained from the two teachers X and Y and the principal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q</th>
<th>Initiating structure items</th>
<th>Consideration items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher X/B</td>
<td>Teacher Y/B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Deduction: According to teachers X and Y, the principal scored high in the initiating structure items but low in the consideration items. However, the principal himself considered him to be high in both items. Here, the answers of the two teachers will be taken into consideration and it can be deduced that the principal was classified in quadrant II in the leadership behaviour quadrants in Hoy and Miskel (1982:228) and was ineffective to deal with people.
4.4.1.4 The School climate

Data obtained from teachers X and Y and the principal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q</th>
<th>Ans</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Ans</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Ans</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Ans</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Ans</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Deduction:** In the table of results for teacher X, six answers match with the closed climate while for teacher Y five answers out of eight match with the closed climate. In the principal’s answers, three out of four revealed a closed climate. Thus, it can be deduced that the teachers X and Y and the principal considered the climate in the category of ‘others’ but was more closed than open.

4.4.1.5 Answers to general questions

(a) For teacher X/B

The interviewed teacher stated that he liked the teaching profession but encountered some problems with the principal because he was ‘too severe’. He complained for having too much of administrative paper work to do and he had problems of indiscipline in his class.

(b) For teacher Y/B

The teacher complained that she had started to dislike the teaching profession because she had certain problems with the principal. For the question of discipline, she stated, “*students misbehave because some teachers misbehave with them.*”
(c) For the Principal P/B

The principal stated that he liked his work because he was well remunerated. He had problems with inexperienced teachers and he confessed that he was given all facilities to do his work. He also stated that he had some problems of indiscipline in his school.

4.4.2 Data obtained from observation

4.4.2.1: The ‘Power’ concept of leadership

When the researcher was talking to the principal, a teacher came and he talked to him very seriously and in a formal manner. In another occasion, while waiting for a teacher to be interviewed, a teacher was seen to be conversing with the principal in the corridor. The conversation was very serious and strict. This proved that the principal was somewhat authoritarian.

4.4.2.2 The ‘Relational’ concept of leadership

The principal scored high in the initiating structure because he was seen to be well organized and there seemed to be good communication in the school. However, a low score is given to the consideration items because the principal did not seem to be friendly and respectable and was not very approachable.

4.4.2.3 The school climate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items on teachers behaviour</th>
<th>Items on principal’s behaviour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Ans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Deduction:** The climate was in the category of ‘others’ and was more closed than open.
4.4.2.4 The physical aspects of the school

The school was situated in the western part of the island. It was found in an urban area in a very busy and noisy area. However, the work in the school was not disturbed by the noises in the streets because the school occupied a very large and well shielded area. The school entrance was well protected by a huge gate and its garden was well looked after. The school possessed all the necessary infrastructures.

4.4.3 Conclusion

Both the interviews and the observation proved that the principal adopted both the democratic and authoritarian styles of leadership but was rather more authoritarian. According to the two teachers, the principle was rated high in the initiating structure items but low in the consideration item although he categorized himself in the high-high quadrant. The climate was in the category of ‘others’ but was more ‘closed’. Both teachers complained about problems of indiscipline with students and problems with the principal. As far as the physical aspects of the school were concerned, everything seemed to be working smoothly.

4.5 PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA FROM SCHOOL C

4.5.1 Data obtained from interviews

4.5.1.1 Profiles of teacher X, teacher Y and the principal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Teacher X/C</th>
<th>Teacher Y/C</th>
<th>Principal P/C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>41-50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital status</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Married</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational attainment</td>
<td>Bachelor’s degree</td>
<td>Bachelor’s degree</td>
<td>PGCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience (years)</td>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Deduction:** The two teachers were not of the same gender and they both had the same qualification. There was a slight difference in their ages and teaching experiences. The principal was quite young (early forties) was not very experienced and was a PGCE holder.

4.5.1.2 The ‘Power’ concept of leadership

Data obtained from teachers X and Y and the principal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q</th>
<th>Ans</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Ans</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Ans</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>D/A</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>D/A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>L.F</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>L.F</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>L.F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>L.F</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>L.F</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>L.F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Deduction:** Both teachers X and Y and the principal considered the principal as adopting both the democratic and Laissez-Faire styles but was more democratic. Only answers eight and nine revealed the Laissez-Faire style in the responses of the three interviewees.
4.5.1.3: The ‘Relational’ concept of leadership

Data obtained from the two teachers X and Y and the principal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q</th>
<th>Initiating structure items</th>
<th>Consideration items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher X/C</td>
<td>Teacher Y/C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Deduction:** Teachers X and Y considered the principal as low in initiating structure but high in consideration. However, the principal considered himself in the High-High quadrant. In this case, the responses of the two teachers will be taken into consideration and it can be deduced that the principal was in quadrant IV; that is, someone who was more people oriented than task oriented.

4.5.1.4 The school climate

Data obtained from teachers X and Y and the principal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q</th>
<th>Items on teacher behaviour</th>
<th>Items on Principal’s behaviour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher X/C</td>
<td>Teacher Y/C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ans</td>
<td>Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Deduction:** All the responses of the teachers X and Y and of the principal revealed that the climate was in the category of ‘others’ but was more open than closed.
4.5.1.5 Answers to general questions

(a) For teacher X/C
The teacher liked his work because teaching was his ambition since childhood and he also stated that he did not have problems with the principal. He was given all the necessary facilities to do his work and stated that he did not have problems of indiscipline in his class.

(b) For teacher Y/C
The teacher liked her work and did not have problems with the principal. She had all the facilities to do her work. She stated that she had some problems of indiscipline because “all students are not the same.” She also conceded that some students misbehaved with both teachers and the administration.

(c) For the principal P/C
The principal liked his work and did not have problems with his staff. He was given all the necessary facilities to do his work and confessed that he did not have problems of indiscipline in his school apart from some minor incidents.

4.5.2 Data obtained from observation

4.5.2.1 The ‘Power’ concept of leadership

The principal was very polite and respectable and he was dressed in a very casual way; that is, no coat or tie. He allowed the researcher to enter the staff room and he moved around himself to look for the teachers to be interviewed. The teachers were very friendly with him and he shook hands with all teachers he met in the corridor, male or female. The teachers seemed to like the principal very much and have great respect for him. Thus, this proved that the principal adopted the democratic style.

4.5.2.2 The ‘Relational’ concept of leadership

The principal was categorised in the High-High quadrant because all the three questions in the initiating structure and the consideration items were ‘Yes’.
4.5.2.3 The school climate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q</th>
<th>Items on teachers’ behaviour</th>
<th>Items on principal’s behaviour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ans</td>
<td>Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Open</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Deduction:** The climate was classified in the category of ‘others’ but was more open than closed.

4.5.2.4 The physical aspects of the school

The school was situated in the coastal region, in the eastern part of the island. It was found in a remote area, far from the residential zone or busy commercial areas. The school entrance was very tidy and well decorated. There was even a beautiful painting on its wall. The reception area was tidy and well ventilated. The building, in general, was well constructed and designed and almost all infrastructures were available. The school yard was beautiful and clean.

4.5.3 Conclusion

Both the interviews and the observations showed that the principal adopted both the democratic and laissez-faire styles and the interviews identified a prevalence of the democratic style. As far as the relational concept of leadership was concerned, the principal was categorized in quadrant IV with low in initiating structure items and high in consideration items by both teachers. However, the principal’s interview and the observation rated the principal in the high-high quadrant, that is, quadrant I. About the school climate, both the interviews and the observation classified it in the category of others but was more open than closed. Moreover, both teachers and the principal were satisfied with their work and all the necessary infrastructures were present.
4.6 PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA FROM SCHOOL D

4.6.1 Data obtained from interviews

4.6.1.1 Profiles of teacher X, teacher Y and the principal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>51-60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital status</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Married</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational attainment</td>
<td>Bachelor’s degree</td>
<td>Bachelor’s degree</td>
<td>Master’s degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience (years)</td>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Deduction:** The two teachers were not of same gender, but had the same ages, qualification and teaching experience. The principal was qualified and experienced.

4.6.1.2 The ‘Power’ concept of leadership

Data obtained from teachers X and Y and the principal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q</th>
<th>Ans</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Ans</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Ans</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D/A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D/A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>D/A</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>D/A</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>D/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>D/A</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>D/A</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>D/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Deduction:** Both teachers X and Y and the principal stated clearly that both the authoritarian and the democratic styles of leadership were used. An equal amount of these two styles appeared in the responses of the two teachers X and Y.

4.6.1.3 The ‘Relational’ concept of leadership

Data obtained from the two teachers X and Y and the principal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiating structure items</th>
<th>Consideration items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Teacher X/D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Deduction:** All the three interviewees allocated a score of high in both the initiating structure and the consideration items. The principal was classified in quadrant I and was effective in managing both people and tasks.

4.6.1.4 The school climate

Data obtained from teachers X and Y and the principal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items on teacher behaviour</th>
<th>Items on Principal’s behaviour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher X/D</td>
<td>Teacher Y/D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Ans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Deduction: According to the responses of teacher X, the climate was in the category of ‘others’ with an equal amount of Open and Closed characteristics. The responses of teacher Y and the principal also categorized the climate as ‘others’ but was more open than closed.

4.6.1.5 Answers to general questions

(a) For teacher X/D
The teacher liked the teaching profession and stated that he did not have problems with the principal. He was given all the necessary facilities to do his work. As far as the question of discipline is concerned, he stated:
“I do have problems of indiscipline, but I manage to solve them with the help of the administration.”

(b) For teacher Y/D
The teacher liked her work and did not have problems with the principal. She was given all the necessary facilities to do her work and she stated that she had certain problems of indiscipline in her class but the problems were immediately solved by the administration.

(c) For the principal P/D
The principal liked her work and she had no problems with her staff. She was provided with all necessary facilities and recognized that she had some problems of indiscipline with both students and teachers but managed to solve them. She also added: ‘If a principal states that he/she is not having problems of indiscipline nowadays it means that he/she is joking and is a liar.’

4.6.2 Data obtained from observation

4.6.2.1 The ‘Power’ concept of leadership

The principal was seen to be well dressed, very polite and even treated her staff with respect. The teachers were very friendly with her and were neither scared nor played hide and seek when she was in the yard. This proved that the principal was democratic.
4.6.2.2 The ‘Relational’ concept of leadership

The administration was seen to be well organized and there was good communication in the school. The principal moved along to supervise the staff. Thus, this proves that the initiating structure was high in the school. As far as consideration is concerned, this also was high because the principal was friendly and respected by the staff.

4.6.2.3 The School climate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items on teacher’s behaviour</th>
<th>Items on principal’s behaviour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Ans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Deduction:** According to the results obtained, the climate was in the ‘others’ category but was more open than closed.

4.6.2.4 The physical aspects of the school

The school was situated in the north of the island, more precisely in the capital of Mauritius. Although it was a busy area, the school was found in a calm and remote area. The school had a spacious yard with a football and a basketball play-ground. The garden was filled with different kinds of flowers and vegetables. The building was made up of concrete and was beautifully painted. All the infrastructures were present.

4.6.3 Conclusion

The interviews revealed that the principal adopted an equal amount of both the authoritarian and democratic styles of leadership. The observation revealed only the democratic style. The principal was also classified in the High-High quadrant, as far as the ‘relational’ concept
of leadership was concerned. The school climate was in the category of ‘others’ but was more open according to one teacher and the principal. Both teachers and the principal were satisfied with their jobs. Moreover, all the infrastructures were available in the school.

4.7 PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA FROM SCHOOL E

4.7.1 Data obtained from interviews

4.7.1.1 Profiles of teacher X, teacher Y and the principal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>51-60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital status</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>Married</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational attainment</td>
<td>Bachelor’s degree</td>
<td>Bachelor’s degree</td>
<td>Master’s degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience (years)</td>
<td>10-15</td>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Deduction:** The two teachers were not of the same gender, but were in the same age range and had the same qualification. The principal was qualified and very experienced.

4.7.1.2 The ‘Power’ concept of leadership

Data obtained from teachers X and Y and the principal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q</th>
<th>Ans</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Ans</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Ans</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Deduction: Surprisingly, the responses of both teachers and those of the principal showed that the latter adopted only the democratic style of leadership.

4.7.1.3 The ‘Relational’ concept of leadership

Deduction: Surprisingly, the responses of both teachers and those of the principal showed that the latter adopted only the democratic style of leadership.

4.7.1.3 The ‘Relational’ concept of leadership

Deduction: Surprisingly, the responses of both teachers and those of the principal showed that the latter adopted only the democratic style of leadership.

Deduction: All the three interviewees unanimously gave a high rate in both the initiating structure and consideration items. Thus, the principal was situated in quadrant I and was effective in managing both people and tasks.

4.7.1.4: The school climate

Deduction: All the three interviewees classified the climate as ‘Others’ but which was more open than closed.
4.7.1.5 Answers to general questions

(a) For teacher X/E
For the question “Do you like the teaching profession?” she answered: “Yes, of course. I adore my work because it is a very noble job.” She stated that she did not encounter problems with the principal. She was given all the necessary facilities to do her work properly and that she did not encounter major problems of indiscipline in her class. She admitted that some students misbehaved with teachers, particularly the new-comers, but not with the administration.

(b) For teacher Y/E
The teacher liked his work and had no problems with the principal. He did not lack any facilities to do his work and as far as problems of indiscipline are concerned, he managed to solve them himself without the help of the principal or the administration. He stated that some students misbehaved with some teachers and even with administration.

(c) For the principal P/E
The principal liked his work and did not have problems with his staff. He admitted being given all the necessary facilities to do his work. He agreed that he had some problems of indiscipline with both teachers and students and that this was ‘inevitable’.

4.7.2 Data obtained from Observation

4.7.2.1 The ‘Power’ concept of leadership

The principal appeared very polite and humble. He was well dressed and very respectable. Moreover, he was very friendly with the teachers and even with the non teaching staff. This proved that the principal was democratic.

4.7.2.2 The ‘Relational’ concept of leadership

The teacher was in the High-High quadrant because all the answers for the initiating structure and consideration items were ‘yes’.
4.7.2.3 The school climate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q</th>
<th>Ans</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Ans</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Open</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Deduction:** The climate was completely open.

4.7.2.4 The physical aspects of the school

The school was situated in the central part of the island in a busy area. The school had a beautiful large gate. The school yard was very clean and had a beautiful garden. The reception area was very tidy and well ventilated. All the infrastructures were present.

4.7.3 Conclusion

It is deduced from the interviews and the observation that the democratic style of leadership was used by the principal and he was rated high in both initiating structure and consideration items. The interviews also classified the climate as ‘others’ but was more open than closed. The observation classified the climate as completely open. Moreover, all the three interviewees admitted being given all the necessary facilities to do their work and the observer found all infrastructures present.
4.8 PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA FROM SCHOOL F

4.8.1 Data obtained from interviews

4.8.1.1 Profiles of teacher X, teacher Y and the principal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Teacher X/F</th>
<th>Teacher Y/F</th>
<th>Principal P/F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>51-60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital status</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Married</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational attainment</td>
<td>Bachelor’s degree</td>
<td>Bachelor’s degree</td>
<td>PGCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience (years)</td>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Deduction:** The two teachers were not of the same gender, age range and teaching experience but had the same qualification. The principal was very experienced and was a PGCE holder.

4.8.1.2 The ‘power’ concept of leadership

Data obtained from teachers X and Y and the principal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q</th>
<th>Ans</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Ans</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Ans</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>D/A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D/A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>L.F</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>L.F</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>L.F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>L.F</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>L.F</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>L.F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Deduction: All the three interviewees considered the principal as adopting all the three styles of leadership; that is, the authoritarian, democratic and Laissez-Faire styles. The principal was considered to be slightly more democratic by teacher X and himself.

4.8.1.3 The ‘Relational’ concept of leadership

Data obtained from the two teachers X and Y and the principal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q</th>
<th>Initiating structure items</th>
<th>Consideration items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher X/F</td>
<td>Teacher Y/F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Deduction: All the three interviewees categorized the principal in the High-High quadrant; that is quadrant I in which the principal was effective in managing both people and tasks.

4.8.1.4: The school climate

Data obtained from teachers X and Y and the principal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q</th>
<th>Items on teachers’ behaviour</th>
<th>Items on Principal’s behaviour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher X/F</td>
<td>Teacher Y/F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Deduction: All the three interviewees considered the climate to be in the ‘Others’ category but was more open than closed.
4.8.1.5 Answers to general questions

(a) For teacher X/F
For the question “Do you like the teaching profession?” he stated: “Yes, I have always liked to work with children.” He conceded having no problems with the principal and that he was given all the necessary facilities to do his work. He recognized that he had some problems of indiscipline in his class and that some students misbehaved with teachers but not with the administration.

(b) For teacher Y/F
The teacher liked her work but admitted that she had some problems with the principal. The teacher was given all the necessary facilities to do her work and she complained that she had some problems of indiscipline in her class and that some students misbehaved with the teachers but not with the administration. About the administration, she stated: “The administration is so severe that the students are obliged to abide by all the rules and regulations.”

(c) For the principal P/F
The principal stated that he liked his work and did not have problems with his staff. He was given all facilities to do his work and he did not have problems of indiscipline.

4.8.2 Data obtained from observation

4.8.2.1: The ‘Power’ concept of leadership
The principal was seen talking to some teachers in a very polite but strict manner. He was well dressed and was very keen to help the researcher in conducting the interviews. The teachers paid great respect to him and were not seen to be scared in his presence. This proved that the principal was democratic.

4.8.2.2 The ‘Relational’ concept of leadership
The principal was in the High-High quadrant because all the answers in the initiating structure and consideration items were ‘yes’.
4.8.2.3 The school climate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q</th>
<th>Items on teachers’ behaviour</th>
<th>Items on principal’s behaviour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ans</td>
<td>Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Open</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Deduction:** The climate was open according to the results above.

4.8.2.4 The physical aspects of the school

The school was situated in the central part of the island in a remote region far from the residential area. The gate was very large but in a ‘rusty’ condition. The school yard, however, was very clean with beautiful flowers. The reception area was spacious and well ventilated. All the infrastructures were present.

4.8.3 Conclusion

All the three interviewees considered the principal as adopting all the three styles of leadership; that is, the authoritarian, democratic and laissez-faire styles. The principal was considered to be slightly more democratic. All the three interviewees categorized the principal in the High-High quadrant and they also considered the climate to be in the category of ‘others’ but was more open than closed. Both teachers liked their jobs as they were given all the necessary facilities but one teacher complained that she had some problems with the principal and the administration although she considered the principal as adopting the democratic, authoritarian and laissez-faire styles. The observation showed that the principal was democratic but did not reveal about the authoritarian and laissez-faire styles. The climate was seen to be open and the principal was rated in the High-High quadrant. Almost all infrastructures were present.
4.9 PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA FROM SCHOOL G

4.9.1 Data obtained from interviews

4.9.1.1 Profiles of teacher X, teacher Y and the principal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Teacher X/G</th>
<th>Teacher Y/G</th>
<th>Principal P/G</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>51-60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital status</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>Married</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational attainment</td>
<td>Bachelor’s degree</td>
<td>Bachelor’s degree</td>
<td>Doctor’s degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience (years)</td>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>15-20</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Deduction: The two teachers were not of the same gender, age range and had different teaching experiences. However, they had the same qualification. The principal was in his late fifties, had a Doctor’s degree and was very qualified.

4.9.1.2 The ‘power’ concept of leadership

Data obtained from teachers X and Y and the principal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q</th>
<th>Ans</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Ans</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Ans</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D/A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D/A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>D/A</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>D/A</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>D/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>D/A</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>D/A</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>D/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Deduction:** All the three interviewees revealed that the principal adopted both the authoritarian and the democratic styles of leadership and was rather more democratic than authoritarian.

4.9.1.3 The ‘Relational’ concept of leadership

Data obtained from the two teachers X and Y and the principal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiating structure items</th>
<th>Consideration items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher X/G</td>
<td>Teacher Y/G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Deduction:** All the three interviewees considered the principal to be in the High-High quadrant; that is, in quadrant I and was effective in managing both people and tasks.

4.9.1.4 The school climate

Data obtained from teachers X and Y and the principal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items on teachers’ behaviour</th>
<th>Items on Principal’s behaviour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher X/G</td>
<td>Teacher Y/G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Ans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Deduction:** All the three interviewees considered the climate as ‘Others’ and, according to the two teachers X and Y, the climate was more open than closed.
4.9.1.5 Answers to general questions

(a) For teacher X/G
The teacher did not like the teaching profession because he found no scope for self development in this job. He admitted having no problems with the principal and was given all the necessary facilities to do his work. He did not have problems of indiscipline in his classroom and the students did not misbehave with teachers and the administration.

(b) For teacher Y/G
The teacher liked her work and did not have problems with the principal. She was given all the necessary facilities to do her work. About problems of indiscipline, she added: "My students are very motivated and work very hard; thus they have no time to misbehave."

(c) For the principal P/G
The principal liked his job. He did not have problems with the staff. He was given all necessary facilities. He conceded having no problems of indiscipline. For the question on whether he had problems with his staff he stated: "My teachers are very hard working and conscientious."

4.9.2 Data obtained from observation

4.9.2.1 ‘Power’ concept of leadership
The principal treated the staff in a very strict and formal manner but was also polite and respectable. The principal was well dressed. The teachers did not seem to be scared in his presence but rather came to meet him. This showed that the principal was democratic.

4.9.2.2 The ‘Relational’ concept of leadership
The principal was classified in the High-High quadrant because all the answers in the initiating structure and consideration items were ‘yes’.
4.9.2.3 The school climate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q</th>
<th>Items on teachers’ behaviour</th>
<th>Items on principal’s behaviour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ans Type</td>
<td>Ans Type</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>No Open</td>
<td>No Open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Yes Open</td>
<td>Yes Closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Yes Open</td>
<td>Yes Open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Yes Open</td>
<td>Yes Open</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Deduction:** According to the observation results, the climate was in the category of ‘others’ but was more open than closed.

4.9.2.4 The physical aspects of the school

The school was situated in the northern part of the island and was situated in the coastal region. The school itself was found in a remote and silent area far from residential area. The gate was unpainted and the building itself was very old. However, the school yard was very tidy with a beautiful garden. The reception area was tidy and well ventilated. All the necessary infrastructures were present.

4.9.3 Conclusion

The interviews showed that the principal adopted both the authoritarian and democratic styles but was more democratic. The observation revealed only the democratic style. The interviews as well as the observation revealed that the principal was in the High-High quadrant. The climate was in the category of ‘others’ but was more open than closed according to the interviews and the observation. Both teachers admitted having no problems with the principal and were given all necessary facilities to do their work. One teacher however, did not like the teaching profession. The observer also found that all the necessary infrastructures were present.
4.10 PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA FROM SCHOOL H

4.10.1 Data obtained from interviews

4.10.1.1 Profiles of teacher X, teacher Y and the principal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Teacher X/H</th>
<th>Teacher Y/H</th>
<th>Principal P/H</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>51-60</td>
<td>21-40</td>
<td>51-60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital status</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Married</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational attainment</td>
<td>Bachelor’s degree</td>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>Master’s degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience (years)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Deduction:** The two teachers were not of the same gender, had a large difference in their ages and teaching experience and even had different qualifications. The principal was a female in her late fifties, was very experienced and had a Master’s degree.

4.10.1.2 The ‘Power’ concept of leadership

Data obtained from teachers X and Y and the principal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Ans</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Ans</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Ans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>L.F</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>L.F</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>L.F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>L.F</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>L.F</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>L.F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Deduction: All the three interviewees conceded and confirmed that the principal adopted both the democratic and Laissez- Faire styles of leadership in different circumstances. The democratic style was more prevalent.

4.10.1.3 The ‘Relational’ concept of leadership.

Data obtained from the two teachers X and Y and the principal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiating structure items</th>
<th>Consideration items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Teacher X/H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Deduction: All the three interviewees classified the principal in the High-High quadrant. Thus, she was effective in managing both people and tasks.

4.10.1.4 The school climate

Data obtained from teachers X and Y and the principal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items on teachers’ behaviour</th>
<th>Items on Principal’s behaviour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher X/H</td>
<td>Teacher Y/H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Ans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Deduction:** Teacher X and the principal considered the climate as completely open. In teacher’s Y responses, only one item showed a closed climate. Thus, it can be deduced that the climate was almost open in school H.

4.10.1.5 Answers to general questions

(a) For teacher X/H
The teacher liked his work very well. He did not have problems with the principal. About the question of facilities provided by the school he stated: "*All facilities are present in the school because if they were not present the school would have been de-registered.*" He did not have problems of indiscipline in his classroom and students did not misbehave with teachers and administration.

(b) For teacher Y/H
The teacher liked her work because she did not find other alternative job. She did not have problems with the principal and were given all facilities to do her work. However, she complained that she suffered from some problems of indiscipline in her class but that the administration helped her to solve these problems.

(c) For the principal P/H
The principal liked her work and did not have problems with her staff. She was given all the necessary facilities to do her work and confessed that she did not have problems of indiscipline in her school apart from some minor incidents.

**4.10.2 Data obtained from observation**

4.10.2.1 The ‘Power’ concept of leadership

The principal was nicely dressed and was seen talking with some teachers very politely and respectable way. The teachers also paid great respect to her and were not scared by her presence. This proved that the principal was democratic.
4.10.2.2 The ‘Relational’ concept of leadership

Since all the answers for the initiating structure and consideration items were ‘yes’, it could be deduced that the principal was in the High-High quadrant.

4.10.2.3 The school climate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q</th>
<th>Items on teachers behaviour</th>
<th>Items on principal’s behaviour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ans</td>
<td>Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Open</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Deduction:** Again it was confirmed that the climate was completely open.

4.10.2.4 The physical aspects of the school

The school was found in the eastern part of the island in a busy and noisy region. The school was found in such a place where noises from the outside were heard in the yard but not in the classes. The school was well built and all the infrastructures were present. That is, foot-ball ground, volley-ball ground and even a large gymnasium with many sports’ equipment. There was no garden in the yard but some flowers were planted in the border of the fencing.

4.10.3 Conclusion

The interviews revealed that the principal adopted both the democratic and laissez-faire styles of leadership but the democratic style was more prevalent. The interviews and the observation revealed that the principal was in the High-High quadrant. It was also deduced that the climate was completely ‘open’. All the three interviewees stated that they liked their job and were given all the necessary facilities. All the infrastructures were present in the school.
4.11 PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA FROM SCHOOL I

4.11.1 Data obtained from interviews

4.11.1.1 Profiles of teacher X, teacher Y and the principal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Teacher X/I</th>
<th>Teacher Y/I</th>
<th>Principal P/I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>51-60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital status</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Married</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational attainment</td>
<td>Bachelor’s degree</td>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>PGCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience (years)</td>
<td>More than 20</td>
<td>5-10</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Deduction:** The two teachers were not of the same gender, age range, teaching experience and even had different qualifications. The principal was in his late fifties, was very experienced and was a PGCE holder.

4.11.1.2 The ‘Power’ concept of leadership

Data obtained from teachers X and Y and the principal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q</th>
<th>Ans</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Ans</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Ans</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>L.F</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>L.F</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>L.F</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>L.F</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>L.F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>L.F</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>L.F</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>L.F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Deduction:** Teacher X and Y stated that the principal adopted both the authoritarian and the laissez-faire styles. However, the principal considered himself to be adopting all the three styles. So, in this case, the responses of the teachers would be considered.

4.11.1.3 The ‘Relational’ concept of leadership

Data obtained from the two teachers X and Y and the principal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Initiating structure items</th>
<th></th>
<th>Consideration items</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Teacher X/I</td>
<td>Teacher Y/I</td>
<td>Principal P/I</td>
<td>Teacher X/I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Deduction:** Teachers X and Y rated the principal as ‘low’ in both the initiating structure and consideration items. Thus, the principal was classified in quadrant III in the leadership behaviour quadrant in Hoy and Miskel (1982:228) and was not effective in dealing with both people and tasks. However, the principal considered himself to be in the High-High quadrant. Thus, only the responses of teachers X and Y would be taken into consideration.

4.11.1.4 The school climate

Data obtained from teachers X and Y and the principal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Items on teachers’ behaviour</th>
<th>Items on Principal’s behaviour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher X/I</td>
<td>Teacher Y/I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Ans</td>
<td>Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Deduction: Both teachers X and Y considered the climate of their school as completely ‘closed’ with no sign of openness. However, the principal considered the climate as ‘others’. Thus, only the responses of the two teachers would be taken into consideration.

4.11.1.5 Answers to general questions

(a) For teacher X/I
The teacher complained that he did not like the teaching profession. He had many problems with the principal and he was not given all the necessary facilities to do his work. For instance, being a science teacher, he complained that there was a lack of apparatus and equipment in the chemistry laboratory. As far as problems of discipline is concerned, he answered clearly that the students were bad mannered and misbehaved with both teachers and administration although the principal was very severe.

(b) For teacher Y/I
The teacher complained that she did not like the teaching profession. She had many problems with the principal. About facilities provided by the school, she stated: “How do you think students would be interested in doing sports when no sports’ facilities are provided.” As far as problems of discipline are concerned, she confessed that the situation was “chaotic” and that the students misbehaved with teachers but not with the administration.

(c) For the principal P/I
The principal liked his work and complained that he had certain problems with his staff. He stated having all necessary facilities to do his work but complained having problems of indiscipline with both teachers and students. He stopped with the phrase “For students to behave well, teachers must set the good example”.
4.11.2 Data obtained from observation

4.11.2.1 The ‘Power’ concept of leadership

The principal was well dressed in a ‘Safari’ suit. He appeared very strict and formal. He was seen talking with a teacher in a very severe and strict manner. Moreover, some teachers were seen to be very scared when they approached him, particularly the new comers. This proved that the principal was authoritarian.

4.11.2.2 The ‘Relational’ concept of leadership

All the answers for the initiating structure items were ‘yes’ while all the answers for the consideration items were ‘no’. This showed that the principal was in the High-Low quadrant.

4.11.2.3 The school climate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items on teachers’ behaviour</th>
<th>Items on principal’s behaviour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Ans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Deduction:** The results showed that the climate was in the category of ‘others’ and was more closed than open.

4.11.2.4 The physical aspects of the school

School I was situated in the southern part of the island in a very remote area far from residential and commercial areas. The school entrance was very attractive. The school yard was small and contained no playgrounds. The building was made of concrete and was in great need of a fresh paint.
4.11.3 Conclusion

The two teachers stated that the principal adopted both the authoritarian and laissez-faire styles but was more authoritarian. The principal stated that he adopted also the democratic style besides the two others. The authoritarian style of leadership was also found by the observer when he was on the site. The two teachers classified the principal in the Low-Low quadrant but the principal classified himself in the High-High quadrant. The observation revealed a different result: High in initiating structure items but Low in consideration items. So, here the responses of the two teachers were taken into consideration. Moreover, both teachers classified the climate as completely closed but the principal and the observer found the climate to be in the category of ‘others’. Both teachers complained that they did not like the teaching profession although they were given the necessary facilities to do their work. One teacher even revealed that the situation was ‘chaotic’ as far as problem of discipline was concerned. The principal also complained that he had problems with his staff. About the physical aspects of the school, it seemed that not all infrastructures were present as the school yard itself was small.

4.12 SUMMARY

This chapter discusses the interpretation and analysis of the data collected by means of interviews and observation conducted on nine different private secondary schools of Mauritius.

The results obtained for each school are presented, interpreted and analysed. In each school, two teachers and the principal were interviewed in order to obtain information on the power and relational concepts of leadership as well as on the school climate. The results obtained are presented in the form of tables and a deduction is written underneath each table. Moreover, each school was observed in order to gather information on the three aspects stated above as well as on the physical aspects of the school.

Chapter five, which concludes the study, will take all the deductions into consideration and will discuss on the findings. Finally, recommendations will be made for further research.
CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, FINDINGS, RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSION

5.1 INTRODUCTION

Having reached almost the end of this study, it is worth mentioning that before embarking on the research, the researcher was already aware that principals of private secondary schools of Mauritius adopted different types of leadership styles and that these schools showed different types of climate. However, the relationship between these two concepts was not known.

After some informal talks with some colleagues who work in these schools and after conducting some brief literature reviews on leadership styles and school climate, the idea of conducting a research to investigate on the relationship between the leadership styles and school climate emerged. A title was formulated and the research started.

This present chapter summarises the study, presents the findings and attempts to make some recommendations for educational authorities and for further research.

5.2 SUMMARY OF THE STUDY

This study was divided into five chapters. Chapter one presented an overview of the two main concepts to be studied in the research. These were the leadership styles of principals and school climate in private secondary schools in Mauritius. It also propounded the relevance of the study and the reason why the research was conducted in private secondary schools. The chapter explained briefly on the methodology to be adopted to conduct the research, which involved the type of research, site selection, sampling, research role and data collection strategies.

Chapter two presented the literature review conducted on the two main themes of the research; that is, leadership styles of principals and school climate. The chapter also revealed some research conducted on these two themes and their relevance to the actual study.
Chapter three dealt with the research design. This chapter expounded on the research methods to be used, the sampling and instrumentation. Moreover, the credibility, validity and reliability of the data gained from the interviews and observations were also highlighted. The chapter also explained on how the data gathered in chapter four would be interpreted and analysed.

Chapter four dealt with the presentation, analysis and interpretation of the data gathered during the interviews and observations. The interviews were conducted with eighteen teachers and nine principals in nine different private secondary schools which were also observed. The data were presented in tables and were analysed and interpreted accordingly. Deductions were made on each table.

Chapter five finally presents the findings, recommendations and conclusion.

5.3 FINDINGS

In this section, all the findings derived from chapter four are summarized and represented in a table (Table 5.1) and the sub-sections explain each one and try to find the relationship between them.
Table 5.1: Summary of findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Qualification and experience of principal</th>
<th>Power concept of leadership</th>
<th>Relational concept of leadership</th>
<th>School climate</th>
<th>Physical aspects of the school</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>MEd degree</td>
<td>Democratic and Authoritarian (More democratic)</td>
<td>High-High</td>
<td>‘Others’ More open</td>
<td>All available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>MEd degree</td>
<td>Democratic and Authoritarian (More authoritarian)</td>
<td>High-Low</td>
<td>‘Others’ More closed</td>
<td>All available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>PGCE</td>
<td>Democratic and Laissez-Faire (More democratic)</td>
<td>Low-High</td>
<td>‘Others’ More open</td>
<td>All available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>MEd degree</td>
<td>Democratic and Authoritarian (Equal amount)</td>
<td>High-High</td>
<td>‘Others’ More open</td>
<td>All available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>MEd degree</td>
<td>Democratic only</td>
<td>High-High</td>
<td>‘Others’ More open</td>
<td>All available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>PGCE</td>
<td>Democratic, Authoritarian and Laissez-Faire (More democratic)</td>
<td>High-High</td>
<td>‘Others’ More open</td>
<td>All available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>DEd degree</td>
<td>Democratic and Authoritarian (More democratic)</td>
<td>High-High</td>
<td>‘Others’ More open</td>
<td>All available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>MEd degree</td>
<td>Democratic and Laissez-Faire (More democratic)</td>
<td>High-High</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>All available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>PGCE</td>
<td>Authoritarian and laissez-faire (More authoritarian)</td>
<td>Low-Low</td>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>Not all available (No playground and small yard)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PS: In the physical aspects of the school column of Table 5.1, ‘All available’ means that all the necessary facilities and infrastructures needed for the functioning of a school were available; that is, sports’ facilities, laboratories, libraries, audio-visual materials and the like.
5.3.1 Findings on profiles of principals

The principals were experienced in all schools except in school C. That is, they had been working as principals for ten or more years. This is shown clearly in Table 5.1 above. The principal of school C had only three years of experience as principal and was also quite young. Moreover, all the principals were qualified and their qualifications ranged from PGCE to DEd. Most of them were MEd degree holders. These data were important in the study in order to know whether the qualifications or experiences of the principals had an influence on the styles of leadership and school climate. These data could have acted as extraneous variables if they were not almost constant.

Furthermore, according to the requirements of the Ministry of Education, a principal should possess a qualification higher than the Bachelor’s degree. For this reason, the minimum qualification noted was the PGCE. Thus, all the principals in the study were in line with the requirements of the Ministry of education. In fact, if a school’s principal in Mauritius does not satisfy these requirements, the school would not be registered by the PSSA.

5.3.2 Findings on the physical aspects of the schools

Almost all schools possessed the necessary infrastructures and they occupied large areas with good play-grounds. Only in one school (school I) no play-grounds were seen as the school yard itself was not that large. Thus, the physical aspects of the school were almost constant in all schools (except in school I) and so they could not act as extraneous variables in the study.

It is understood that for these private secondary schools to continue to exist, they should compete with the state secondary schools in terms of academic facilities and infrastructures offered to the students. It is note-worthy that these private secondary schools of Mauritius are government-aided schools. In order for them to continue to benefit from the grants allocated, they should satisfy certain basic requirements. Thus, for this reason all the schools were seen well equipped in terms of infrastructures. As regards school I, which did not satisfy certain basic requirements in terms of infrastructures, it was finally known by the researcher that the school obtained a provisional registration and the grants allocated were greatly reduced.
5.3.3 Findings on the ‘power’ concept of leadership.

The ‘power’ concept of leadership, as explained lengthily in section 2.2 of chapter two, constitutes of the authoritarian, democratic and laissez-faire styles. These styles of leadership were investigated in the research conducted in nine private secondary schools in Mauritius and the findings are discussed below.

Among the nine schools which participated in the research, the democratic style of leadership seemed more common. This style was used alone in one school (school E) and was used either with the authoritarian or the laissez-faire style or with both of them in seven other schools. In other words, in only one school the principal did not adopt the democratic style. This was in school I in which the authoritarian and the laissez-faire styles were used. Moreover, among the seven schools in which the democratic style was used together with the other two styles, in five of them it was reported that the principals adopted the democratic style in preference. These five schools were schools A, C, F, G and H.

As far as the authoritarian style was concerned, this style was not used alone in any school but was used together with others in six schools out of the nine schools which participated in the research. These six schools were schools A, B, D, F, G and I. Among these six schools, a greater prevalence of the authoritarian style was noted in only two of them which were schools B and I.

The laissez-faire style was least common as it was used by principals in only four schools; that is, in schools C, F, H and I. Moreover, in neither of these schools, a greater prevalence of the laissez-faire style was noted. This style was used together with either one or two of the other types of leadership styles; that is, the democratic and the authoritarian styles.

Thus, to conclude, the democratic style was most common, followed by the authoritarian style. The laissez-faire style was least common.
5.3.4 Findings on the ‘relational’ concept of leadership

The ‘relational’ concept of leadership, as explained in section 2.2 of chapter two, consists of two dimensions called the initiating structure and consideration behaviours of principals. In the research, each dimension was evaluated by means of a set of five questions. Analysis of the two sets of questions on the initiating structure and consideration behaviours classified the principal of a school in one of four quadrants. The findings of the research conducted in nine private secondary schools in Mauritius are discussed below.

In six out of nine schools, the principals were rated ‘high’ in both the initiating structure and consideration items. These six schools were schools A, D, E, F, G, and I. That is, the principals were classified in quadrant I of the leadership behaviour quadrants in Hoy and Miskel (1982:228) as discussed in chapter two. In this quadrant, the principal was seen to be effective in managing both people and tasks. In one school, school B, the principal scored ‘high’ in initiating structure items but ‘low’ in consideration items. This categorized the principal in quadrant II. In another school, school C, the principal scored ‘low’ in initiating structure items but ‘high’ in consideration items. That is, the principal was placed in quadrant IV. In one school, school I, the principal scored ‘low’ in both initiating structure items and consideration items. This is the quadrant III of the leadership behaviour quadrants in Hoy and Miskel (1982:228). In this quadrant, the principal was considered ineffective in managing both people and tasks.

Thus, it can be concluded that in most schools the principals were classified in the ‘High-High’ quadrant (quadrant I) and were effective in managing both people and their tasks as far as the ‘relational’ concept of leadership was concerned. This was noted in schools A, D, E, F, G and H.

5.3.5 Findings on school climate

As explained in section 3.9.1 of chapter three, the school climate can be categorized as either ‘open’, ‘closed’ or ‘others’. The “others” category is neither completely “open” nor “closed” but in between. Now, if more answers correspond to the ‘open’ climate, then the climate of the school is considered as ‘others’ but more ‘open’. However, if more answers correspond
to the ‘closed’ climate, then the climate is considered as ‘others’ but more ‘closed’. The findings of the research are discussed below.

Among the nine schools which participated in the research, in one school, school I, the climate was reported as completely ‘closed’ by both teachers who were interviewed. The principal and the observer, however, found the climate to be in the category of ‘others’ (as explained above) and the observer found the climate to be more ‘closed’ than ‘open’. The principal might have hidden certain information regarding his school which might have tarnished the reputation of his school. Moreover, when the observer was in the school, he might not have seen some aspects which might have qualified the school as completely ‘closed’. In another school (school H) the climate was considered as completely ‘open’.

In the seven remaining schools, the climate was classified in the category of ‘others’. In six of them the climate was more ‘open’ than ‘closed’. These six schools were schools A, C, D, E, F and G. In only one school the climate was more ‘closed’ than ‘open’. This was in school B.

Thus, it can be deduced that in most schools the climate was in the category of ‘others’ but was more ‘open’ than ‘closed’. That is, the analysis of data revealed that more answers showed characteristics of ‘open’ climate rather than ‘closed’ climate.

5.3.6 Findings on the relationship between the ‘power’ concept of leadership and the school climate

Among the three leadership styles, the democratic style seemed most common. This style was used alone in only one school (school E) but together with either one or two of the other styles, that is, the authoritarian and laissez-faire style, in seven schools. The democratic style was not used at all in only one school (school I). It was surprising to note that among the eight schools in which the democratic style was adopted, either alone or with the two others, in six schools the climate was in the category of ‘others’ and was more ‘open’ than ‘closed’. Moreover, in these six schools with more ‘open’ climate, the democratic style was more prevalent. These six schools were schools A, C, D, E, F and G. In one school, school H,
with completely ‘open’ climate, the democratic style was used together with the laissez-faire style and the democratic style was again more prevalent.

By and large, the authoritarian style was not used alone in any school but was adopted by principals together with the other styles in six schools; that is, in schools A, B, D, F, G and H. It was striking to note that in two of these schools, schools B and I, the authoritarian style was more prevalent, and in one school (school B) the climate was in the category of ‘others’ but was more ‘closed’ and in the other school (school I) the climate was completely ‘closed’.

The laissez-faire style was the least common style adopted by the principals of secondary schools. It was used together with the other styles in only four schools. These were schools C, F, H and I. It was not the prevalent style in any school. What was amazing about this style was that in one school (school H) it was used together with the democratic style and the climate was completely ‘open’. In another school (school I) it was used together with the authoritarian style and the climate was completely ‘closed’.

To conclude, it could be noted that when the democratic style was used alone or with other styles but was more prevalent than others, the climate tended to be more ‘open’, whereas when the authoritarian style was much more adopted by principals in schools, the climate tended to be more ‘closed’. Moreover, for an ‘open’ climate to occur, the laissez-faire style could be used very cautiously and judiciously.

5.3.7 Findings on the relationship between the ‘relational’ concept of leadership and the school climate

In six schools (schools A, D, E, F, G and H) the principals were rated ‘high’ in both the initiating structure and consideration items and in five of these six schools the climate was in the category of ‘others’ but was more ‘open’ than closed. In one school (school H) the climate was completely ‘open’.

Moreover, in one school (school I) the principal scored ‘low’ in both initiating and consideration items and the climate was completely ‘closed’. In another school (school B) the principal scored ‘high’ in the initiating structure items but ‘low’ in the consideration
items and the climate was in the category of ‘others’ but was more ‘closed’ than ‘open’. In another school (school C) however, the principal scored ‘low’ in initiating structure items but ‘high’ in consideration and the climate was in the category of ‘others’ but was more ‘open’.

Thus, after thorough analysis of these results, it could be deduced that when a principal was rated ‘high’ in both the initiating structure and consideration items, the school climate tended to be more ‘open’. However, when a principal scored ‘low’ in both the initiating structure and consideration items, the school climate tended to be more ‘closed’.

5.3.8 Findings on the relationship between the ‘power’ concept of leadership and the ‘relational’ concept of leadership

In all schools where the democratic style outweighed the other two styles, the principals scored ‘high’ in the consideration items. This was obvious in schools A, C, E, F, G and H. However, in two schools, schools B and I, where the authoritarian style outweighed the other two styles, the principals scored ‘low’ in consideration items.

Moreover, in four schools where the principals adopted two or three styles of the ‘power’ concept of leadership, but with the democratic style outweighing the ‘others’, the principals scored ‘high’ in both the initiating structure and consideration items. This occurred in schools A, F, G and H.

Thus, it could be deduced that when the democratic style was used alone or with other styles but was more prevalent than others, the principals of these schools scored ‘high’ in both the initiating structure and consideration items. However, when the authoritarian style was used with others but was more prevalent, the principals either scored ‘low’ in both the initiating structure and consideration items or ‘low’ in the consideration items only.

5.3.9 Findings on the relationship between the two concepts of leadership and the school climate

After thorough analysis of all the findings, it could finally be deduced that when the democratic style was used alone or with other styles but was more prevalent, the principals of
these schools scored ‘high’ in both the initiating structure and consideration items and the climate of these schools was classified in the category of ‘others’ but was more ‘open’ than ‘closed’. However, when the authoritarian style was used with other styles but was more prevalent, the principals either scored ‘low’ in both initiating structure and consideration items or ‘low’ in the consideration items only and the climate was again in the category of “others” but was more ‘closed’ than ‘open’.

5.3.10 Summary of findings

Having discussed lengthily on the findings on the relationship between the two concepts of leadership and the school climate, it can finally be deduced that a strong relationship does exist between them. Section 5.3.6 and 5.3.7 explain clearly how each concept of leadership is related to school climate. Section 5.3.8 explains how the two concepts of leadership are themselves inter-related. Finally, section 5.3.9 explains how the two concepts of leadership are related to school climate and hence the main aim of the study is fulfilled.

The results of this study are in line with the researches conducted by Hoy, Hoffman, Sabo and Bliss (1994: 41-59) which showed that openness in climate was positively related to open and authentic leader and principal behaviour. Even Al-Gasim (1991:100) found a strong relationship between an open climate and principals who were high in both consideration and initiating structure dimensions. Not to forget, Kruger (1999:18) explained clearly that there was a direct connection between a principal’s leadership role and school climate. He expounded further that in order to foster and maintain a school climate where the majority of the staff was committed to their work, an efficient and outstanding management and leadership was essential and should be characterized by flexibility and adaptability to the situation.

5.4 RECOMMENDATIONS FOR EDUCATIONAL AUTHORITIES

The present study was carried out in nine private secondary schools of Mauritius and these schools are all controlled by the PSSA which is itself accountable to the Ministry of Education. Thus, all the nine findings discussed in sections 5.3.1 to 5.3.9 are cross-referenced and are considered here in order to make recommendations to all private
secondary schools of Mauritius, the PSSA and the Ministry of Education which can implement and apply these recommendations to state secondary schools of Mauritius. These recommendations, by and large, can be considered valid not only on a national basis but also on an international basis in the sense that good leadership styles on the part of principals and open school climate are two important factors which are universally acknowledged to be beneficial in the creation of a good environment conducive to learning.

5.4.1 Recommendations based on findings on profiles of principals

The PSSA, under the supervision of the Ministry of Education, ensures that all principals are highly qualified. The basic requirements for a principal actually is a post-graduate certificate in education (PGCE) plus a minimum of five years experience in teaching prior to the date of appointment as principal. Thus, for this reason, it is noted that all the principals in the nine schools were qualified with a minimum of post-graduate certificate in education (PGCE). Most of them possessed master’s degree. One was a doctor in education.

Thus, it is recommended that the Ministry of Education must continue to adopt this policy for appointment so that the principals are in better positions to manage their schools. Moreover, the Ministry of Education in collaboration with the PSSA should inform all the institutions which are involved in the dispensation of post-graduate courses, like the MIE and UoM, that leadership styles are very important for the creation of good school climates.

Moreover, since all principals were not equally experienced, regular meetings in the form of workshops, seminars and in-service courses should be organized by the MIE and the UoM. In these meetings, the principals can share their experiences and can even learn some new developments and techniques in management skills. This is very important nowadays due to the degradation in moral values and ethics in the family and society at large.

5.4.2 Recommendations based on findings on the physical aspects of the school

The present research has noted that almost all schools, except school I, possessed the necessary infrastructures. This is a good sign because the physical aspects of the school play an important role in the making of an ‘open’ school climate. Thus, these schools must be
encouraged to improve their school environment by regular maintenance. It is recommended that the PSSA must control and ensure that the grants offered to private secondary schools are used properly so that the students in private secondary schools in Mauritius could acquire the same facilities as in secondary schools.

5.4.3 Recommendations based on findings on the ‘Power’ concept of leadership.

The findings on the ‘Power’ concept show clearly that principals of private secondary schools adopted much more the democratic style than the authoritarian or laissez-faire styles and the laissez-faire style was least common. Thus, it is recommended that principals should adopt all the three styles judiciously in different circumstances. They should be encouraged to use mixed styles but must be more democratic.

While considering the literature review in chapter two again, it is found that Jewell (2000: 480-481) and Davar (1993: 116) point out clearly that the authoritarian style can best be used when immediate action is called for because there could probably be no time to consult other people. As far as the democratic style is concerned, the principals must be made aware that in order that their subordinates can respect them, they themselves must treat others with respect. They should allow teachers to participate in decision making as described by Stimpson (2004:249). In this way, the teachers would feel concerned about their welfare and the welfare of the school. Moreover, this style gives rise to a positive group spirit. Not to forget, the laissez-faire style also can be adopted if the principal finds that the teachers are highly motivated and like certain autonomy.

5.4.4 Recommendations based on findings on the ‘relational’ concept of leadership

As far as the findings on this topic are concerned, in most schools the principals were classified in the ‘High-High’ quadrant and were effective in managing both people and their tasks.

The literature review in chapter two explains clearly that a ‘high’ grade in the initiating structure reflects the high extent to which the leader attempts to organize work and sees to it
that the followers are working up to capacity whereas a leader ‘high’ in consideration listens to staff members and is very approachable (Lunenberg and Ornstein 1991:134).

Thus, it is recommended that principals should be encouraged to adopt a ‘High-High’ attitude on both initiating structure items and consideration items. They should be made aware that they should organize their work properly and must ensure that the teachers are working up to their capacity as described by Lunenberg and Ornstein (1991:134).

5.4.5 Recommendations based on findings on school climate

The findings of the research show that in most schools, seven of them, the climate was in the category of ‘others’ but was more ‘open’ than ‘closed’. Only in one school the climate was completely ‘open’ and in another one the climate was completely ‘closed’.

The literature review on school climate, as discussed in chapter two, reveals clearly that a school’s climate is a reflection of its particular nature and personality and reflects the feelings the people in the school have towards it (Kelley 1980:1). Kelley goes further by admitting that a school’s climate has a strongly directive influence on the motivation and achievement of teachers and learners.

Thus, it is recommended that both teachers and principals should create environments in their schools that would much more show characteristics of an ‘open’ climate than a ‘closed’ climate. Of course, the creation of a completely ‘open’ climate can appear very difficult, but at least, a climate in the category of ‘others’ but being more ‘open’ can be realized. As far as teachers are concerned, they must be motivated to work hard and incentives must be provided to encourage them. The teachers must enjoy warm and friendly personal relations with one another. As regards the principals, they should not always conduct staff meetings in a formal way and they must always try to help teachers to solve personal problems.
5.4.6 Recommendation based on findings on the relationship between the ‘power’ concept of leadership and the school climate.

As discussed in section 5.3.6, the findings reveal clearly that when the democratic style was used alone or with other styles but was more prevalent than others, the climate was more ‘open’ whereas when the authoritarian style was much adopted by principals in schools, the climate was more ‘closed’. Thus, it is recommended that principals should adopt all the three styles of the ‘power’ concept of leadership but the democratic style should outweigh the others so that the climate could be more ‘open’ than ‘closed’. The laissez-faire style can be used but very cautiously and in limited amount. For this to be realized, the principals must study all these three styles and must know how to apply them appropriately. The principals must also, if possible, make the teachers aware of what styles of leadership they are adopting in particular circumstances.

5.4.7 Recommendations based on findings on the relationship between the ‘relational’ concept of leadership and the school climate

The findings reveal that when a principal was rated ‘high’ in both initiating structure and consideration items the school climate tended to be more ‘open’. However, when a principal scored ‘low’ in both the initiating structure and consideration items, the climate tended to be more ‘closed’. Thus, it is recommended that principals must try to adopt a High-High attitude in the initiating structure and consideration items in order that a more ‘open’ climate could prevail. For this to be realized, there should be mutual understanding between a principal and the teachers in a school. The principal must not only be task-oriented but must also take into consideration the human aspect of his/her relationship with the teachers.

5.4.8 Recommendations based on the findings on the relationship between the ‘power’ concept of leadership and the ‘relational’ concept of leadership.

The findings reveal that when the democratic style was used alone or with other styles but was more prevalent than others, the principals of these schools were more likely to score ‘high’ in both the initiating structure and the consideration items. However, when the authoritarian style was used with others but was more prevalent, the principals either scored
‘low’ in both the initiating structure and consideration items or ‘low’ in the consideration items only. Thus, it is recommended that if a principal wants to score ‘high’ in both initiating structure and consideration items, he should be asked to adopt all the three styles of the ‘power’ concept of leadership but the democratic style must outweigh the others. The principals must be able to master all these styles and must know when to apply them judiciously.

5.4.9 Recommendations based on the findings on the relationship between the two concepts of leadership and school climate.

The findings reveal that when the democratic style was used alone or with other styles, but was more prevalent, the principals of these schools were more likely to score ‘high’ in both the initiating structure and consideration items and the climate of these schools was classified in the category of ‘others’ but was more ‘open’ than ‘closed’.

As explained in section 5.3.9 of this chapter, the findings of this research are supported and backed by prior researches conducted by Hoy, Hoffman, Sabo and Bliss (1994: 41-59), Al Gasim (1991: 100) and Kruger (1999: 18).

Thus, it is recommended that if principals could adopt all the three styles of the ‘power’ concept of leadership but with the democratic style outweighing the others, automatically they would score ‘high’ in both the initiating structure and consideration items. And, more importantly, the climate would definitely be more ‘open’ than ‘closed’.

Moreover, principals could be made aware of all these findings by the help of inspectors of the PSSA, as well as by institutions (like the MIE, MGI, MCA and so forth) which organize workshops, seminars and in-service courses.

5.4.10 Summary of recommendations

All the recommendations discussed above are directed to principals who are the key-figures in the day to day running of a school. They have to play their role properly by adopting good leadership styles so that a positive school climate can prevail in the school. Thus, principals
must be made aware of their responsibilities and must be properly trained so that they cannot complain that they were not aware of the relationship between the leadership styles and school climate.

5.5 RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

The present research has tried to investigate the relationship between the leadership styles of principals and school climate in private secondary schools in Mauritius. But, what about the state secondary schools? Definitely, such a research can be done in state secondary schools because there also the same situation arises. The physical aspects of the schools and qualifications of the principals would not pose as extraneous variables because all of them are state owned, highly equipped and well constructed and the principals are all highly qualified. Thus, they would be constant and hence controlled.

Moreover, the present research is a qualitative one. Thus, that same research can be done on a quantitative basis on either private secondary schools or state secondary schools. This would certainly act as a supplementary evidence of the relationship between leadership styles of principals and school climate.

By and large, this research has just investigated on how the leadership styles of principals are related to school climate in nine private secondary schools. It has adopted all the principles of an ethnographic study whereby teachers and principals have been interviewed and observed in their working environments. By considering the results obtained from this study, a case study can be conducted in any one of the schools in order to have a detailed picture of the influence of some leadership styles on the school climate. Another type of research which can be undertaken on these two topics, that is, the leadership styles of principals and school climate, is an experimental one in which the researcher can give some instructions to some principals in different schools on the type of leadership styles to be adopted. Then the researcher must devise a scale to measure the climates in these schools. Of course, in such type of research great precaution must be taken to control extraneous variables.
As far as Mauritius is concerned, not many researches have been conducted on educational management as a whole. Thus, researchers can find a wide range of related topics which can be studied.

5.6 CREDIBILITY, VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY OF THE STUDY

As described in section 3.6 of chapter three, this research has not neglected the factors of credibility, validity, and reliability of data during the data collection stage and also during the interpretation and analysis of data.

As far as credibility is concerned, the interpretation and analysis of the data have shown that the results approximate reality and are judged to be trustworthy and reasonable according to Mc Millan and Schumacher (1997: 162). As far as validity is concerned, the results have shown to be appropriate, meaningful and useful. By and large, the two types of design validity, internal and external, have also been considered. For instance, the extraneous variables like qualification and experience of principals as well as the physical aspects of the schools have been proved to be constant and hence controlled. About external validity, the results obtained can be generalized to other private secondary schools in Mauritius.

Lastly, the factor of reliability has also been taken into consideration. That is, the results have shown certain consistency. In most cases, similar results have been obtained with the two teachers and the principal of each school and have even been supported by the observation.

5.7 CONCLUSION

Before concluding this study, it is good to mention that the researcher was somewhat reluctant at first to embark on such a research due to a false prejudice that all principals of private secondary schools were very arrogant and authoritarian people and that they would not participate fully in the research. The researcher took a high risk and, with a positive attitude, started the research in school A. The researcher analysed the data collected on the same day and was greatly astonished by the results obtained and was encouraged and eager to pursue the study. The research was continued the next day in other schools and the data
obtained were analysed accordingly to come up with the deductions which were presented in chapter four. Finally, the findings were presented and some recommendations were made.

By and large, this study has finally fulfilled the aims mentioned in chapter one (Section 1.4). The first aim was to assess the types of leadership styles adopted by principals in private secondary school in Mauritius. The results showed that, as far as the ‘power’ concept of leadership was concerned, the democratic style was most commonly used together with one or two of the other types of leadership. The authoritarian style then followed and the laissez-faire style was least common. As regards the ‘relational’ concept of leadership, in most schools, the principals scored ‘high’ in both initiating structure and consideration items and were classified in quadrant I of the leadership behaviour quadrant in Hoy and Miskel (1982:228) as discussed in chapter two. That is, the principals were effective in managing both people and their tasks.

The second aim was to evaluate the school climate that prevailed in these private secondary schools in Mauritius. The results showed that in most schools, the climate was in the category of ‘others’ and was more ‘open’ than ‘closed’. The completely ‘open’ or ‘closed’ climate was not very common in the schools.

The third aim was to find out any relationship that existed between the leadership styles and the school climate in the private secondary schools in Mauritius. The results showed that when the democratic style was used alone or with other styles but was more prevalent, the principals of these schools scored ‘high’ in both the initiating structure and consideration items and, the climate of these schools was classified in the category of ‘others’ but was more ‘open’ than ‘closed’. However, when the authoritarian style was used with other styles but was more prevalent, the principals either scored ‘low’ in both the initiating structure and the consideration items or ‘low’ in the consideration items only and the climate was more ‘closed’ than ‘open’.

At last but not the least, leadership styles of principals and school climate are two concepts which lie in a dynamic equilibrium and are closely inter-related as shown in figure 5.1 below.
This study has proved that there is a relationship between the leadership styles of principals and school climate in private secondary schools in Mauritius but has not investigated on how each one influences the other. That is, how leadership styles can influence school climate and how school climate can influence leadership styles of principals. Thus, this present study comes to an end but the whole debate on the inter-relationship between the leadership styles of principals and school climate remains a dynamic equilibrium and hence, a never-ending reversible process. The researcher keeps the debate open and so more works can be conducted on leadership styles of principals and school climate.
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APPENDIX 1: INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR TEACHERS OF PRIVATE SECONDARY SCHOOLS.

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE TO INVESTIGATE THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE LEADERSHIP STYLES OF PRINCIPALS AND SCHOOL CLIMATE IN PRIVATE SECONDARY SCHOOLS OF MAURITIUS.

A: DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONS

1: Gender
   - Male
   - Female

2: Age
   - 21-30
   - 31-40
   - 41-50
   - 51-60

3: Marital status
   - Married
   - Single

4: Highest educational attainment
   - HSC (ADVANCED LEVEL)
   - DIPLOMA
   - BACHELOR’S DEGREE
   - MASTER’S DEGREE
   - OTHERS (please specify) …………………

5: Total teaching experience (years)
   - 1-5
   - 6-10
   - 11-15
   - 16-20
   - More than 20 years
B: QUESTIONS ON LEADERSHIP STYLES OF PRINCIPAL

B1: INVESTIGATION OF THE ‘POWER’ CONCEPT OF LEADERSHIP.

1. Does he/she take all the decisions alone and impose them on others?
   - Always
   - Sometimes
   - Rarely
   - Never

2. Does he/she use fear, threats and force to implement certain rules?
   - Always
   - Sometimes
   - Rarely
   - Never

3. Does he keep a distance from the staff?
   - Always
   - Sometimes
   - Rarely
   - Never

4. Does he/she allow teachers to participate in policy making?
   - Always
   - Sometimes
   - Rarely
   - Never

5. Does he/she treat others with respect?
   - Always
   - Sometimes
   - Rarely
   - Never

6. Does he/she listen to others’ opinions?
   - Always
   - Sometimes
   - Rarely
   - Never

7. Does he/she care for the welfare of the school?
   - Always
   - Sometimes
   - Rarely
   - Never
8. Does he/she allow teachers to work on their own?
   - Always
   - Sometimes
   - Rarely
   - Never

9. Does he/she delegate his/her responsibilities on others?
   - Always
   - Sometimes
   - Rarely
   - Never

B2: INVESTIGATION OF THE ‘RELATIONAL’ CONCEPT OF LEADERSHIP.

INITIATING STRUCTURE ITEMS

1. Does s/he make her/his attitudes clear to the staff?
   - Always
   - Sometimes
   - Rarely
   - Never

2. Does s/he organize her/his work properly?
   - Always
   - Sometimes
   - Rarely
   - Never

3. Does s/he let staff members know what is expected of them?
   - Always
   - Sometimes
   - Rarely
   - Never

4. Does s/he see to it that staff members are working up to capacity?
   - Always
   - Sometimes
   - Rarely
   - Never

5. Does s/he see to it that the work of staff members is coordinated?
   - Always
   - Sometimes
   - Rarely
   - Never
CONSIDERATION ITEMS

1. Does s/he explain her/his actions?
   - Always
   - Sometimes
   - Rarely
   - Never

2. Does s/he act by consulting the staff?
   - Always
   - Sometimes
   - Rarely
   - Never

3. Does s/he treat all staff members as equals?
   - Always
   - Sometimes
   - Rarely
   - Never

4. Is s/he willing to make changes?
   - Always
   - Sometimes
   - Rarely
   - Never

5. Is s/he friendly and approachable?
   - Always
   - Sometimes
   - Rarely
   - Never

C: INVESTIGATION OF SCHOOL CLIMATE

C1: ITEMS ON TEACHERS’ BEHAVIOUR

HINDRANCE ITEM

1. Are you burdened by much administrative paper work that your teaching time is affected?
   - Always
   - Sometimes
   - Rarely
   - Never
INTIMACY ITEM

2. Do you enjoy warm and friendly personal relations with one another?
   - Always
   - Sometimes
   - Rarely
   - Never

DISENGAGEMENT ITEM

3. Do teachers ask non-sensical questions in faculty meetings?
   - Always
   - Sometimes
   - Rarely
   - Never

ESPRIT ITEM

4. Do you accomplish your work with great vigour and pleasure?
   - Always
   - Sometimes
   - Rarely
   - Never

C2: ITEMS ON PRINCIPAL’S BEHAVIOUR

PRODUCTION EMPHASIS ITEM

1. Does the principal supervise your work very closely?
   - Always
   - Sometimes
   - Rarely
   - Never

ALOOFNESS ITEM

2. Are staff meetings conducted in a very formal way?
   - Always
   - Sometimes
   - Rarely
   - Never

CONSIDERATION ITEM

3. Does the principal help teachers to solve personal problems?
   - Always
   - Sometimes
   - Rarely
   - Never
THRUST ITEM

4. Does the principal set a good example by working hard?
   - Always
   - Sometimes
   - Rarely
   - Never

D: GENERAL QUESTIONS ON BOTH LEADERSHIP STYLE AND SCHOOL CLIMATE.

Give brief explanation for each of the questions below.

1. Do you like the teaching profession?

2. Do you have any problems with the principal of your school?

3. Are you given all the necessary facilities to do your work properly?

4. Do you have problems of indiscipline in your classroom?

5. Do the students misbehave with teachers and the administration?

(Thank you for your cooperation)
APPENDIX 2: INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR PRINCIPALS OF PRIVATE SECONDARY SCHOOLS.

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE TO INVESTIGATE THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN LEADERSHIP STYLES OF PRINCIPALS AND SCHOOL CLIMATE IN PRIVATE SECONDARY SCHOOLS OF MAURITIUS.

A: DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONS

1: Gender
   - Male
   - Female

2: Age
   - 21-30
   - 31-40
   - 41-50
   - 51-60

3: Marital status
   - Married
   - Single

4: Highest education attained
   - Bachelor’s Degree
   - PGCE
   - Master’s Degree
   - Doctor’s Degree
   - Others (please specify)………………..

5: Total years of experience as Principal……………………….

B: QUESTIONS ON LEADERSHIP STYLES OF PRINCIPALS

B1: INVESTIGATION OF THE “POWER” CONCEPT OF LEADERSHIP

1. Do you take all decisions alone and impose them on others?
   - Always
   - Sometimes
   - Rarely
   - Never
2. Do you use fear, threat and force to implement certain rules?
   - Always
   - Sometimes
   - Rarely
   - Never

3. Do you keep a distance from your staff?
   - Always
   - Sometimes
   - Rarely
   - Never

4. Do you allow teachers to participate in policy making?
   - Always
   - Sometimes
   - Rarely
   - Never

5. Do you treat your teaching and non-teaching staff with respect?
   - Always
   - Sometimes
   - Rarely
   - Never

6. Do you listen to others’ opinions?
   - Always
   - Sometimes
   - Rarely
   - Never

7. Do you care for the welfare of your school?
   - Always
   - Sometimes
   - Rarely
   - Never

8. Do you allow teachers to work on their own?
   - Always
   - Sometimes
   - Rarely
   - Never

9. Do you delegate your responsibilities on others?
   - Always
   - Sometimes
   - Rarely
   - Never
B2: INVESTIGATION OF THE “RELATIONAL” CONCEPT OF LEADERSHIP

INITIATING STRUCTURE ITEMS

1. Do you make your attitudes clear to your staff?
   - Always
   - Sometimes
   - Rarely
   - Never

2. Do you organize your work properly?
   - Always
   - Sometimes
   - Rarely
   - Never

3. Do you let your staff members know what is expected of them?
   - Always
   - Sometimes
   - Rarely
   - Never

4. Do you see to it that your staff members are working up to capacity?
   - Always
   - Sometimes
   - Rarely
   - Never

5. Do you see to it that the work of staff members is coordinated?
   - Always
   - Sometimes
   - Rarely
   - Never

CONSIDERATION ITEMS

1. Do you explain your actions to your staff?
   - Always
   - Sometimes
   - Rarely
   - Never

2. Do you act by consulting the staff?
   - Always
   - Sometimes
   - Rarely
   - Never
3. Do you treat all staff members as equals?
   - Always
   - Sometimes
   - Rarely
   - Never

4. Are you willing to make changes?
   - Always
   - Sometimes
   - Rarely
   - Never

5. Are you friendly and approachable to your staff?
   - Always
   - Sometimes
   - Rarely
   - Never

C: QUESTIONS ON SCHOOL CLIMATE

ITEMS ON PRINCIPAL’S BEHAVIOUR

PRODUCTION EMPHASIS ITEM

1. Do you supervise your teachers’ work?
   - Always
   - Sometimes
   - Rarely
   - Never

ALOOFNESS ITEM

2. Do you conduct staff meeting in a very formal way?
   - Always
   - Sometimes
   - Rarely
   - Never

CONSIDERATION ITEM

3. Do you help teachers to solve personal problems?
   - Always
   - Sometimes
   - Rarely
   - Never
THRU ST ITEM

4. Do you set good examples by working hard?
   - Always
   - Sometimes
   - Rarely
   - Never

D: GENERAL QUESTIONS ON BOTH LEADERSHIP STYLE AND SCHOOL CLIMATE.

Give brief explanation for each of the questions below.

1. Do you like your work?

2. Do you have any problems with your staff?

3. Are you given all the necessary facilities to do your work?

4. Do you have problems of indiscipline in your school?

5. What other problems do you encounter in your school?

(Thank you very much for your cooperation)
APPENDIX 3: OBSERVATION SCHEDULE

A: OBSERVATION OF LEADERSHIP STYLES OF PRINCIPALS


1. How does the principal treat the staff?
   - In a very rough manner
   - In a polite and respectable way
   - He ignores them and does not bother about what they are doing.

2. How do the teachers behave when they see the principal in the school yard?
   - They play hide and seek and are scared.
   - They come to meet him and shake hand with him.
   - They ignore him.

3. Give a brief description of the principal after your encounter with him?

A 2: OBSERVATION OF THE ‘RELATIONAL’ CONCEPT OF LEADERSHIP.

INITIATING STRUCTURE
1. Is the principal seen to be well organized?
   - Yes
   - No

2. Is there good communication in the school?
   (That is, circulars, morning assembly etc)
   - Yes.
   - No
3. Is the principal seen moving along to supervise the staff?
   - Yes
   - No

CONSIDERATION
1. Is the principal friendly and respectful to the staff?
   - Yes
   - No

2. Does the principal listen to the staff and is very approachable?
   - Yes
   - No

3. Does the principal treat the staff as equals?
   - Yes
   - No

B: OBSERVATION OF SCHOOL CLIMATE

B1: OBSERVATION OF TEACHERS’ BEHAVIOURS

HINDRANCE ITEM
1. Do they appear burdened by lots of administrative paper work?
   - Yes
   - No

INTIMACY ITEM
2. Do they appear to enjoy friendly relationship with one another?
   - Yes
   - No

DISENGAGEMENT
3. Are the teachers seen committed to their tasks?
   - Yes
   - No
ESPRIT ITEM
4. Are they seen to be doing their work with pleasure?
   ☐ Yes
   ☐ No

B2: OBSERVATION OF PRINCIPAL’S BEHAVIOUR.

PRODUCTION EMPHASIS ITEM
1. Is the principal highly directive and not sensitive to teachers’ feedback?
   ☐ Yes
   ☐ No

ALOOFNESS ITEM
2. Does the principal keep a distance from the staff?
   ☐ Yes
   ☐ No

CONSIDERATION ITEM
3. Does the principal help teachers to solve personal problems?
   ☐ Yes
   ☐ No

THRUST ITEM.
4. Is the principal seen to be a hard worker?
   ☐ Yes
   ☐ No
B3: OBSERVATION OF THE PHYSICAL ASPECTS OF THE SCHOOL.

1. Where is the school situated?
   - Describe the area where it is found:
   - Describe whether it is in a residential area, remote and quiet area or in a busy and noisy area:

2. How is the school entrance?
   - Describe its fencing and gate:
   - Describe its tidiness and whether it is decorated with flowers:
   - Describe whether it is attractive or not:

3. How is the reception area?
   - Describe its tidiness, ventilation, size etc:

4. How is the building?
   - Describe its architecture, painting and general appearance:
• Describe the infrastructure available:-------------------------------------------------------------
  ---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

5. How is the school yard?
• Describe its cleanliness and size:---------------------------------------------------------------
  ---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

6. How is the school garden?
• Describe its cleanliness and size:---------------------------------------------------------------
  ---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

7. How are the hallways?
• Describe whether they are clean or not:--------------------------------------------------------
  ---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

• Describe their sizes:--------------------------------------------------------------------------
  ---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
APPENDIX 4: LETTER OF PERMISSION (from teacher)

St Martin Street
Mahebourg
This 20\textsuperscript{th} May 2005

Dear teacher,

I am following a MEd correspondence at the University of South Africa and I am actually working on a dissertation entitled:

“The relationship between the leadership styles of principals and school climate in private secondary schools in Mauritius.”

In this context, I have to undertake a research and I would be grateful if you could participate in an interview. All information gathered will be treated with strict confidentiality and anonymity.

Thanking you for your cooperation.

Yours faithfully

Essan Kausmaully
Dear Principal,

I am following a MEd correspondence course at the University of South Africa and I am actually working on a dissertation entitled:

“The relationship between the leadership styles of Principals and school climate in private secondary schools in Mauritius.”

In this context, I have to undertake a research and I would be grateful if you could grant me the permission to interview some teachers and yourself in your school during the recess time.

All information gathered will be treated with strict confidentiality and anonymity.

Thanking you for your cooperation.

Yours faithfully

Essan Kausmaully
Dear Sir,

I am following a MEd correspondence course at the University of South Africa and I am actually working on a dissertation entitled:

“The relationship between the leadership styles of Principals and school climate in private secondary schools in Mauritius.”

In this context, I have to undertake a research and I would be grateful if you could grant me the permission to enter some private secondary schools in order to conduct interviews with some teachers and principals. I would also appreciate if you could allow me to consult some journals in the library of the PSSA.

Thanking you in anticipation

Yours faithfully

Essan Kausmaully