Educational Challenge: The Meaning of Leadership

in Hong Kong Schools

Dr Ruth Ming Har WONG

The Hong Kong Institute of Education

Department of English, 10 Lo Ping Road, Tai Po, Hong Kong

Tel: (852) 2948-8341   E-mail: wongmh@ied.edu.hk

Abstract

Different scholars have defined and redefined leadership at different levels and in different contexts (e.g., Ball, 1981; Hargreaves, 1967; Richardson, 1973), although the results of research on the characteristics of effective leaders may not apply in all contexts. This study compares and contrasts the meanings of leadership in the Hong Kong secondary school context, and examines whether educators at different levels hold conflicting opinions of the qualities of leadership. The study adopts both quantitative and qualitative approaches to examine whether principals and teachers interpret leadership differently. The results show that these two groups of educators do indeed hold different views about what it means to be a leader. The reasons for these different points of view are explored.

Keywords: Leadership, Interpretations, Hong Kong.

1. Introduction

News headlines hold alarming messages for educators, informing them that there is a leadership crisis in education. At the same time, the management strategies being employed in schools often serve to exacerbate the situation, rarely resolving or lessening it (Walker & Dimmock, 2002). What purpose then do leadership serve in the educational context if problems cannot be resolved? Different scholars have defined and redefined leadership at different levels and in different contexts (e.g., Ball, 1981; Hargreaves, 1967; Richardson, 1973), although the results of research on the characteristics of effective leaders may not apply in all contexts. The questions posed by the study presented herein are: 'What is the situation in Hong Kong?', 'Do school principals and their subordinates view leadership in the same way?', 'If not, then why do they view it differently?' and 'Where has the crisis come from?' This study compares and contrasts the interpretations of leadership amongst principals and their subordinates in the Hong Kong secondary school context, and explores the reasons behind their different points of view, if any.

2. Study Aims

Research indicates that teachers and educational leaders define leadership differently in different contexts. Burgess (1983), for example, conducted an observation study that focused on how a particular school worked and how the people within it 'define[d] and redefined the situation in which they were located' (see also Ball, 1981; Best et al., 1983; Hargreaves, 1967; Lacey, 1970; Richardson, 1973). To date, no research that defines and examines how leadership is interpreted in the Hong Kong context has been carried out. This gap therefore provides the main motivation for this study, which has the following two objectives.

1). To compare and contrast the views of leadership amongst two levels of Hong Kong secondary school educators, principals and teachers.

2). To explore the reasons behind their conflicting opinions (if any).

3. Literature Review

Defining leadership and analysing its characteristics have long been preoccupations amongst management researchers. Leadership is a topic of ongoing study and discussion, about which everyone seems to have a view, and the definitions of leadership are as varied as its explanations. Recent definitions and study have focused on leadership and change. The question of what leadership means in the educational setting, however, remains an open one, particularly in the Hong Kong context. This section reviews the ongoing debate, and considers some of the main arguments about and approaches to the meaning of leadership. After a discussion of different approaches to leadership, we move on to an examination of how educators at different levels view leadership in a particular context.

3.1 Research Theories and Approaches

Leadership within the educational context is often seen as the process and product by which powerful groups are able to control and sustain their interests (Gunter, 2001), a definition that seems inadequate when applied to Hong Kong's complex education system. The questions of what leadership is and what makes for an effective leader within education remain open.

In the mid-twentieth century, leadership researchers concentrated almost solely on the personal traits of leaders. Trait theorists (Stogdill, 1948, 1974) focused on analysing leaders to determine whether they possess distinct character traits, concluding that certain personality characteristics do appear to differentiate leaders from followers. Stogdill (1948), for example, found that leaders acquire status through active participation; demonstrate the ability to facilitate group efforts to attain their goals; work intelligently; are alert to others' needs, understand tasks and show initiative; display persistence in dealing with problems; are self-confident; accept responsibility; and have the desire for dominance and control. In a later study (Stogdill, 1974), he also identified six categories of personal factors that are associated with leadership: capacity, achievement, responsibility, participation, status and situation.

Further research, however, has failed to confirm that the foregoing traits are common to effective leaders or determinants of effective leadership. In addition, no set of personality characteristics appears to recur in successful leaders, and Stodgill (1948) concluded that such a narrow characterisation of leadership traits is insufficient as a person did not become a leader by virtue of the possession of some combination of traits. Attempts to isolate specific individual traits have led to the conclusion that no single characteristic distinguishes leaders from non-leaders, and certain traits have also been found to vary by situation (Stogdill, 1948).

As early researchers ran out of steam in their search for leadership traits, they turned to an investigation of how leaders actually behave, which led to the development of the behavioural approach to leadership. The four main types of behaviour found amongst leaders are as follows. (1) **Concern for tasks**: leaders emphasise the achievement of concrete objectives. They look for high levels of productivity and ways of organising people and activities to meet those objectives. (2) **Concern for people**: leaders look upon their followers as people, rather than as units of production or as means to an end, and pay attention to their needs, interests, problems, development and so on. (3) **Directive leadership**: leaders make decisions for others and expect followers and/or subordinates to follow their instructions. (4) **Participative leadership**: leaders share decision-making with others. Concern for tasks is set against concern for people, and directive leadership contrasts with participative leadership (McGregor, 1960).

As leadership qualities may be due to situational differences, researchers next turned to situations in which leadership is exercised, leading to the concept of situational leadership. Studies in this tradition attempted to identify the distinctive characteristics of the setting to which the leader's success could be attributed (Hoy & Miskel, 1987). Hencley (1973) reviewed leadership theories and noted that 'the situation approach maintains that leadership is determined not so much by the characters of the individuals as by the requirements of [the] social situation' (p. 38). This research focus suggests that a person can be a follower or a leader depending on the circumstances. Attempts have thus been made to identify the specific characteristics of situations that affect leaders' performance. Hoy and Miskel (1987) listed four areas of situational leadership: structural properties of the organization, organizational climate, role characteristics, and subordinate characteristics. Situational leadership research has revealed the complexity of leadership, but has still proved insufficient because its theories cannot predict which leadership skills are effective in certain situations. Hersey and Blanchard (1977) proposed situational leadership dimensions that are linked to task and relational behaviour. Task behaviour focuses on defining roles and responsibilities, whereas relational behaviour concerns providing support to a team. The extent to which either type of behaviour is engaged in depends on the person's job maturity and psychological security.

Contingency theory also concentrates on situational factors. A leader is not necessarily the person who is normally in charge, but one who, when a crisis occurs, emerges to deal with it successfully. Contingency theorists claim that it is the capacity to understand the essential elements of a given situation and engage in appropriate behaviour and provide a path out of a difficult situation that distinguishes a good leader. Fiedler and Garcia (1987) and Fiedler (1997) argued that the most effective style of leadership depends on relationship quality, the relative power position between leader and followers, and the nature of the task. They also suggest that the style adopted is relatively stable and a feature of the leader's personality, and thus can be predicted. These researchers distinguished between task- and relationship-oriented leaders. Contingency theory is

especially applicable to the Hong Kong context, as Chinese society is organised around human relationships. Successful leadership also rests upon human relationships.

In summary, the insufficiency of trait studies carried out between 1904 and 1948 led many leadership researchers to reject the relevance of trait theory entirely (Stogdill, 1974), and the leadership field next turned to situational (and contingency) theories. The result was that these theorists over-emphasised the importance of situations and under-emphasised the traits that distinguish leader from non-leader. The consensus today is that there are certain traits that increase the probability that certain leaders will successfully lead their followers in a narrow range of situations (Stogdill, 1974). The leadership literature also suggests that effective leadership is critical to organisations. Early examinations of leaders reported differences between leaders and followers, and subsequent studies differentiated effective from non-effective leaders. Leadership is recognised as a complex concept, and recent studies assert that vision and collaboration are important characteristics of effective leaders. What is it about certain leaders that enable them to lead their organisations to change? There is clear progression in the research literature from static to dynamic considerations. This evolution leads us to the questions addressed in the next section: What are the characteristics of leaders of change? Are there any particular characteristics that are particularly important in the Hong Kong educational context?

3.2 Qualities of an Effective Leader

Drawing on the previous literature, Table 1 lists all possible characteristics of a leader. The table, which served as the basis for the questionnaire employed in the study, is divided into three categories: personality, managerial skills and professionalism. These three categories are the key leadership qualities identified by experienced principals, professional developers, policymakers and academics (Walker & Dimmock, 2000) and in previous research. Personality refers to the leader's character and can be divided into inner and outer qualities. Managerial skills are human-related skills used to solve both short- and long-term tasks. Finally, professionalism involves educational vision and awareness, resources, values and intellect.

4. Research Questions

To explore the opinions about leadership amongst school principals and teachers in Hong Kong, four research questions were selected for testing.

1). What is leadership from Hong Kong secondary school principals' point of view?

2). What is leadership from Hong Kong secondary school teachers' point of view?

3). Are there any conflicting opinions between school leaders and their subordinates?

4). What are the reasons for these conflicting opinions, if any are found?

5. Methodology

5.1 Subjects

The researchers sent letters randomly to 50 schools in Hong Kong to invite their principals and teachers to take part in the study. The final sample included 26 school principals and 75 teachers. The work experience of the former ranged from 15-25 years, and that of the latter from 1-22 years.

5.2 Questionnaire

Questionnaires were distributed to collect the views of the participating principals and teachers on the importance of particular characteristics of leadership. To examine whether there were any conflicting views between the two groups, they were each given the same questionnaire, and their responses were then compared.

The characteristics of effective leaders listed in Table 1, which were developed from a review of the previous literature, were used as a guideline in designing the study questionnaire. The final questionnaire comprised 57 closed statements, all of which were modified from the 57 characteristics in Table 1. Twenty-two statements fall under the key leadership quality of 'personality', 24 under 'managerial skills' and 11 under 'professionalism'. Table 2 provides examples of the statements.

Respondents were asked to indicate their responses using a six-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (least important) to 6 (most important). A pilot study confirmed that this six-point scale was effective in reducing respondents' tendency to choose the central response. As all of the respondents were competent English users, English was the language adopted in the questionnaire. The Cronbach's alpha indicated the questionnaire had a high level of internal consistency.

5.3 Interviews

After the teachers and principals had completed the questionnaire, interviews were carried out to investigate the reasons for their answers with regard to the meaning and characteristics of leadership. The interview questions, which were based on the questionnaire findings, were semi-structured in nature to uncover more details of the participants' views of leadership. For example, when a teacher reported difficulties in co-operating with the school principal, we asked such questions as 'How does that situation make you feel? and 'Can you explain why this happened? Data were processed by inductive analysis (Bogdan & Biklen, 1992), and the findings allowed interpretations to emerge. The interviews were all recorded with the interviewees' permission, and conducted in Cantonese, the language with which all of the respondents felt most comfortable.

6. Findings

The purpose of the study discussed herein was to discover how Hong Kong educators at two different levels view leadership in the Hong Kong context. The descriptive data of 26 secondary school principals and 75 secondary school teachers, gleaned from the questionnaires, are summarised in this section and presented according to the categories listed in Table 1.

6.1 Personality

A glance at Table 3 shows that the principals have means of 5.12 and 5.34 for inner and outer qualities, respectively, and the teachers have means of 5.76 and 5.68. The principals believe inner qualities to be more important than outer qualities, whereas the teachers hold the opposite view.

6.2 Managerial Skills

Table 4 provides statistical evidence to show that the principals and teacher believe managerial skills to be equally important. They have means of 5.8 and 5.4, respectively, with regard to this leadership category. The principals view skills that are related to long- and short-term tasks to be more important than do teachers. The former have means of 5.82 and 5.78 for long- and short-term tasks, respectively, and the corresponding figures for the latter are 6.5 and 6.2.

Table 5 indicates that principals (mean of 5.51) place greater emphasis on professionalism than do teachers (5.20). With regard to individual components, the former have higher means for most components relative to the latter, with the exception of values. Here, the teachers have a mean of 5.46 and the principals a mean of 5.26. The two groups also have different views of resources, with principals (5.78) holding them to be more important than teachers (5.18).

A more in-depth look at Table 5 reveals additional interesting results. It is evident that both principals and teachers see managerial skills and professionalism as important. However, there is a discrepancy between the two groups on the personality component, with principals having a mean of 5.18 and teachers a mean of 5.75 (see Table 6). A comparison of the groups' overall means indicates that teachers see the overall characteristics of a school leader as more important.

As can be seen from Table 7, the leadership qualities that resonated most with teachers are 'express what you value', 'trusting', 'positive', 'committed' and 'preventing teacher stress and burnout'. Six of the seven qualities in the table are from the 'personality' category. 'Strategic thinking', which falls into the management skills category, is the exception. Table 8 presents different results. The qualities rated most highly by the principals fall into the managerial skills category, with none concerning professionalism or personality. They include 'knowing what he/she wants to happen and causing it to happen', 'connection with the wider environment', 'knowledgeable', 'professional training and experience' and 'strong philosophy and clear vision'.

7. Discussion

From the descriptive data presented in the tables, it can be concluded that personality is central to a successful school leader in the eyes of teachers; principals also see managerial skills and professionalism as very important. In general, teachers rate the characteristics of a school leader to be more important than do principals. These findings can be explained with reference to the interview responses. The different interpretations of successful leaders can be attributed to three main reasons.

7.1 Teachers' interpretation

From the statistical results and respondent interviews, it is clear that teachers interpret the term 'management' differently from principals. Smyth and Shacklock (1998) explained that teachers have not fully embraced the management imperative and language because there are deep contradictions between what they are being told is good managerial practice and their experience of what matters in their work with children and the community,

which is especially true in the Hong Kong context. The ongoing educational reform means that teachers are given increasing numbers of tasks to perform, and they sometimes blame the school's mismanagement for the 'many unnecessary administration meetings', in the words of one of the teachers interviewed.

7.2 Mistrust between teachers and principals

It is obvious that mistrust between teachers and principals is the main cause of conflict. Several teachers reported a lack of trust between themselves and their principals. One of the teachers said: 'Our class finishes at 3:35 pm, but our principal doesn't allow us to leave the school until 5:00 pm because he wants us to spend more time at school. He doesn't trust us'. De Clercq (2008) sees authentic and trusting relationships as central to the exercise of leadership, which is not technical, but rather artful and creative. Wallace (2008) also pointed out the creation of a climate that raises levels of motivation and self-esteem is crucial to empowerment.

7.3 Importance of the 'group'

Another key reason for the different interpretations of leadership is deeply rooted in Chinese culture. Although Hong Kong is a cosmopolitan city, its population is mainly Chinese. The concept of the 'group' plays a major role in all aspects of social activities, including work. Kam-Cheung (1997) reminds us that throughout Chinese history, the group has been more important that the leader. Although teachers have different views of 'leadership', they may choose to keep quiet and not criticise the principal to maintain 'group harmony'. This explanation supports Schein's (1985) assertion that organisational behaviour in East Asian organisations is relationship-centred, whereas that in Western organisations tends to be ego-centred. This observation is helpful in explaining why there are grievances towards principals amongst teachers.

7.4 Too many 'changes' – educational reform

Hong Kong has been undergoing tremendous educational reform, and teachers have no choice but to adapt. However, some of them seem incapable of change for various reasons, which leads to discontent with the school, especially with leaders. Fullan (1993) suggested that the inherently complex educational reform was the reason that strong leadership by itself doesn't work. The key is for teachers to become organisational members who can help to manage inherently complex and ever-changing situations by building a learning organisation. Of course, not all schools strive to become learning organisations, and, according to one in-service teacher, some school leaders do not advocate the philosophy and culture of learning or teachers' development. One teacher commented, 'My school is just like a business. All the school principal does at school is think about how he can improve the school's reputation and facilities or how he can get teachers to apply for more external funding to help the school to develop. Today's policy can become tomorrow's old policy'. Angus (1989) argued that there is no evidence to show that entrepreneurial traits such as vision and risk-taking bring educational success.

8. Conclusion

The results of this study demonstrate that principals and teachers view the important characteristics of a school leader differently. Teachers see personality as an important contributing factor of a successful leader, whereas school principals rate management skills and professionalism as more important. It is obvious that principals and their subordinates hold different views of leadership. The main reasons for this discrepancy are mistrust between principals and teachers, the 'group' philosophy embedded in Chinese ideology and the impacts of educational reform.

Leadership in Hong Kong schools is centralised on principals and school leaders. It is suggested that leadership be de-centralised and delegated to different parties. A leadership programme for both teachers and principals may be an option that would help the two to build a mutually trusting relationship (Louw & Zuber-Skeritt, 2009). The principal's role is to coordinate and plan strategically, not to mandate actions and plans. Principals should also provide channels for teachers to learn to become effective leaders. Cooperation between teachers and principals will lead to an effective school.

This study examines only the meaning of leadership in the Hong Kong secondary school context, and thus its results may not apply to other types of educational institution. Further study is recommended to investigate the role played by leadership at different educational levels. The results can then be compared with the results presented here to come to a more general definition of leadership in the Hong Kong educational context.

References

Angus, L. (1989). "New" leadership and the possibility of educational reform. In J. Smyth (Ed.), *Critical Perspectives on Educational Leadership*. New York: Sage.

Ball, S. J. (1981). *Beachside Comprehensive.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bennis, W. (1984). The 4 competencies of leadership. *Training and Development Journal, 38*(8), 15-19.

Best, R. R., Ribbins, P., Jarvis, C. & Oddy, D. (1983). *Education and Care*. London: Heinemann.

Bogdan R. C. & Biklen, S. K. (1998). *Qualitative Research for Education: An Introduction to Theory and Methods*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Burgess, R. G. (1983). *Experiencing Comprehensive Education*. London: Methuen.

Covey, S.R. (1992). *Principle-centered Leadership*. New York: Simon & Schuster.

De Clercq, F. (2008). Teacher quality, appraisal and development: The flaws in the integrated quality management system. *Perspectives in Education, 26*(1), 7-18.

Esp, D. (1993). *Competences for School Managers*. London, Philadelphia: Kogan Page.

Everard, K. B. & Morris, G. (1985). *Effective School Management*. London: Harper and Row.

Fiedler, F.E. (1997). *Directory of the American Psychological Association*. Chicago: St James Press.

Fiedler, F.E. & Garcia, J.E. (1987). *New Approaches to Leadership, Cognitive Resources and Organizational Performance*. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Fullan, M. (1993). *Change Forces: Probing the Depths of Educational Reform*. London: Falmer Press.

Fullan, M. (2001). *The New Meaning of Educational Change* (3rd ed.). New York: Teachers College Press.

Fullan, M. G., & Hargreaves, A. (1991). *What's Worth Fighting For: Working Together for Your School*. Ontario: Ontario Public Schools Teachers' Federation.

Gardner, J. W. (1990). *On Leadership*. New York: Free Press.

Geijsel, F., Sleegers, P., van den Berg, R. & Kelchtermans, G. (2001). Conditions fostering the implementation of large-scale innovation programs in schools: Teachers' perspectives. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 37*, 130-166.

Gronn, P. C. (1996). From transactions to transformations: A new world order in the study of leadership? *Educational Management and Administration*, *24*(1), 452-473.

Gronn, P. (1999). *The Making of Educational Leaders*. London: Cassell.

Gronn, P. (2000). Distributed properties: A new architecture for leadership. *Educational Management and Administration, 28*(3), 317-338.

Gunter, H. (2001). *Leaders and Leadership in Education*. London: P. Chapman; Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications.

Hargreaves, D. H. (1967). *Social Realty in a Secondary School*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Hencley, S.P. (1973). Situational behavioral approach to the study of educational leadership. In L. C. Cunningham & W. J. Gephart (Eds.), *Leadership: The Science and Art Today* (pp. 139-164). Itasca, IL: F.E. Peacock Publishers.

Hersey, P. & Blanchard, K. H. (1977). *Management of Organizational Behavior: Utilizing Human Resources* (3rd ed.). New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Holt, A. (1994). *The New School Governor: Realizing the Authority in the Head and Governing Body*. London, Philadelphia: Kogan.

Hord, S. M. (1992). *Facilitative Leadership: The Imperative for Change*. Austin, TX: Southwest Educational Development Laboratory.

Horne, M. & Stedman-Jones, D. (2001). *Leadership: The Challenge for All?* London: Institute of Management.

Hoy, W. & Miskel, C. (1987). *Educational Administration*. New York: Random House.

Kam-Cheung, W. (1997). Early Chinese thinking and the moral education of educational leaders. *International Studies in Educational Administration, 24*(2), 17-24.

Klein, S. R. & Dikert, R. M. (1999). Creating artful leadership. *International Journal of Leadership in Education, 2*(1), 23-30.

Lacey, C. (1970). *Hightown Grammar*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Leithwood, K. (1994). Leadership for school restructuring. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 30*, 498-518.

Leithwood, K. & Jantzi, D. (1999). Transformational school leadership effects: A replication. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement, 10,* 451-479.

Leithwood, K., & Menzies, T. (1998). Forms and effects of school based management: A review. *Educational Policy, 12*, 325-346.

Lieberman, A., Saxl, E. R. & Miles, M. B. (1988). *Teacher leadership: Ideology and practice.* In A. Lieberman (Ed.), *Building a Professional Culture in Schools* (pp. 129-147). New York: Teachers College Press.

Louis, K. & Miles, M. (1990). *Improving the Urban High School: What Works and Why.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Louw, I. & Zuber-Skeritt, O. (2009). Reflecting on a leadership development programme: A case study in South Africa higher education. *Perspectives in Education, 27*(3), 237-246.

Manasse, A. L. (1986). Vision and leadership: Paying attention to intention. *Peabody Journal of Education, 63*(1), 150-173.

McGregor, D. (1960) *The Human Side of Enterprise.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Ndebele, N. (2007). Perspectives on leadership challenges in South Africa. *Perspectives in Education, 25*(1), 1-8.

Rosenholtz, S. (1989). *Teachers' Workplace: The Social Organization of Schools*. New York: Longman.

Schein, E. N. (1985). *Organizational Culture and Leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Stogdill, R. M. (1948). Personal factors associated with leadership: A survey of the literature. *Journal of Psychology, 25*, 35-71.

Stogdill, R. M. (1974). *Handbook of Leadership: A Survey of the Literature*. New York: Free Press.

Walker, A. & Dimmock, C. (Ed.) (2002). *School Leadership and Administration: Adopting a Cultural Perspective.* New York: RoutledgeFalmer.

Wallace, B. (2008). Raising the motivation and self-esteem of all learners by creating a climate for all talents to flourish: Developing empowerment for life. *Perspectives in Education, 26*(3), 19-28.

Table 1. Characteristics of an Effective Leader

PERSONALITY	MANAGERIAL SKILLS	PROFESSIONALISM
Inner Qualities	Short-term tasks	Vision and Awareness
Have a strong will (Stodgill, 1974)	Ability to delegate (Covey, 1992)	A clear educational vision (Everad & Morris, 1985)
Forward-looking (Everad & Morris, 1985; Horne & Stedman-Jones, 2001)	Continuing to give assistance (Hord, 1992)	Commitment to the vision (Gronn, 1996)
Courageous (Stodgill,1974; Everad & Morris, 1985; Horne & Stedman-Jones, 2001)	Assessing progress (Hord, 1992)	Understanding followers' needs (Gardner, 1990)
Humble (Everad & Morris, 1985)	Supporting and respecting colleagues (Horne & Stedman-Jones, 2001)	Resources
Optimistic (Everad & Morris, 1985)	Accurate allocation of resources (Everad & Morris, 1985)	Connection with wider environment (Everad & Morris, 1985; Fullan & Hargreaves, 1991; Fullan, 1988)
Have self-confidence (Gardner, 1990)	Task competence (Garnder, 1990)	Planning and providing resources (Hord, 1992)
Have a desire to improve (Horne & Stedman-Jones, 2001)	Acknowledge what you value (Fullan & Hargreaves, 1991; Fullan, 1988)	Values
Possess self-objectivity (Hord, 1992)	Flexibility/Adapt-ability for change at any time (Stogdill, 1974; Gardner, 1990; Fullan, 2001)	Believing schools are for learning (Leithwood, 1994)
Possess self-awareness (Bennis, 1984)	Long-term Tasks	Value human resources (Fullan & Hargreaves, 1991; Fullan, 1988)
Honest (Horne & Stedman-Jones, 2001)	Promoting collaboration (Fullan & Hargreaves, 1991; Fullan, 1988)	Intellect
Empathetic (Everad & Morris, 1985; Ndebele, 2007)	Effective organisational process (Everad & Morris, 1985)	Knowledgeable (Gronn, 1996; Horne & Stedman-Jones, 2001)
Outer Qualities	Diplomatic skills (Gardner, 1990)	Educational methods and theories (Everad & Morris, 1985)
Dependable (Stodgill, 1974; Gardner, 1990)	Promoting effectiveness in work done and a search for continual improvement (Leithwood & Menzies, 1998)	Intelligence (Gardner, 1990)
Sociable (Stodgill, 1974)	Focusing on individual needs of subordinates (Gronn, 1996)	Understand the culture of the school (Fullan & Hargreaves, 1991; Fullan, 1988)
Inspiring (Gronn, 1996; Horne & Stedman-Jones, 2001)	Articulating a shared vision (Louis & Miles 1990, Manasse, 1986)	
Trusting (Bennis, 1984)	Creating a context conducive to change (Rosenholtz, 1989)	
Communicative (Lieberman, Saxl & Miles, 1988)	Setting clear goals (Bennis, 1984)	
Proactive (Covey, 1992)	Leading by example (Dimmock, 1995, 2000)	
Understanding (Covey, 1992)	Developing goals and translating mission and vision into action (Geijsel, Sleegers, van den Berg & Kelchtermans, 2001)	
Consistent (Everad & Morris, 1985)	Sustaining school culture (Schein, 1985)	
Assertive (Stodgill, 1974)	Capacity to motivate people (Gardner, 1990)	
Decisive (Stodgill, 1974; Gardner, 1990)	Leadership for organisational learning (Dimmock, 1995, 2000; Leithwood et al., 1999)	
Eagerness to accept responsibility (Gardner, 1990)	Promoting teachers' professional development (Peeke, 2003; Leithwood et al., 1999)	
	Strategic thinking (Horne & Stedman-Jones, 2001)	

Table 1 lists all possible characteristics of a leader and serves as the basis for the study questionnaire.

Table 2. Sample Statements about Individual Key Qualities

Key Leadership Quality	Items	Example
Personality		
Inner Qualities	1, 4, 7, 10, 12, 15, 18, 20, 23, 25, 27	An effective leader should be forward-looking.
Outer Qualities	32, 35, 38, 40, 42, 44, 46, 48, 50, 52, 54	An effective leader should be communicative.
Managerial Skills		
Short-term Tasks	2, 5, 8, 11, 13, 16, 19, 21	An effective leader should be able to delegate.
Long-term Tasks	26, 28, 30, 33, 36, 39, 41, 43, 45, 47, 49, 51, 53, 55, 56, 57	An effective leader should be able to set clear goals.
Professionalism		
Vision and Awareness	3, 6, 9	An effective leader should have a commitment to vision.
Resources	14, 17	An effective leader should have a connection with the wider environment.
Values	22, 24	An effective leader should believe schools are for learning.
Intellect	29, 31, 34, 37	An effective leader should be knowledgeable.

Table 2 provides examples of the questionnaire statements.

Table 3. Descriptive Statistics – Importance of Personality

	Principals				Teachers			
	Items	Mean	SD	Cronbach's Alpha (reliability)	Items	Mean	SD	Cronbach's Alpha (reliability)
Inner Qualities	11	5.12	.34	0.775	11	5.76	.42	0.687
Outer Qualities	12	5.34	.37	0.788	12	5.68	.37	0.743

Table 3 shows that principals believe inner qualities to be more important than outer qualities and that teachers hold the opposite view.

Table 4. Descriptive Statistics – Importance of Managerial Skills

	Principals				Teachers			
	Items	Mean	SD	Cronbach's Alpha(reliability)	Items	Mean	SD	Cronbach's Alpha (reliability)
Skills related to short-term tasks	8	5.82	.32	0.698	8	5.65	.38	0.687
Skills related to long-term tasks	16	5.78	.30	0.726	16	5.62	.37	0.743
Overall Managerial Skills	24	5.80	.33	0.714	24	5.64	.36	0.734

Table 4 provides statistical evidence to show that principals and teachers see managerial skills as equally important.

Table 5. Descriptive Statistics – Importance of Professionalism

	Principals				Teachers			
	Items	Mean	SD	Cronbach's Alpha (reliability)	Items	Mean	SD	Cronbach's Alpha (reliability)
Intellect	3	5.78	.35	0.735	3	5.18	.45	0.688
Values	2	5.26	.30	0.712	2	5.46	.42	0.706
Resources	2	5.36	.52	0.685	2	4.86	.52	0.698
Vision and Awareness	4	5.64	.68	0.633	4	5.32	.46	0.734
Overall Professionalism	11	5.51	.54	0.720	11	5.20	.48	0.728

Table 5 shows that principals consider the importance of professionalism to be more crucial than do teachers.

Table 6. Descriptive Statistics – Leadership Components

	Principals				Teachers			
	Items	Mean	SD	Cronbach's Alpha (reliability)	Items	Mean	SD	Cronbach's Alpha (reliability)
Personality	23	5.18	.34	0.758	23	5.75	.42	0.708
Managerial skills	24	5.69	.37	0.714	24	5.66	.37	0.734
Professionalism	11	5.55	.46	0.720	11	5.30	.56	0.728
Overall	58	5.47	.42	0.734	58	5.57	.45	0.720

Table 5 shows that both principals and teachers see managerial skills and professionalism as important, but there is a discrepancy between the two groups in terms of the personality component. The table also shows that teachers view the overall characteristics of a school leader as more important.

Table 7. Means and SDs for Leadership Qualities that Teachers Rate Most Highly

Characteristic Component	Statement	Mean	SD
Personality – Outer qualities	Express what you value	5.85	.11
Personality – Outer qualities	Trusting	5.81	.18
Personality – Outer qualities	Supportive	5.80	.32
Personality – Inner qualities	Positive	5.80	.38
Personality – Inner qualities	Committed	5.78	.55
Managerial skills –short-term tasks	Preventing teacher stress and burnout	5.75	.61
Managerial skills –long-term tasks	Strategic thinking	5.74	.76

This table lists only qualities with means of 5.70 or above.

Table 7 shows teachers see personality is an important component for effective leadership.

Table 8. Means and SD for Leadership Qualities that Principals Rate Most Highly

Characteristic Component	Statement	Mean	SD
Managerial Skills –vision and awareness	Knowing what he/she wants to happen and causing it to happen	5.84	.56
Managerial Skills –resources	Connection with wider environment	5.80	.36
Managerial Skills –intellect	Knowledgeable	5.78	.63
Managerial Skills –intellect	Professional training and experience	5.75	.48
Managerial Skills –vision and awareness	Strong philosophy and clear vision	5.70	.38

This table lists only qualities with means of 5.70 or above.

Table 8 shows opposite results to those presented in Table 7. The principals viewed managerial skills as the most important.