Managing Challenging Teachers

**Thesis submitted for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
At the University of Leicester**

By

Eliezer Yariv

May 2002

UMI Number: U601160

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

UMI U601160

Published by ProQuest LLC 2013. Copyright in the Dissertation held by the Author.
Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.

All rights reserved. This work is protected against
unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code.

ProQuest LLC
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346

Managing challenging teachers

Doctoral thesis

Eliezer Yariv

Content

Acknowledgments

Abstract

List of figures and tables

Introduction

1. Setting the stage.....1

Literature review

2. Poor performing teachers.....15
3. Evaluation of teaching effectiveness39
4. Managerial behavior and management styles.....53
5. Emotions and management.....72

Method

6. Research design and data collection.....84

Results

7. The schools and the principals.....116
8. The challenging teachers.....139
9. Interventions and results.....180

Discussion

10. Poor performance, sources and stresses.....220
11. Educational management in a situation of conflict.....229
12. Negative feedback, emotions and obstacles.....242

Overall conclusions

13. Theoretical and practical implications.....259

Bibliography.....282

Appendixes.....310

Acknowledgments

Only one author's name appears on the cover, and rightly so. A doctoral thesis is meant to prove an ability to hold an independent scientific research. Yet, this work would have never been born without the assistance of many people to whom I am sincerely grateful.

To Dr. Marianne Coleman, my supervisor, for her patient and wise guidance. Her warm and empathetic encouragement has tremendously assisted me in moments of lowness (there were many). Also thanks to my second supervisor, Prof. Paul Cooper, for the thought-provoking important remarks.

To the many principals, teachers, inspectors and other individuals who willingly shared with me their invaluable knowledge. Their identity is strictly kept hidden but their contribution is manifested in every page of this work.

To the staff of the Educational Management Development Unit at the University of Leicester, and especially for Dr David Middlewood and Dr. Mark Brundret for their helpful comments.

To Dr. Miriam Sarid, my statistical consultant who assisted me to translate the perplexing numbers into a meaningful presentation.

To my colleague students at the Ph.D. program. Special thanks are given to Col. (ret.) Alex Schneider, Michael Cohen, and Talia Lahav. Their wisdom and knowledge contributed tremendously to the study.

Finally, to my wife Rachel and my sons Guy, Doron and Dan who accompanied and supported me.

This thesis is dedicated to my late parents, Zalman and Tziporah Krieger.

Managing challenging teachers

Eliezer Yariv

Abstract

Teachers' poor performance is estimated to prevail among 5-10 percent of the teaching force. Despite its damage to pupils and to schools' reputation it has been rarely studied. Two major empirical works (Bridges, 1986, 1992; Wragg et al, 1999) described its antecedents and administrators' response. The current study examines, within the Israeli context, who are the poor performing (referred as 'challenging') teachers? How principals cope with their shortcomings and what is the hidden emotional dynamics within that dyad? The theoretical framework follows the *three-component model of attitude* (Rosenberg & Hovland, 1960; Eagly & Chaiken, 1998), which analyzes the findings according to its cognitive, behavior and affective components.

The sample includes all the principals and 131 teachers who were working in 40 elementary schools in northern Israel. In addition to a semi-structured interview with each principal, they also completed two questionnaires, one about a challenging teacher and one about an outstanding teacher. Having those two teachers and two additional teachers (marginal + outstanding) who filled similar questionnaires triangulated that information.

Over seven percent of the teachers were identified as challenging, mostly these were veteran teachers who manifested either insensitiveness toward pupils or had low motivation. Relatively more of these teachers taught in deprived schools with inexperienced principals. The reasons for their difficulties were generally poor fit between personal characteristics and job demands. Half faced major life event changes, which deteriorated their performance. The principals of these teachers presented highly nurturing management style with little demanding of individual teachers. They evaluated the challenging teachers as performing below average; they were emotionally ambivalent toward them and reduced support and increased their demands, in comparison to the outstanding teachers. Principals tended not to plan in advance, and coped with teachers' shortcomings more by overlooking and using soft measures than taking organizational measures and sanctions. Escalating the conflict damaged the principals-teacher relations and prevented finding a solution, while a planned and focused intervention, which included colleague teachers' assistance proved to be highly effective.

List of figures and Tables

Figures

2.1 The factors that affect a conflict's development	21
2.2. A model of conflict management styles	26
2.3 Administrators actions and incompetent teacher responses	33
4.1. A Contingency Schema for Understanding Leadership	53
4.2.The academic administrator grid	57
4.4. Management styles by dimensions of demanding and giving	66
5.1 A hierarchy of emotions' categories	79
8.1. Principals' demanding from individual teachers	172
8.2. Principals' emotions toward individual teachers	173
10.1 A general perspective on stress	222
10.2 A tentative model for teachers' adjustment	227
11.1 Level of tension and effectiveness in problem solving	237
12.1. Principals' feelings and submitting verbal or written feedback	244

Tables

2.1 Problems arising from poor staff management	23
2.2. Degree of difficulty of dealing with poor performance	29
3.2 Dimensions of evaluation	43
4.1 Leader's behavior and administrative practices	59
4.2 Leadership styles outgrow two-factors models	70
5.1. Manifestations of emotions	76
5.2 Proposed prototypical script for adult shame	77
6.1 Questionnaires reliability coefficients	103
6.2 Factor analysis of principal's style of demanding from staff	105
7.1 Principal's methods for evaluating teachers' performance	124
7.2 Principals' criteria of evaluating teachers	127
7.3 Principals' demanding and giving styles	132
7.4 Correlations of teachers and principals demanding and giving styles	134
7.5 Demanding from staff – perceptions of P's & T's of two schools	135
7.6 Giving style to staff - perceptions of P's & T's of two schools	137
8.1 Sources of information about problematic teachers	148
8.2 Correlations of causes of the teachers' difficulties	165
8.3 Management styles, T' performance evaluation and mutual emotions	169
8.4 Principals' performance evaluation of their teachers	170
8.5 Management style, effectiveness and emotions – T's perspective	175
8.6 Management style, effectiveness and emotions – P's perspective	176
9.1 Principals' responses and background variables	181
9.2 Correlations between tolerating and confronting measures	189
9.3 Correlations of principals' responses and teachers' difficulties	192
9.4 Principals' responses and the causes for teachers' difficulties	193
9.5 Correlations of principals' responses and success rates	213
10.1 Structure of discussion chapters	215
12.1 Social liking of high and low self-esteem challenging teachers	247
14.2. Correlation of principals' emotions and rates of success	250

Chapter 1. Introduction

Setting the stage

Many years ago I was accepted to work as a psychologist in two schools. The first year ran smoothly, as if reports of the difficulties of all my predecessors, who had managed to remain in the job for just few months, were only rumours. Things began to change in the second year. The head of department, who had fully supported my work, left and communication with the new head was minimal. My relations with the principals gradually eroded; one avoided me while her colleague often expressed bitterness and dissatisfaction. Feeling uneasiness with no one with whom to discuss my performance, drove me to double my efforts, but in vain. After a few months the new boss invited me to his office to inform me that both principals were unhappy with my work. Feeling surprised and insulted I spontaneously decided to leave. It took me just two weeks to find a new job but twelve painful months to gain back my personal and professional confidence. Despite many years of successful practice ever since, I know what a stressful experience it is to be defined as a 'poor performer'.

The sort of temporary weakness in an unfavorable situation that I experienced, or even the experience of chronic incompetence is not a rare phenomenon. It is as universal as mediocrity or excellence. Assessing aspects of excellence (or failure) in teaching appears to be different from those in other professions. Unlike other workers, teachers are not only supposed to work and behave well. They are also expected to educate others (pupils) to do so. The role model they give is crucial to convince young children to follow them. A principal who tends to come late to school may ruin any attempt s/he makes to convince others of the significance of punctuality. The importance of good-conduct and effectiveness is not only necessary to run the organization smoothly. It helps teachers and principals attain their goal - education.

Problematic teachers present one of the toughest challenges school principals may ever face. Poor performing teachers not only do not bring the expected results, but also their bad behavior may derail others from doing their work. They consume much of the principal's time and take the place of other workers who might be of more help to the organization. Their bad behavior damages the school's reputation. That 'weakest link in the chain' as one high school principal described them (Pilot school C), may raise a fierce reaction from parents and cause a considerable amount of stress on all sides. The British chief inspector once stated: 'It is in nobody's interest for such teachers to remain in the profession' (Ofsted, 1996, p.10). That controversial remark raised a hot debate among administrators and educators in England about whether these teachers should be identified, inspected or even removed.

Managing poorly performing teachers is the subject of this research. An example, a vignette, based on an interview with an elementary school principal (pilot, school D) is given here to illustrate the area researched. The false biblical names were added to both anonymize the subjects and to help the reader visualize the protagonists. The view given here is purely that of the principal.

Several days before the beginning of the school year Deborah, an elementary school principal, received a call from her inspector. 'I have no other choice but to transfer a teacher to your school' he announced. Initiated transfer is the Ministry of Education's 'code' for moving incompetent teachers from one area to another one. The inspector's promise that the teacher would stay for only three years, the successful absorption of two teachers who were transferred the previous years, and the shortage of teachers at the time made the principal less suspicious.

Ruth was a 50 years old veteran tenured teacher who taught humanities. Deborah assigned her to educate a fifth grade class. The role of an 'educator' in the Israeli school system means not only teaching subject matter but also being a leader to a designated class and responsible for its pupils social and personal matters. The position of an educator is more prestigious with a better salary than that of a specialist teacher. As an experienced teacher she used various methods

with reasonable success, but her students did not enjoy her lessons. The difficulties emerged at the end of the first year, when the principal noticed that Ruth had bad relations with others. She 'managed' to quarrel, first with colleague teachers and later with parents and students, insisting to be the one who sets the tone (e.g. how to teach, when to examine classes). In one case Ruth objected to a legitimate decision made by an educator. The principal, who got very angry, called her outside the classroom in the middle of a lesson to reprimand her, but Ruth argued with her (as she did whenever the principal tried to open a discussion). These corrective measures brought no progress. Other staff members did not like her. It reached a point when Ruth celebrated her daughter's wedding but not one of the teachers agreed to attend the ceremony. The principal had to force a few of them to represent the school.

Ruth used to come late to school. Deborah responded first politely and later more assertively. Ruth sensed that she was under probation and came to school on time. By the end of the first year Deborah decided that Ruth would not continue as an educator, but Ruth begged her to amend the decision. She told the principal of her desire to retire the next year, requesting that she remain an educator, in order to maintain her full pension. Deborah agreed to change her decision, hoping her consideration would pave Ruth's way out. It was a mistake. The difficulties continued the next year. By the time she had made up her mind to get rid of her, Ruth's husband got sick and Deborah refrained from taking action. By the end of the second year Ruth announced she had decided not to retire. The principal assigned her to a position of guiding teachers, but even then she could not cooperate with them and the principal was asked to intervene.

By the third year the inspector left his job and the new inspector felt committed to her predecessor's promise but could not deliver his promises. Further, the teachers' union chairperson told Deborah she empathized with her difficulties but was fully committed to protecting Ruth. Having almost no relations with the teacher and no support from the Ministry of Education and the teachers' union, Deborah found herself in a hopeless situation.

The case of Ruth exemplifies some of the complexities for principals of coping with teachers' problems: the possible lack of information, sometime intentionally hidden by inspectors and colleague principals; the teacher's denial of difficulties; the manoeuvres and occasional deceptions used to postpone any of the principal's actions. A difficult organizational climate and regulations tie the principal's hands. In addition there are the principal's hesitations and moral consideration that slow down any move they may consider taking. The teachers may obviously see these problems differently.

A matter of terminology

Kruger and Dunning (1999) argue that the skills that engender competence in a particular domain are often the very same skills necessary to evaluate competence in that particular domain. For example an expert music teacher will have better tools to appraise a music lesson than a layperson, or an inexperienced teacher. They maintain that 'incompetence' is a matter of degree and not one of absolutes. There is not a clear line that separates competent individuals from incompetent ones. 'When we speak of 'incompetent' individuals we mean people who are less competent than their peers' (p. 1122). There are some variations with regard to the terminology. Teachers' '*incompetence*' is defined as a lack of relevant content knowledge or necessary skills in such key areas as instruction and classroom management (Tucker, 2001, p. 52). A '*marginal teacher*' is one who appears to have sufficient command of subject matter but a lack of classroom management skills gets in the way of student learning (Sweeney & Manatt, 1984, p. 25). Both definitions concentrate on teaching skills and leave other important aspects of the teacher's work (e.g. collegiality, moral behavior, motivation) unmentioned. Linguistically, '*poor performing*' describes the results of an actual behavior, while *incompetence*, emphasizes skills and personality traits. Since personality traits supposedly remain constant throughout one's life, the term 'incompetence' leaves little room for a change. In comparison, the behavior-driven approach is more optimistic – behavior can hopefully be modified.

In order to soften the serious meaning of those terms, a new term in Hebrew has been used in this work '*challenging teachers*' ('morim etgari'im') which emphasizes both the difficulties these teachers pose for their principals and the hope for their improvement. This new term has 'bleached' the serious meaning and enabled principals in this research to discuss more freely the difficulties they have. Unlike Kruger and

Dunning (1999) who focused their analysis on the incompetence individuals display in a specific domain, the staff here is defined as *those who pose a challenge to the principal of how to work with them*. Such a broad definition leaves enough room to explore the teacher's performance and competence, not just within the classroom, as most studies do. Such a definition also avoids the legal connotation, which significantly limits the scene to rare cases, such as those brought to court and eventually lead to dismissal. The term 'challenging' often substitutes here for terms like 'incompetence', 'poor performance', 'marginal' or 'problematic'. Due to their very negative meaning, considerable efforts were made to present these terms as balanced and non-judgmental.

A land not searched

Compared to other aspects of educational management, relatively little thought and research has been given to the identification and assistance of poor performing teachers. Screening Human Resource Management books and databases bring surprisingly little material. Relevant words (e.g. inefficient, competence) are almost non-existent in textbook indices.

When we looked at practice in other European countries there were often no agreed procedures for dealing with allegations [of incompetence]. For too long the whole issue has been given a low priority and has been clouded by lack of research evidence of a fundamental kind ...on what is often regarded as a taboo subject for systematic inquiry. (Wragg et al. 1999, p. 27)

Formidable barriers face researchers and practitioners who wish to explore this phenomenon. First, 'Principals don't like to talk and admit these [teachers] exist in a school' (Fuhr, 1993, p. 23). Workers and their employers will do their utmost to hide their shortcomings. Common feelings of frustration and shame may be covered with a heavy layer of denial and false descriptions. Second, moral, ethical and practical difficulties restrict the use of certain research methods (e.g. video-recording of a lesson) and the scope of topics to be examined (e.g. a formal evaluation meeting of a principal and a failing teacher).

Third, on the national and international level, parliaments hesitate to set laws and clear performance standards for teachers. The subject is so inherently vague that such legislation would be perceived as intervening in labor relations and may raise concerns and opposition from teachers' unions. The tendency of heads is to avoid direct conflicts and painful criticism. In most cases only external intervention (e.g. parents' complaints) forces principals and inspectors to take action and directly confront their ineffective teachers. Very few cases are brought to court. Hearings are made behind closed doors, and, paraphrasing the British chief inspector, it is in nobody's interest to wash dirty linen in public.

Despite these constraints, two important comprehensive studies have been carried out recently. In an outstanding work, Bridges (1986, 1992) gives a compelling account of the causes of incompetence among teachers in California, the measures district administrators take and an analysis of why these measures fail so often. In a more recent large scale study in England, Wragg et al. (1999, also appeared as book in 2000) meticulously recorded the standpoint of all those who are involved: heads, parents, pupils, unions representatives, LEA and school board officers and most interestingly 70 allegedly 'incompetent' teachers. Evidently, despite the different contexts, Wragg's et al. study substantiates Bridges' findings with quantitative data.

Former studies' main findings

Failing workers, and teachers are not unusual and may comprise about five to ten percent of the work force. Sometimes the burden is not divided equally. For example, Tucker (1997) found that over one third of schools' principals report having no weak teachers at all.

Many reasons are cited to account for the incompetence of teachers. The infrastructures, or the 'seeds of tolerance', as Bridges (1986) define them are job security laws, ambiguity in teacher evaluation and the desire of administrators to avoid conflict and unpleasantness. These conditions lay the foundation on which personal shortcomings are developed. Some of these limitations are inherent within the teachers themselves (e.g. lack of ability and motivation), some with the shortcomings of managers or supervisors (e.g. poor selection or guidance), while others are related to

external influences (e.g. marital or financial problems). There is a wide agreement that these difficulties feed one another and may create a personal downward spiral.

Clearly the subject of poor performing is not handled only in a single school or by an individual principal. Political and legal bodies and workers unions are all involved. First, the subject is entangled within the domain of working relations: the recruiting, induction, and the development of workers and also in arrangements for a contract's termination. Second, state laws of labor, national and regional judicial courts and arbitration panels are established to handle cases of dispute. The government and the workers' unions play major roles, but other organizations (e.g. the media, parents, municipalities) contribute to create a multifaceted picture.

Generally, heads are extremely reluctant to cope with poor performing teachers. Only when they are pressed by external threat (e.g. the story has leaked to the local newspaper) do they take action, which may be too little and too late. In his model, Bridges (1992) describes a clear pattern of managerial response with several stages. The principals first tolerate and overlook. Then they try to find escape hatches to minimize the damage. Only when those steps do not bring the expected results does the administrator confront the teacher in order to gain rapid improvement or have the teacher leave the school.

The Israeli context

Searching for material on failing teachers in Israel is a frustrating experience. No books and articles have been written, Government officials are reluctant to disclose information, no public statistics are available, and cases of incompetence are dealt behind closed doors in civil servants courts. Sensational stories brought to the media tend to be one-sided and partial in nature.

Early interviews with teachers, principals and officers in the teachers' unions and the Ministry of Education have led to polarized impressions: on one hand the state has a relatively effective administrative and judicial system which deals each year with 10-15 cases of incompetent tenured teachers. In addition, each year the Ministry of Education dismisses about 1000 untenured teachers, mainly due to administrative considerations

(most of them are later rehired). On the other hand there is no constructed infrastructure to handle less extreme cases.

The department for evaluation in the Ministry of Education holds in depth surveys across Israel in several dozens of schools each year. According to its data (Ministry of Education, 1997), most principals do observe teachers in classes, discuss their impressions and guide teachers as to how to improve their teaching. Compared to ongoing practices of formative evaluation, almost no summative evaluation exists within the school system. The Ministry of Education has no such policy for principals and personnel decisions (promotion, dismissal) are rarely substantiated by formal documentation from heads. Even school inspectors, who are legally and administratively in charge on personnel management, have no formal procedures for evaluating teachers.

The lack of strict evaluation procedures is crucial, but there are additional barriers. Prospective heads are not instructed on how to handle such difficulties, novice heads do not get proper counseling, no recommended policy is stated by the Ministry of Education and its inspectors need to establish their own methods of how to help problem teachers. Legal constraints, as well as militant teachers' unions prevent, in many cases, getting assistance in court. Further, recent governmental policy of banning early retirement has increased the numbers of burned out and incompetent teachers. This topic is rarely discussed openly, let alone researched. All the interviewees in the research for this thesis unanimously emphasized how important it is to explore this untouched subject.

This introduction raises the need to explore in depth the Israeli context – both the organizational context and the way with which Israeli principals cope with problematic teachers. The results would elaborate the limited international research and help substantiate (or refute) Bridges' (1992) model of a managerial fixed pattern response.

A tentative model of managing challenging teachers

In the same way as it is easier to bring up talented children, so managing energetic workers is probably less demanding. Only when leaders face difficult situations and people, their competence (or incompetence) is brought to light. As a practicing

educational psychologist in elementary and middle schools I am asked each year to assist teachers who have 'difficult' classes and problematic students. These difficult missions brought many experiences and led to a conceptualization of that issue. In a recent book by the author (Yariv, 1999) a tentative theoretical model has been suggested on how the teachers' behavior in terms of giving and demanding is connected with students' discipline difficulties. Such difficulties, it is stated, reflect the nature of their interrelations and raise specific emotions on both sides. Once these emotions are correctly identified, changing these relations can help principals and teachers solve students' problems (Ibid. pp. 163-174).

This model has not been tested empirically yet, but its usefulness in counseling and warm responses by teachers and parents to its ideas has encouraged the exploration of its premises. While planning this research it was decided to transform the issue of teacher's handling students' discipline difficulties to the question of principals coping with poor performing teachers. The notion of management styles according to the dimensions of demanding and giving and the emotional ingredient within the managerial process will contribute to this study within the context of educational management.

Management made simple

Management is a broad topic, and this study aims to explore its most simple and basic elements. That quest for simplicity is an old one:

Science begins with a quest for simplicity. *Simplex sigillum veri* (simple images the truth). . . This logical simplicity is however an end, not a beginning. Human culture begins with a much more complex and involved state of mind."
(Cassirer, 1944)

In searching for what is the smallest yet still meaningful organizational unit where educational management is being practiced, what comes first to mind is the basic human transaction of *give and take*. These small practices reflect ongoing dynamic social exchanges. Such simple acts of *giving* and, for our purpose, *demanding* (Yariv, 1999, p. 164-175) are so common, we rarely think of them in daily activities. Yet, they constitute many activities that any person in authority (e.g. a manager, a parent, an

army officers) carries out. Giving, and especially demanding, is inherent to any action of leading others. The model (Yariv, 1999) assumes that the amount of giving and demanding (much/less) creates four different management styles. Following Blake & Mouton (1978) 'managerial grid', a basic tool of management theory, each style represents a different combination of behaviors, and each style stems from different motives. The teacher's style (and for that matter, the style of any person in an authority position) is presumably connected with certain results and specific difficulties (e.g. disobedience).

Describing the parent and teacher's leadership role is only one segment in a complicated environment. Contingent theories (Fiedler, 1978; Yukl, 1998) state that the nature of the situation and the followers is no less important. Like bringing up children in an educational setting, Hersey and Blanchard (1977) proposed a theoretical model, which simulates the psychological aspects of 'bringing up' workers in the organization. They attached the manager's level of guidance and control to the commitment and professional experience of the worker's in the organizational hierarchy (e.g. novice worker, middle manager). For example, the *delegating* leader lets the experienced subordinates themselves decide what to do.

Management made multifaceted

In order to understand such a complicated phenomenon it was decided to describe and analyze the management of problematic workers from three angles – behavioral, cognitive and affective. Such methodology replicates studies on attitudes. The *three-component model of attitude* (Rosenberg & Hovland, 1960) has served to study complex social phenomenon such as prejudices, self-esteem and values (e.g. Brehm & Kasson, 1990 pp.41-95; Eagly & Chaiken, 1998). The principals' management is analyzed through its cognitive aspect (appraising the teacher's performance), behavioral (aspects of demanding and giving), and affective (the mutual emotions). The *three-component model of attitude* is the theoretical framework of this study.

Evaluating teachers' performance (cognitive) - In order to cope with a problem, the principal has to first diagnose its existence. Poor performing and ineffectiveness are relative terms (Ingverson, 2001, Nevo, 1997). Some principals may approve teachers' behavior, which others would define as problematic. Good teaching depends on many factors (e.g. student competence, nature of subject matter, external requirements). Even

concrete data, such as the number of 12th grade graduate students who have passed the matriculation exams, would be interpreted by different persons as a failure or success, depending on their personal judgment and expectations. In order to understand what makes some teachers more or less appreciated, a closer look must be given to the practices and the criteria by which principals evaluate their successful and unsuccessful teachers.

Managerial style (behaviour) - the classification of giving and demanding relates to daily managerial behavioral units, and it extends to other taxonomies which judge managerial behavior on dimensions like boss/subordinate-centered leadership (Tannenbaum and Schmidt, 1973) or task/people orientation (Blake and Mouton, 1978). For example, when managers decide to implement a programme they ask (demand) a teacher to carry out the job. Sometimes they add an encouraging smile and suggest their help (giving). Later they check if any progress has been made (follow-up). Portraying the principal's management style in terms of demanding and giving, and the nature with which he or she copes with teachers' shortcomings would hopefully provide clues as to the causes and the remedies for these difficulties.

Emotional response (affective) - Emotions are inner responses to external occurrences, usually of a social nature (Scherer, 2001). Since management and leadership are based on relations with others, the emotions supervisors and subordinates feel toward each other may reflect their mutual relations. For example, warm praise would lead to feelings of pride and reflect positive relations. Meanwhile, acts of rejection would raise concern and may further deteriorate unhappy relations. More specifically, the current model explores the connection between the level of demanding and giving with the appearance of specific emotions. For example, immense demands with little support (hard leading style) would enrage teachers about the load of work they have to perform. Dealing with a challenging worker is expected to raise negative (or at least ambivalent) emotions. The acquaintance with these 'soft' elements will add important knowledge to the more frequently researched (Rafaeli & Sutton, 1989) 'hard' aspects of management (i.e. decision making, budgeting). Exploring mutual emotions would probably tell us more about the external and especially about hidden interpersonal streams.

Aims of research

This research has three main goals:

1. The collection of data about problematic teachers in Israel: How many are they? What criteria do principals use to identify them as challenging ? What are their personal and professional characteristics? What are the reasons for their shortcomings? How do colleague teachers and pupils relate to them? What roles do other interest groups play (colleague teachers, parents, teachers unions)? What roles are played by the Ministry of Education, mainly by its inspectors? The collected data is compared to Bridges (1986, 1992) and Wragg's et al. (1999) findings.
2. To explore how principals manage these workers: What are the sources of information they use to identify the problem? What remedial programs do they offer? Do heads seek the assistance of others (e.g. inspectors)? Is there a fixed pattern of handling these teachers, as Bridges (1986, 1992) found? When do principals decide to ignore (de-escalation) and what forces them to confront (escalation) the weak teacher?
3. To explore what the connections are between the principals' performance evaluation, their management styles in terms of giving and demanding and the emotions they feel towards their above average and the weak teachers? What are the theoretical and practical meanings, and how can the results serve school principals?

Exploring such complicated phenomenon has entailed the use of both positivist and interpretive paradigms (Usher, 1996. p 131; Burgess, 1993) alike. The method of research adopted includes qualitative in depth semi-structured interviews (Johnson, 1994, p. 45) with 40 elementary school principals, sampled randomly (Cohen and Manion, 1994. p. 87) in the Ministry of Education's Haifa district. The principals were asked about a case of a challenging teacher with whom they worked and their management practices. In addition, the principals completed questionnaires about their management style toward their staff and toward two selected teachers: one below

average and one above average. The questionnaires included two additional sections - evaluating the performance of those teachers and disclosing their emotions toward those workers. In order to triangulate that information and validate the results (Cohen and Manion, 1994. p. 233), those teachers and two additional teachers selected by the principal (one above-average and another marginal teacher) were asked to fill identical questionnaires. Two groups of 80 teachers each are compared here with regard to the influence of the management styles, their perceived effectiveness and the mutual emotions they have with their principals.

This study explores a 'normal' phenomenon, educational management, under extreme conditions, coping with challenging workers. The lack of former research and the sensitive topic demanded at time meant taking a courageous and determined stance. This study carries some important theoretical and practical innovations. Theoretically, adopting the three-prong method as in the study of attitude, the notion of "challenging" behavior, and the constructs of giving and demanding in management. This study also examines mutual emotions as a reflection of relationships between subordinates and bosses. Practically, this study identifies the organizational and personal reasons for failure at work, and the effective means of coping with teachers' shortcoming. That knowledge may help to minimize these cases, and save the aggravations connected with them. More generally, the results would help to improve HRM practices - selecting, guiding and assisting novice teachers.

Two final comments: first, this chapter opened with my personal story, the first and only time so far in this study that the experience (not to say the anguish) of the poor performing workers has been presented. The reasons for concentrating solely on the school principals' perspective was that they are the most influential persons in the organization, those who lead their people and judge their performance. It was also expected that teachers would not cooperate once they were stigmatized as 'poor performers'. Many efforts were made not to put the blame on anyone, to observe the participants as being caught in a vicious circle from which they try to get out, recognizing that circumstances can sometimes alter behavior. Second, the stories brought in this study, and its core psychological meaning were presented as accurately as possible, but many details were changed or omitted (e.g. gender, age, position) in order to protect the participant's anonymity. The ethical section in the methodology

chapter elaborates on this subject. For readers who may feel tempted to look for ‘familiar faces’, such efforts, given the heavy layers of camouflage, would definitely take them to the wrong destination.

The theoretical framework includes three main threads:

- A. The *three-component model of attitude* (Rosenberg & Hovland, 1960; Eagly & Chaiken, 1998). Within the Affective-Behavioural-Cognitive scheme educational management is discussed according to dual-process models (e.g. Blake & Mouton, 1978), and includes the author’s model of demanding and giving (Yariv, 1999).
- B. An analysis of the principal-teacher’s relationships ,mainly discussed according to the leader-member exchange theory (LMX) (Dansereau, Graen, & Haga, 1975).
- C. The principal’s style in coping with the teacher’s difficulties, mainly analyzed according to the conflict management style (Rahim, 1985; Rahim & Bonoma, 1979).

These theoretical outlines were found to best fit the current subject and findings. Since the study has brought ample data, some of it fairly unique and unexpected, it entailed reviewing more literature, which unlike ‘normal’ scientific writing, is mainly presented in the final chapters. For example the analysis combines a discussion on the impact of stress on the teacher’s adjustment changes (Holmes & Rahe, 1967; Beehr & Newman, 1978).

The next chapter reviews the literature on managing poor performing teachers. Then aspects of performance appraisal, management styles and emotional aspects of management are discussed in the next three chapters of the literature review. After presenting the methodology and results, several chapters analyze and discuss the findings according to the theoretical threads.

Managing poor performing teachers

Poor-performance – quantitative aspects

Ineffective workers are not an endangered species. They generally comprise about five to ten percent of the personnel in any organization and schools are no exception. It is estimated that incompetent teachers comprise about four per cent of the total teaching force in the UK (Ofsted, 1996, p.10). Similar numbers are estimated in the USA (Bridges, 1992, Lavelly et al. 1992; Tucker, 1997) and reported also in several other countries. In a visit to the People's Republic of China, Bridges (1992) report that officials 'view teacher incompetence as a serious problem and estimate that there are three million such teachers in their country' (p. VII). Despite incompetence estimates of five percent and higher for the teaching profession, the dismissal rate is far less than one percent. In a national study of 909 schools in the USA, ERS (1988) found only 0.5 percent of termination rate (including resignations and dismissals). Bridges (1992) and Tucker (1997) report similar findings.

There is evidence in England (Wragg et al, 1999) that the number of cases of alleged incompetence is increasing. It is not presumably due to greater incompetence among teachers but rather due to the rapid changes in teaching methods and reforms including the introduction of a national curriculum in England, which many teachers have found difficult to adopt. It was also connected with the high profile given to teaching standards by the government and in the media. As Bridges (1992) also pointed out, situational factors such as higher expectation and monitoring by heads as well as the reduction in opportunities to move elsewhere may account for the change in numbers. The growing amount of due process tenure which teachers are entitled to in some states in the USA discourages schools from pursuing dismissals of even the most unsatisfactory teachers (Jones, 1997).

Union officers in England believe that there are two groups of teachers that seem more likely to face allegations of incompetence: newly qualified teachers, including those who should never have been in the job in the first place and others who have not been properly tutored or supported. The second group is that of teachers, aged 45 and over with many years of teaching experience. There are also reports that more primary school teachers were found incompetent, which may be due to restricted opportunities for helping them (e.g. to watch others teach, consult with colleagues), compared to secondary schools.

Poor performance viewed from various perspectives

Different points of view lead the main players to adopt varied, sometimes even contradictory attitudes and behaviors. For example, there is a wide gap between professional and a layperson observation as to who may be considered as a good or bad teacher. School principals (Wragg et al., 1999) defined incompetence as consisting of a cluster of factors, not just single one:

Poor classroom organization, poor class control, low expectations, inability to deliver the curriculum through lack of planning, poor subject knowledge and failure to capture the children's interest. Inability to communicate effectively with parents about children's performance (p. 4)

The salience of the difficulties plays a major role in determining who the problematic teachers are. Discipline problems, which are highly visible, are more readily connected with ineffectiveness. Even incompetent teachers more willingly admit them, believing the blame rests on others' shoulders. Other difficulties ranked by principals (Wragg et al., 1999, p. 12) were teachers' low expectations of pupils, pupils' progress, planning and preparation, and inability to respond to change as identifiable in unreflective teachers. The salience increases also when heads are informed by several sources about the teacher's weaknesses.

Parents, on the other hand, mainly focused on the teacher's personality. The good teacher has 'patience' and 'a caring attitude'. Professional aspects such as using effective teaching methods and good classroom discipline, which are so emphasized by heads, accounted for only one third of the parents' answers. The bad teacher, according

to the parents was not only 'the opposite of the good teacher' but also "bossy", "untidy in appearance", is likely to have classroom discipline problems. Meanwhile, principals and parents overlooked aspects of teachers' misconduct and tended to concentrate on pupils' behavior.

The gap becomes wider when the two parties are in direct conflict with regard to the definition of the problem. The principal's 'lazy incompetent' was the teacher's 'unsupported victim'. Sometimes the conflict has been apparent within the observers themselves. Teachers' union's officers are supposed to have a clear role, but they are often caught in a conflict between the desire to weed out poor performing teachers in order to preserve good professional reputation and the need to protect their individual members. Union' officers sometimes crossed the "enemy lines" and strongly identify with schools' authorities. No wonder many allegedly incompetent teachers complained their representatives were ineffective (Wragg et al, 1999). Unions' leaders' method to overcome that role conflict was to silently seek the best resignation terms for the teachers, while militantly raising their voice in public hearings against dismissals. That conflict has been solved once by an American court, which ordered unions to indiscriminately protect their members, regardless of their professional failing record (Bridges, 1992).

Finally, describing a teacher as poor performing may turn from a neutral diagnosis into a self-fulfilling prophecy. Intriguingly, LEA and union officers in England felt strongly that once a teacher had been identified as being 'incompetent', the standards, which s/he then had to attain, were beyond anything, which would be normally required of any other teacher in the school. Some officers accused heads of taking too narrow a focus on classroom practices without acknowledging the 'incompetent' teacher's overall contribution to the school.

Poor performance as a legal issue

Since incompetence serves as a cause for a worker's dismissal, a solid legal infrastructure – laws, regulations, judicial procedures and court decisions – is essential to handle such allegations. In countries with compulsory education, disciplining teachers who are employed by the government has been a process regulated by the

state. The broad issue of labor relations and labor laws is beyond the scope of this work, but for the sake of simplicity two of its essential elements are discussed briefly:

Legislations and regulations – the state, via its parliament and governmental bodies sets rules as to what is expected of teachers, as citizens, as workers and as professionals. States designate specific laws for the relations between employers and employees (e.g. wages, pension, dismissal), in addition to general laws clarifying what conduct is considered illegal. The grounds upon which disciplinary action is taken have traditionally revolved around the notion of ‘inefficiency’ and ‘misconduct’ (Williams, 1994). The Australian law, for example, has defined:

‘[Engaging] in disgraceful or improper conduct, whether during or connected with [the teacher’s] employment and functions as a teacher or not’, and being ‘inefficient or incompetent and such inefficiency or incompetence appears to arise from causes within [the teacher’s] own control. (Ibid, p. 222)

Misconduct refers to unlawful and improper behaviors, which applies to every law-abiding citizen. Inefficiency is set on grounds of professional norms such as poor preparation of lessons, lack of sound classroom management, poor communication skills, deficiencies or absence of planning and teaching skills. Every worker fails sometimes, but inefficiency describe employees who, according to Fidler and Atton (1999) have major failings in a number of critical aspects of their work. They fall below the threshold of satisfactory performance on a number of criteria: they are not just unsatisfactory in one small aspect of the job. The evidence must be substantial, extensive and gathered over a period of time, proving the persistence of findings. It should include also the adverse effect on pupils, the teaching process or the functioning of the school (Parry, 1991, p. 76).

This introduces the concept of a benchmark, which can be used to identify the minimum satisfactory performance. The context of the school and its history will influence what are appropriate benchmarks. Thus it is ‘criteria in context’ which are important for defining the expectations of a satisfactory teacher. (Fidler and Aton, 1999, p. 2)

In addition to the state laws, the Ministry of Education, as an employer, sets regulations, code of conduct and other formal requirements, which teachers are supposed to follow. In addition to the formal setting, informal norms, values of certain behaviors are defined within the context of each school. These norms are important to the smooth operation of the organization.

The legal situation may sound simple and clear, but it is complicated and sometimes confusing. Power games and political tactics used by various federal, state and local agencies (LeRoy and Schultz, 1995) lead to the legislation of conflicting, overlapping and sometimes vague laws and regulations. When such a legal or organizational professional benchmark is not available, workers do not have a clear idea what is expected of them. Even a detailed job description cannot cover every small detail, and some results must be measured against actual context (Fidler and Aton, 1999). When working relations are not sufficiently defined, it intensifies personal interpretations as to the proper work behavior. It also increases the involvement of external bodies (Parents, media, teachers' unions), the use of power games and appeals to court.

Judicial procedures and bodies – following the legal differentiation between misconduct and inefficiency, cases of criminal behavior are usually brought to a general state court, while allegations of poor performing may be dealt within designated professional courts (Bridges, 1992, Parry, 1991). These judicial channels differ according to the nature of allegations and the instance where it is discussed. In addition to labor courts, which deal with complicated cases and serve as an instance of appeals, there are state's civil court and arbitration panels such as legally based tribunals where cases are determined. Of special interest is the status of workers' unions, which gained legal, standing in individual and collective arbitration with regard to labor relations. These issues are discussed in more length in the chapter on the Israeli context.

Handling poor-performers as a conflict management

When a teacher behaves aggressively toward pupils it certainly conflicts with the principal's expectations and the school's norms. Conflict has been defined in many ways. It is sometimes described as a situation where two parties feel obstructed and frustrated by the other (Fink, 1968; Rahim, 1992; Rubin et al, 1994; Vliert, 1998). It is

viewed as competitive and aggressive behavior that involves negative interpersonal perceptions and hostile feelings. Often it is analyzed according to its causes or its win or loss outcomes. The underlying construct to all these manifestations, according to Deutch (1971, 1980) is that conflict is a basic psychological mechanism that centers on incompatible goals. Conflict exists whenever one set of goals, needs or interests disagree with another set. They may prevail within the individual (e.g. when a principal needs to choose one out of several candidate novice teachers), interpersonal (e.g. the principal's dispute with a lazy teacher about his performance), inter-group (e.g. enraged parents who clash with the staff, demanding the removal of a failing principal), and even inter-organizational. Despite the fact that conflicts are perceived to be undesirable, destructive and unpleasant they sometimes offer a stimulating opportunity to raise unmet needs and address a long held dispute in a constructive way. A dispute about the work can actually help the group become more successful (Jehn, 1995), as much as it can be detrimental to the relations among staff if not properly managed. Some authors (Bush, 1994b; Baldrige, 1971) broaden the scope, including conflicts as integral part of any political process of decision-making.

The conflict process and structure

The development of a conflict is studied by means of group process observation. The observer records interaction events that identify the players, the issues, and the strategies used to manage the conflict. There are two main models to analyze these observations: *process models* are oriented primarily toward the cyclical and dynamic course of events, where one event follows another - conceptualization of the issue, action, reaction, consequences, and renewed frustration (Follett, 1975; Lewicki, Weiss, & Lewin, 1992; Pondy, 1969; Rahim, 1992; Thomas, 1992; Walton, 1987). *Structural models*, on the other hand, are oriented primarily toward factors influencing the issues and the behavior of the parties: predispositions, mutual dependence, incompatibility of interests, pressure from others, rules and procedures. (Katz and Kahn, 1978; Lewicki et al. 1992; Thomas, 1992; Walton and Dutton, 1969). Process models pay little attention to the causes of the conflict, while structural models neglect the dynamics and consequences of the conflicts. The best approach should integrate both models, as suggested by Vliert (1998) and by Berry (1998)

Figure 2.1 The factors that affect a conflict's development

Adapted from Berry, 1998, p. 401

Antecedents

The antecedent conditions include organizational and individual aspects, as well as relational characteristics. Katz and Kahn (1978) stated that 'every aspect of an organizational life that creates order and coordination of effort must overcome other tendencies to action, and in that fact lies the potentiality for conflict' (p. 617). Among dozens of conflict typologies (e.g. Coombs, 1987; Deutch, 1973; Rahim, 1992), Walton (1987, p. 68) and Mastenboek (1987, p. 125) describe antecedent conditions, which may elicit three kinds of frustration. The second and the third sources are clearly at the core of the principal-teacher conflict:

1. Conflicts of interest over scarce resources.
 2. Disagreement about collective policies, procedures, or individual role behavior.
- It was found, for example, that 54 percent of the conflicts in task groups were attributed to unequal member contributions toward the task accomplishment

(Wall and Nolan, 1986). Disagreement on role behavior may happen when the principal and the staff put forth immense efforts to improve achievements, while the weak teacher seek to satisfy his/her personal needs (e.g. convenient working hours).

3. Social-emotional conflicts whereby a group member's identity comes into question. It also relates to the frustration, which occurs when others deny certain personal identifications. Such identity conflicts may be recognized by their intense emotional involvement: feeling of being insulted, of fear, suspicion, resentment, contempt, anger, hate (Mastenboek, 1987). For example, stigmatizing teachers as 'incompetent' endangers their ability to make a living, and seriously damages their self esteem. The principals are also emotionally involved, being concerned that the teacher's failures would damage their personal and the school's reputation.

A conflict may stem from many factors, which relate to the goals, values, and organizational characteristics. It may arise, for example, from close supervision, illegitimate rules, or the norm that competition is to the benefit of the organization (Blake et al, 1964). Conflict emerges also due to individual characteristics – workers' personal background and personality. For example, how they handle role ambiguity and frustrating situations. Do they fight in order to win and beat the opponent (Blake and Mouton, 1985; Vliert, 1997), or do they practice other methods to solve the conflict, such as avoiding, compromising or problem solving (Sternberg & Dobson, 1987). As much as conflicts arise, each organization develops its own mechanisms to alleviate those tensions – careful definition of rights and duties, and procedures to resolve disagreements (Pinkley, 1990; Ury et al, 1988).

The antecedent of becoming a poor performing teacher

What may cause a worker to perform poorly? Probably the main general reason stem from poor person-organization fit (Kristof, 1996). French and his associates (1982) developed the *Person-Environment Fit Theory*, which explains how the social world affects an individual's social adjustment and physical and mental health. Its central proposition states that the resources and demands of the work environment may or may not fit the needs, goals, and abilities of the employee. When the match between the

worker and the organization is poor, the level of stress increases. More specifically, it may emerge from several sources (Steinmetz, 1969): a. shortcomings of the manager or the supervisor; b. shortcoming of the employee; c. outside or non-job-related influences affecting the employee. The causes of the poor performing appear to be multi-faceted and supervisors attribute them both to external and internal influences.

A. Ineffective management

One important external source is poor management skills and the lack of adequate supervision. Fidler & Atton (1999) discuss common managerial faults to do with the selection, induction, motivation and mentoring, appraisal, and development of teachers, which can bring about serious difficulties down the road.

Table 2.1 Problems arising from poor staff management

Adapted from Fidler & Atton, 1999, pp. 14-23.

	Potential problems	results
Selection	Key skills of job not identified	lack of capability
	Candidate's skills not matched to job	lack of capability
	Poor fit between candidate and School culture	capable employee performs poorly
Staff induction	Job not made clear	parts of job undone
	Expectations of job not clarified	parts of job not done sufficiently well
	Culture not considered	candidate does not fit in
Motivation and Monitoring	Employee not motivated	Poor quality work or Other interest taken up
	Work and standards not discussed	job not done or not done sufficiently well
Staff appraisal	Work problems not discussed	Job not done or done sufficiently
	Career plans not discussed	Employee not motivated or has to devise own career path unaided.
	Needed development not discussed	Lack of motivation or Lack of skill for change
	Employee problems not discussed	Frustration
No development	Unskilled for future changes	Shows lack of competence
	Lack of professional progress	Little stimulation to improve
	In a 'rut'	Quality of work gradually falls

Some principals lack general leadership skills or simply fail to deal effectively with their teachers' difficulties. They do not take corrective measures at early stages while

such guidance might still help. Administrators also blame some of their former colleagues who lacked the ability to deal with incompetent teachers, who were reluctant to confront or to give them proper assistance.

Fidler & Atton's (1999) eloquent conceptualization clearly shows that when principals do not invest in developing their staff, some teachers' initial shortcomings may worsen. Selection and staff induction are beyond the scope of this work, but various aspects of motivating, monitoring and staff appraisal seem to account for how managerial behavior contributes to the emergence and maintenance of teachers' shortcomings. Two examples will clarify that point. Some evidences suggest that motivating is harder when workers do not deliver the expected results. Employers become more directive, allow little responsibility and communication appear to be one-way. In response employees reduce their loyalty and motivation (Vecchio & Godbel, 1984; Duarte, Goodson & Klich, 1993). With regard to monitoring and appraisal, much evidence shows that principals do collect much information about their teachers but hesitate to transmit negative feedback (see chapter 3). Principal's reluctance to transmit their unfavorable evaluation remind studies on the emotional difficulties to tell others bad news (Rosen & Tesser, 1970; Tesser & Rosen, 1975; Weening et al. 2001). Lack of structured feedback probably means omitting essential tool to improve the workers' performance.

B. Shortcoming of the teacher

Generally, career development follows specific stages at which the worker needs to accomplish different tasks and requirements (Schein, 1978). For example a novice worker is expected to become an effective member quickly, overcoming the insecurity of inexperience. Meanwhile a late career worker is expected to take the roll of a mentor, yet remain technically competent (Schein, 1978, pp. 40-46). Within the American schools, the most common shortcoming cited by administrators was lack of ability and skills deficiencies (Bridges, 1986). Another source of difficulties, though less prevalent was low motivation. In a few cases administrators portrayed the poor performers as 'trying hard but simply not getting any results' (Ibid, p. 86). Instead of having normal development of their career (Schein, 1978), these teachers probably did not have sufficient mental abilities to adopt the job's requirements. Recent studies show that the lack of meta-cognitive capabilities (Kruger & Dunning, 1999) as much as emotional skills, especially with regard to unrealistic high self-esteem (Heatherton &

Vohs, 2000) prevent these people from grasping overt and hidden messages about their performance.

Low motivation and weak skills were not the only sources of teachers' difficulties in the classrooms. In nearly half of the cases teachers suffered from some type of personal disorder or pathology that adversely affected their performance. Emotional distress, burn out, and health problems were common. Administrators were not always aware of whether the causes were due to lack of skill or low motivation, while each pattern required different treatment (Bridges and Grove, 1990; Bridges, 1985).

C. Outside influences

In addition to poor supervision and lack of teaching skills, administrators also attributed unsatisfactory performance to outside influences. Marital difficulties and financial problems were commonplace. Several of the teachers had gone through arduous divorces while other teachers were distracted by continual turmoil in their marriages. Holmes & Rahe (1967) who developed the *Stressful Life Events Model* propose that whenever an individual experiences 'life change events' that requires adaptive response or coping behavior it is followed by stress reaction. Rarely is the teacher's poor performance due solely to a single reason like effort, skill or ability (Bridges, 1986). More commonly, unsatisfactory performance stems from other sources as well, such as personal disorders, marital problem, and inadequate supervision.

Under these conditions efforts to improve the performance of such teachers represents a formidable challenge and undertaking. It is unlikely that something akin to a miracle drug or an organ transplant will ever suffice as a cure for the problem of incompetent teaching. (p. 12)

Styles of conflict management and outcomes

In addition to describing the nature of the antecedents, conflict theories also discuss the procedures to contain and resolve the dispute. Conflict may be managed by (1) joint decision-making. It may entail the use of various tactics of negotiating and exerting influence, including escalating and deescalating the conflict (Vliert, 1998). When the parties do not succeed in reaching an agreement, they may ask (2) a third party decision making; or use (3) separate action, including unilateral behaviors such as retreat, withdrawal and tacit coordination (Pruitt & Carnevale, 1993). Selecting the means of resolving the conflict depends on many factors. Due to cultural differences,

for example American managers tend to follow norms of discussing parties' interests and synthesizing multiple issues, while their Chinese counterparts follow norms of concern for collective interests and concern for authority. The Chinese managers were more likely to involve higher management in conflict resolution than their American colleagues (Tinsley & Brett, 2001). According to one theory (Deutch, 1973, 1980) the conflict management style reflects the goals of both parties and the extent to which they correspond or contradict each other. Once the goals are independent, there would be no conflict. If the goals are perceived to be positively linked, the parties are moving in the same direction, and striving to cooperate and assist each other. When the goals are linked negatively, the success of one depends on the failure of the other. If they see their goals as negatively linked, they behave competitively. Adopting *competitive* or *cooperative* styles depends on many factors. Unequal power, for example does not necessarily lead to dominating or competitive behavior. Persons with unequal power can and do work cooperatively. Superiors can use their power to promote goal progress that benefits their subordinates as well as themselves (Tjosvold, 1981, 1984).

Another theory of conflict behavior discusses the goal relationships in terms of concerns of self and other (Rahim, 1985; Rahim & Bonoma, 1979). *Concern for self* is defined as the extent to which a party aspires to satisfy his/her own goals. *Concern for other* is the extent to which a party is interested in satisfying the other's goals. The theory, which is based on Blake & Mouton's (1985) managerial grid, provides the basis for five styles of conflict management (Rahim & Bonoma, 1979).

Figure 2.2. A model of conflict management styles

Adapted from Rahim & Bonoma, 1979, p. 1327

Integrating behavior is shown when there is high concern for both one's own and for others' needs. Integrating involves an open discussion in order to work out a solution acceptable to both. When there is a low concern for self and high concern for the other, and each party attempts to smooth over differences it exhibits *obliging* behavior.

Dominating behavior is aimed to force the other party while in the *avoiding* behavior there is no concern for self and others' goals. In the *compromising* style each party shows moderate concern for itself and for the other. Both are willing to accept a partial gain.

The way that people perceive the partner's and their own style is a key determinant of competence in conflict management. In fact, according to the *competence model of conflict* (Papa & Canary, 1995; Spitzberg, Canary, & Cupach, 1994) perceptions are just as important, if not more important than actual communication. The competence model (Papa & Canary, 1995) focuses on three dimensions of competent communication in conflict resolution: effectiveness, relational appropriateness, and situational appropriateness. *Effective communication* achieves the valued objectives or goals of the persons involved. *Relational appropriateness* refers to behavior that is generally pro-social and constructive in nature. *Situational appropriateness* refers to the speaker's style (ability to carry on a smooth conversation and to successfully adapt to the needs of a given situation).

Combining the competence model and the Rahim's conflict style model (1985, Rahim & Bonoma, 1979) reveals that certain styles are associated with specific perceptions (Gross & Guerrero, 2000). The integrative conflict style is generally perceived as the most appropriate (in terms of being both polite, pro-social strategy and an adaptive, situational appropriate strategy), and the most effective style. The dominating style tended to be perceived as inappropriate when used by others, but some participants judged themselves as more effective when they used dominating tactics along with integrating tactics. The obliging style was generally perceived as neutral, although some participants perceived themselves to be less effective and relationally appropriate when they employed obliging tactics. The avoiding style was generally perceived as ineffective and inappropriate.

Are certain managing styles more related to specific outcomes? Rahim & Bonoma (1979) proposed that both integrating and obliging behavior lead to positive-sum

outcomes (Deutch, 1973). Compromising is thought to have mixed outcomes, and depends on the parties' perceptions of the results. If they agree to divide the resources equally it may become even a positive-sum outcome for them (Pruitt & Carneavale, 1993). Dominating indicates a win-lose or zero-sum outcome, while avoiding is predicted to result in a lose-lose or negative-sum consequences. With that respect, the level of anger and tension influence the expected results. According to the *productive conflict theory* by Walton (1969) organizational conflict with a moderate tension level is better than no conflict at all (VanYperen & Van de Vliert, 2001) or a high level of conflict. The more efforts the parties are willing to exert, the more the improvement of the quality of solution and its results. Meanwhile, no efforts at all (no-conflict situation) or the highly tensed situation significantly reduce the level and quality of the solution.

If the parties do not reach a solution they may call a third party to intervene. In such a case, the third party may use several strategies as *consultation* or *imposing* a solution (Prein, 1987). Giving a greater goal, in which it becomes clear to the parties they must cooperate (Sherif, 1966). Such tactics reduce competition and help to alleviate tensions. A capable and resourceful third party may help to reduce communication blocks, narrow down the issue of conflict and help to develop rules of interaction and assist both sides to reach an agreement (Deutch, 1971, 1973). If the conflict is left open, it can flare up in future interaction, especially if the unresolved dispute was communicated in a competitive manner. Then the blocks of communication and the lack of truth drive the parties to re-ignite the issues at stake (Deutch, 1971, 1973).

Principals' measures to cope with incompetent teachers

From a theoretical point of view, the principal – teacher relations can be described in terms of a dynamic prolonged conflict. Several important aspects determine the principal's response. The first and obvious one is for how long the teacher and the principal were facing the problem. A little below half (45 percent) of the principals in England said they had inherited a problem when they first arrived at school (Wragg et al., 1999). Fidler and Atton (1999) argue that existing managers are most likely to take action on a weak teacher who has just appeared, but refrain from such actions against a long-standing poor performer.

Table 2.2. Degree of difficulty of dealing with poor performance

By Fidler & Atton, 1999, p. 3

Poor performance	Manager	Degree of difficulty
Recent	New or existing	Moderate
Long-standing	New	Considerable
Long-standing	Existing	Immense

Novice principals who have no former commitments are most likely to intervene in such cases. For example, some teachers in Wragg's et al (1999) study that were alleged of incompetence complained the previous head has valued them, while they experienced a clash of values, beliefs and practices when the new head came.

Tolerance of the poor performer

Organizations tend to avoid taking action against poor performing workers. That tendency is rooted in psychological and organizational factors. According to Bridges (1992), two of the most important situational factors are legal employment rights possessed by the majority of California teachers and the difficulties inherent in evaluating the competence of classroom teachers. The most important personal factor is the human desire to avoid conflicts and unpleasantness, which often accompany criticism of others. In schools such *modus operandi* is manifested in several forms: The initial tendency is to overlook the difficulties with the hope they might disappear. Principals refrain from describing the real performance of the teacher and fake an unrealistic picture (see chapter 3 on teacher's appraisal).

Despite the reluctance to confront the ineffective teacher there are several factors which may diminish the potentially inhibiting effects of job security, the ambiguity in teacher evaluation, and the desire to avoid conflict (Bridges, 1986, 1992): A. the emergence of parental complaints that supply the necessary external arguments for the principal to respond. B. The more a district's enrolment declines, the smaller a district in size, and the more a district experiences financial squeeze, all these factors increase the pressure laid on the administrators to respond; C. the importance the district attaches to teacher evaluation (e.g. measured by the number of warning notices sent to the Californian incompetent teachers).

According to Bridges (1986, 1992) once a teacher has been identified as a poor performer, heads prefer to tolerate and protect. They use double talk, ceremonial congratulations and give inflated ratings (which are interpreted by the teacher as a sign of approval). They also offer some remedial programs, but the personal and organizational conditions reduce the chances of a successful intervention. About only one quarter of the failing teachers recover with such help. When no improvement happens, principals refer the teacher to 'escape hatches', other positions (e.g. librarian, teaching individual students), which confine the actual damage. Teachers in California may also be transferred to other schools, with better chances to improve with the new conditions. When external situations emerge, such as enrolment decline, financial squeeze or continuing complaints from parents and colleague teachers, principals are forced to make tough decisions. At this stage another factor comes into effect - the importance attached to teacher assessment by the principal. If the school runs a strict procedure of periodical evaluation with formative and summative feedback there is a better foundation to offer assistance or ask the teacher to leave. Proper appraisal enables the substantiation of allegations of incompetence and the initiation of steps toward resignation or dismissal.

Salvage Attempts

At early stages heads tend to overlook the difficulties and diffuse the tension. Principals confront the situation when the problem teacher endangers the school's functioning and reputation. When soft responses do not change the teacher's situation, as often happens, principals may take more rigorous steps. Most principals take responsibility and raise the issue with the teachers concerned. The communication is not always made tactfully. Several teachers report the shock of receiving the allegation in a letter without any previous warning (Wragg et al 1999). Only in a small number of cases (15 per cent according to Wragg's study) others, mainly heads of department or curriculum coordinators, raise the matter first. The salvage stage represents the "caring and just" approach (Phillips and Young, 1997). Administrators may use three types of 'escape hatches': a. Transfer between schools within the district (nicknamed 'the turkey trot' or 'the dance of the lemons' p. 36); b. placement in a position of assisting individual students. c. Reassignment of the incompetent teacher to non-teaching position, such as librarian or even driving the school bus.

After trying to assist, principals and supervisors initiate a period of open criticism, which are met with teachers' defensive responses. Administrators begin to specify more carefully the teacher's behavior, decrease assistance, restrain support and rely more on extensive documentation. According to Bridges (1992), the remedial plans and other measures taken by the administrator often bring little improvement.

There are no miracle cures for the veteran teacher who is deemed 'at risk'. The incompetent performer is not transformed into a fully satisfactory teacher.

When success occurs, it is measured by inches. Not yards. (p. 70)

Induced exits

If the incompetent teacher fails to demonstrate sufficient improvement during the salvage stage, principals may initiate actions to get rid of him or her. When allegations of incompetence are presented it immediately deteriorates the relationships between the principal and the teacher. The perceptions of both sides are likely to become diametrically opposed. Most teachers feel unjustifiably blamed. There are two options to choose at this point: to dismiss the teacher or to attempt to induce the teacher to submit a resignation. The difference between both actions is large. Dismissal stigmatizes the teachers while the induced resignation or early retirement offers the teacher an opportunity to record the resignation as a voluntary act, which saves public humiliation.

Administrators limit the use of dismissals. In his survey, Bridges (1986) discovered that within a two-year period less than six-tenths of one percent of the teachers was dismissed. Not only is the procedure itself very expensive (attorney fees and substitute salaries may rise up to \$150,000), administrators are also aware of the devastating personal meaning for the worker:

Dismissal is the harshest sanction, which can be imposed on an employee and is often regarded as the corporate equivalent of the death sentence...the teacher is removed involuntarily from the district's payroll and is denied all other benefits, rights and privileges of employment. Dismissal stigmatizes the teacher and temporarily deprives him or her of the means of earning a living. (p. 32)

Job termination becomes much easier in case of untenured teachers who lack any job protection. In his survey, Bridges (1986) found that even though temporary teachers constituted only 7 per cent of the teaching force in California, they accounted for approximately 70 per cent of terminations within a period of 18 months. Meanwhile, tenured teachers, the lion's share of the work force (80 percent) accounted for only 5 per cent of the dismissals. Only one quarter of the alleged incompetent teachers improved, but most teachers preferred to leave before the formal stage of dismissal procedure. These managerial steps do not necessarily appear together or in that order. The actual numbers may vary from one state to another in the USA (Sahin, 1998). Moreover, these features are influenced in part by the tolerant treatment of the poor performer in the past. All in all, the treatment in about half the cases in the Wragg et al. (1999) study took between 1-3 years while only one in five took longer. The LEA and the governors of the schools agreed these procedures in advance. Only a small minority of principals followed no predetermined track.

Reflecting upon those sad cases, most principals said they should have responded earlier, especially at the informal stage. Once ignored, the problems simply escalated. In order to change the course of events they had to find a more focused and structured approach, both for those who improved and those who did not. Given that most principals had received no training and consultation on how to deal with such cases, coupled with other above-mentioned reasons, it is not surprising the results were so poor.

Poor performing teachers' response

The situation of the poor performing teacher is not easy either. As long as the principal tolerates the situation, teachers tend to ignore the problem. When first allegations emerge they are met with disbelief, denial and defensive responses. They attack the principal and are willing to blame anything for their failure except themselves (Griffin, 1993). Many teachers feel traumatized and do not know how to react in their best interest. The relationships between heads and the accused teachers soon deteriorate and may irretrievably break down. Even when no particular criteria are used, as with surplus workers lay-offs, it raises anxiety and deteriorates the personal and collective morale (Lauer Schachter, 1988).

Most of the teachers who are induced to leave are novice. Yet, an interesting picture emerges from Wragg et al's (1999) study who managed to collect responses from 70 experienced teachers (80 per cent had taught over 10 years), over half of them had been teaching in the same school for over five years when the first allegations for incompetence were made. The sampled population is not representative, yet the information is unique. Many of them felt strongly that they had been unjustly accused of unsatisfactory performance, some even cited as evidence events in which their effective teaching had been recognized.

The teachers gave a wide range of explanations for the allegations: a belief there was a conspiracy, bullying and victimization, racial discrimination, incompetence by the head, unjustified complaints from parents, and clashes of philosophy. About one third of them agreed to receive support in the initial phases but were less prepared to accept advice as events progressed. Due to the emotional turbulence they experienced some teachers were not aware or were even resistant to acknowledge that advice was offered to them by the principal. Wragg et al (1999) found no relationship between receptiveness for support and the outcome. Reflecting upon their experience many allegedly incompetent teachers felt they should have been more assertive, asked for more information and sought for support in the early stages when the allegations of incompetence were first made against them.

Figure 2.3 Administrators actions and incompetent teacher responses

Adapted from Bridges (1992, p. 125)

Taking a proactive stance with a marginal teacher requires “courage, honesty, knowledge, and hard work” (Staples, 1991, p. 142) on the part of the principal. According to Bridges (1992) findings and the escalation model (Vliert, 1998), even courageous principals would never use harsh means before they have tried spontaneous (e.g. ignoring) and de-escalating actions (e.g. using escape hatches). Only, when these measures do not alleviate the frustration and the problems increase do they turn to confrontation and escalate their actions. Both sides admitted that the most important lesson was the need to respond earlier.

A game with many players and vague rules

The groundbreaking work of Bridges (1986, 1992) has shed some light on the painful and neglected problem of the marginal teachers. The growing awareness of the damage they cause has urged legislators, courts and administrators in the USA to search for more effective methods (Parry, 1991; Rebore, 1991, p. 205). It has also brought a growing number of articles and guidebooks as to how to develop appraisal methods, assistance programs and policies for reducing the numbers of ineffective teachers (Palker, 1980; Rich, 1988; Lawrence, 1993; Fidler & Aton, 1999). Yet, the lack of a clear definition of what is considered as good teaching, the desire to avoid conflict with employees, coupled with the specific national contexts of educational systems prevent an effective operation. The complicated example of the British educational governing bodies that handle the dismissals of teachers will clarify the point.

Responsibilities for the employment of teachers in England lie with the governing bodies of schools. The Education Reform Act 1988 required governing bodies in England to establish disciplinary rules and procedures’ (Schedule 3, paragraph 6). Governors have the power to dismiss a teacher but arrangements must be made for an appeal against the decision. Once they have decided to initiate such acts, heads must follow carefully the agreed procedures aimed at redeeming the identified failing. Only in the case of gross misconduct may a member of staff be suspended, pending further investigation and allowing some reduction in the staging procedure. Appeals may be admitted at every stage (Foreman, 1997). Even where capability procedures exist, head teachers were not always aware of or did not follow them. Forty two per cent of teachers indicated that the head, following the allegation of incompetence, had followed no predetermined procedure and a number of teachers believed that even

when the procedures were available, heads did not use them properly (Wragg et al. 1996). Meanwhile LEA officers, who are under continuous pressure not to tolerate weak teachers expressed concern that they do not have the power to require schools to take action.

Coping with incompetent teachers – the Israeli context

Israeli principals engage in many conflicts. Coping with problematic teachers is among the most frequent and harsh ones they face. Friedman & Ya'acov-Benades (1998) who surveyed 174 high school principals found that 35 per cent of them mentioned such a conflict within the last two years. These conflicts took a relatively long time, from six to twelve months until they were resolved. Due to its 'all or none' nature, negotiators used not only persuasion, but also appeals, to other organizations (e.g. local media, court), demonstrations, strikes, defamation, violence and lawsuits. In many cases (23 per cent) both sides could not reach an agreement and the conflict was brought to court or remained unsolved. These figures do not necessarily represent the overall numbers of incompetent and marginal teachers who work in the Israeli schools. Many less serious cases are kept hidden. Despite these ongoing difficulties, principals spend relatively little time on improving their teachers' performance and discipline.

Rosenblatt and Somech (1998) who observed a sample of 94 elementary school principals found that only 1.4 per cent of their time was devoted to discipline teachers (ranked 24th among 47 work functions required). In larger schools with over 600 students, principals were more occupied with that task - seven minutes (out of two sessions of six hours each), compared to only 2.6 minutes in schools with less than 300 pupils. These figures slightly exceed the time secondary schools' principals in Israel interacted with their teachers (Gali, 1983), and more than elementary school principals in the USA (Kmetz & Willower, 1982).

The relatively short time spent on discipline may reflect the good working behavior of the staff, or the principal's efficacy in treating problems. In contrast, it may stem from the principals' reluctance to engage in painful relations. An Israeli inspector who decided to dismiss a teacher discussed the pressures and humiliation he experienced (Michael, 1999):

When I came to observe his lesson he slammed the door and did not allow me come in. When I explained to him after the lesson that as an inspector I need to meet with him he replied: 'I'd like you to know that greater and smarter than you have tried to fire me and they are all in the grave'. Exactly so. Two teachers who witnessed the case apologized that they would not give a testimony because they are afraid. In the Ministry of Education I explained that since he is an employee of the local municipality I should discuss with them the question of using disciplinary sanctions. (p. 61).

Legal aspects of handling poor performance

The legal basis for a teacher's dismissal is stated in section 8(3) to the Education Order (State of Israel, 1933), set by the British mandate in Palestine. It basically adheres to the notions of misconduct and ineffective teaching. More specifically, pedagogic reasons for the dismissal of a tenured teacher are (State of Israel, 1996):

- (1) serious and steady discipline problems at lessons or constant use of improper means for discipline (e.g. beating, frightening)
- (2) negligence at work (unjustified absenteeism; disobedience which disrupts school's routine; negligence of the duties of a teacher; lack of fulfillment of regulations ordered by the general director)

Other legal sources are collective agreements, civil service regulations, and the Ministry of Education's general director circulars. Attempts to lay foundations for an ethical code within the education system were rejected by the teachers' unions (Taub, 1997). The most ambitious attempt was made by the national committee to examine the status of teachers and the teaching profession (Hed Hachinuch, 1981). The committee, headed by the supreme-court judge Etzioni, was established after a six weeks teachers' strike. It examined in depth the teachers' situation and came up with a detailed rehabilitation plan. The committee also laid out a detailed ethical code and suggested how to establish organizational infrastructure (e.g. regional tribunals) to implement that code. By rejecting that proposal the teachers unions missed an invaluable opportunity to raise the professional image of their profession.

Accredited teachers need two years of experience in order to become tenured (Hed-Hachinuch, 1999). That automatic procedure may be postponed for one more year with

a reasoned letter sent by an inspector. The reasons are often administrative in nature (e.g. lack of registration and lack of a working license) and are made in order to reduce work force and give inspectors more flexibility in handling personnel matters. The formal procedure of dismissal is made gradually, first a warning letter, then an inspecting visits and finally the case is brought to parity committee. The dismissal of teachers can be based on allegations of misbehavior and discipline problems (Law of civil service [discipline] 1963). Tenured teachers are mainly dismissed due to lack of pedagogic fitness or due to closure of schools. (Taub, 1997).

Coping with incompetence – outcomes

The above-mentioned well organized legal and procedural mechanisms should not mislead the reader: dismissing a teacher in Israel is an extremely difficult and lengthy procedure. Collective labor agreements and strong workers unions militantly defend against employer's efforts to lay off its employees. As in other European countries, the number of hired workers who enjoy tenure decreases steadily (Wargeft, 2001). But despite privatization in national firms and the growing tendency in the private sector to sign individual contracts, still 56 percent of workers, mainly in the public sector (e.g. education, hospitals, electric company) are defended by collective labor agreements (compared to 85 percent in the 50's and 60's). Some experts believe that the Histadruth (national workers union) over arching campaign to prevent dismissals gradually eroded its power. Law expert, Prof. Ruth Ben Israel explains:

The unions gave a total defense, not always justified, against lay offs, not permitting to dismiss anyone. They defended the good and diligent workers with the same determination as they did workers who damaged their work place (Wargeft, 2001, p. 4)

In practice, only 10 to 20 teachers are dismissed each year, mainly due to misconduct and bureaucratic reasons, rather than for improper teaching or wrong implementation of the curriculum (Stanner, 1966). Civil service courts seriously consider charges of beating pupils, but instead of dismissing they prefer to reprimand and fine the teachers as deterring sanctions (State of Israel, Civil service court, 1981, 1985, 1986). For example, 140 teachers were accused in civil service courts in the year of 2000 for acts of violence toward pupils. Five teachers were dismissed, 70 teachers were fined and the

rest were still waiting for their trial (Dayan, 2001). Teachers who were charged with criminal acts like embezzlement were reprimanded and fined, while cases of theft and bribe often led to dismissal. Also courts seriously consider negligence and lack of students' supervision within schools and while on outdoor educational activities (Taub, 1997).

Summary

Teachers' poor performance pose a very complicated and sensitive challenge to school principals. In most cases efforts to improve these shortcomings bear only limited results. Rarely do teachers make significant progress and rarely (and quite dramatically) are teachers dismissed. Since worker dismissal endangers vital interests it creates a downward spiral, which involves many individuals and organizations that do not hesitate to use legitimate (and sometimes less legitimate) measures to win their case.

In order to understand better why coping with a challenging teacher is so difficult, it is essential to return to square one, namely, teachers' appraisal. Defining the standards for good teaching, appraising teachers' performance and feed back discussion appeared to be crucial to the teacher's success or failure. This chapter discusses the cognitive aspects. The next two chapters will focus on behavioral and emotional elements within the theoretical framework.

Teachers' effectiveness and its appraisal

The principal's appraisal of the teacher's work plays a crucial role in encouraging good performers and coping with others' shortcomings. But how do principals judge their staff? What criteria do they use? How do they transmit that feedback, and what happens when 'bad news' is involved? Are there differences between educational systems in various nations? And probably the most intriguing question: why is the practice of teachers' appraisal so problematic and painful? This chapter elaborates on these issues.

Defining effective teaching

Effective means being able to bring about the intended result (Oxford dictionary, 1993, p. 245), and effectiveness is 'the judgment we make regarding the performance of individuals, groups and organizations'. The closer their actual performance is to the desired performance the more effective we judge them to be' (Gibson et al. 1988 p. 25). This definition implies that effectiveness includes pre-determined goals for the expected outcomes, which serve as criteria for evaluating the actual performance. Effectiveness therefore is a relative term – not the actual numbers of the performed products but the comparison of that amount to the expected targets. It is the manager's duty to set goals and identify the causes of both individual and organizational effectiveness. Unfortunately managers do not always control the internal and external organizational context, and researchers do not always identify the causes for specific outcomes (Lewin & Minton, 1986).

There are two established approaches to assess workers' effectiveness (Jackobson, 1986): A. the outputs approach, which measures outcomes; B. The inputs approach, which evaluates efforts, capabilities, behaviors, and traits related to the job. The

disadvantages of each approach lead to the emergence of a third view, which combines aspect of both methods.

The outputs approach

The outputs approach like the goal approach (Gibson, 1988) emphasizes the importance of goal achievement as the criterion for judging effectiveness. Anyone who attended school is familiar with the teachers' tasks. Wragg (1993) defines those missions as teaching young children to read and write, to understand the world around them, to grasp and be able to apply fundamental mathematical and scientific principles, to use their developing intelligence and imagination, and to live and work harmoniously with others. In principle, measuring student achievements is highly desirable, but current efforts to develop such evaluation system are facing with daunting challenges of equity and reliability (Danielson, 2001, 15). Many factors affect student learning; it is extremely difficult to attribute such learning to the skills of individual teachers.

The inputs approach

Despite its appeal, the outputs approach fits only limited kinds of occupations. Its drawbacks lead employers to use alternative methods, such as the inputs approach. In this method the criteria are stated in subjective-judgmental terms of the performed elements, its quality and traits, abilities and the potential necessary to perform the job. That approach has two versions (Bowman, 1999):

Trait based scales - the evaluation of personal traits and competencies, professional experience and education, which are supposed to contribute to performance. Teachers have always needed to master a wide range of abilities and competencies. These duties imply that:

An effective teacher should possess knowledge and understanding of the content of the subjects and the topics being taught, as well as ability to manage a class, explain clearly, ask intelligent questions, and monitor and assess learning (Wragg, 1993, p. 1)

It is difficult to translate these skills into operative definitions. What is exactly a clear explanation and how would a teacher know if the question she asked is intelligent.

When a principal evaluates the teacher as 'not committed to school', both of them may have different interpretations as to what commitment actually mean. It also may be that different raters (principal, inspectors, parents) would emphasize different traits as more important than others. Such an appraisal method is far from being perfect, yet the definition of a person as 'warm' 'ambitious' or 'friendly' fits the human tendency to organize complicated perceptions of people in a simple manner. These concepts, though less accurate, are more easily coined and remembered. Trait based scales predict better success in work than act as a tool in professional development.

Behaviorally based methods - when educational goals and the criteria for success are unclear, and when the impressions of teachers of their traits can lead to misunderstanding, a more tangible approach is needed. Defining the activities needed for teaching by breaking them down into specific actions and evaluating its accomplishment offers the principal a more accurate teacher's appraisal tool. The analysis of the occupation into its essential elements enables the measurement of how each aspect is directly related to a failure or success. For example, the ability to manage a class (a trait) can be defined, among other behaviors, by the use of a variety of teaching techniques and instructional materials (behaviors). Several good lists of teachers' duties for use in evaluating and developing teacher competence and performance were compiled in the last years (Scriven, 1994).

Mixed approach - traditional studies on teacher effectiveness have focused largely on the teacher performance in the classroom, but teachers must perform a wide range of roles and responsibilities. Wragg et al. (1996) justly point out:

There is no single way of teaching well; many different styles find favor according to context and circumstances; there will be difference of opinion even amongst those highly experienced in the profession; effectiveness as a teacher extends beyond the boundaries of the classroom, so preparation and planning, pastoral care and relationships with others such as fellow teachers and parents must be taken into account (p. 13).

Cheng and Tsui (1999) believe that the conception of teacher effectiveness should be multifaceted and not confined only to classroom teaching, even though it remains important. Based on school effectiveness literature, they suggest seven models of

teacher effectiveness research, which combine output (achievements) measurement, process analysis, as well as traits and behavior assessment. Setting an assortment of criteria combined with various methods of data collection (e.g. budgetary, constituents satisfaction) seems to promise a better model of assessing such an elusive concept as good teaching. Yet, investigations of supervisor's handling of poorly performing employees tend to look at formal discipline processes, mainly focusing on specific problems and responses (Arvey & Jones, 1985; Mitchell & O'Reilly, 1983). These formal perspectives do not take in account the personal idiosyncratic perspectives - what are the values, criteria, and personal sensitiveness according to which principals determine who are their best teachers and who performs below average? Do these individual cognitive considerations differ from more established formal yardsticks? Is the evaluation in the eye of the beholder? These questions are examined in this study.

Aims of teachers' evaluation

Workers' performance appraisal is the process of identifying the activities, dimensions and the various components required for the successful execution of a job. Bell (1988) depicts the aims that may be involved in appraising staff:

Staff development – principals have a clear responsibility to establish a policy for staff development and training based on systematic assessment of every teacher's performance. Staff appraisal schemes, which are geared primarily to identifying personal in-service needs and improving teachers' performance, can attain that goal (Duke & Stiggins, 1990).

Effective management of teachers - the appraisal process can generate a significant amount of valuable educational information about the staff. Such knowledge can contribute to more effective management of the teaching force.

External accountability – the ever-growing involvement of parents, employers and the community puts teachers' and principals' actions under exacting scrutiny. Emphasizing certain aspects of the curriculum, short and long-term objectives, as well as specific decisions (e.g. who among the staff members would teach the weakest class next year) should be informed and explained. For those who believe that parents have the power to assess who the 'good' and 'bad' teachers are and agree they should have a louder say, the assessment of the parents may contribute an important segment to the overall evaluation process.

Improving pay and promotion – rewarding the efficient and effective teachers can motivate staff members. Principals cannot help improve teachers' salaries, but they can promote the successful teacher to middle management positions, give them better classes etc. Such decisions naturally follow positive results of formal or informal evaluation. For example, in the UK principals have the option of approving a teacher gaining a higher salary through the pay threshold.

Identifying incompetent teachers – some teachers are ineffective and probably should be laid off. Ideally assessment should set agreed standards and enable the identification and dismissal of those who fall short of that benchmark. Introducing an appraisal method immediately implies compiling a measurement scale. As with each goal, a set of procedures and professional standards must be developed and used regularly in order to help insure that evaluations attain the highest levels of quality and fairness of all their aspects.

In education such standards must be employed to enhance and assess both systems used to evaluate teachers and evaluation of individual teachers.

(Shinkfield & Stufflebaum, 1995, p.18)

Formative and summative evaluation

Teachers' appraisal is meant to provide answers to specific questions: what are the teacher's personal and professional development needs and what are the outcomes he or she produces? Middlewood and Cardno (2001, p.5) describe these questions as two poles on a continuum. More established definitions identify those poles as a summative 'objective' approach and a formative 'process-oriented' approach (Clemmett and Pearce, 1986).

Table 3.2 Dimensions of evaluation
(After Clemmett and Pearce, 1986, p.36)

Objectives approach ←-----→	Process approach
Summative	Formative
External	Internal
Formal	Informal
Generalization	Case particular
Product	Process
Judgmental	Descriptive
Pre-ordinate	Responsive
Analytical	Holistic

The 'objectives approach' attempts to quantify outcomes in terms of 'pre-specified and measurable objectives' (Clemmett and Pearce, 1986, p.36). Summative evaluation is a set of procedures designed to assist the appraiser to decide whether the teacher meets certain pre-determined criteria (e.g. an inspector's visit to observe a novice teacher before granting tenure). The process approach represents a descriptive and subjective view of assessment, where the evaluation is part of a development process. Formative evaluation provides teachers with data for making decisions on how they can improve their own teaching style, techniques and strategies. In addition to these formal stages, principals are busy monitoring daily activities, assisting their staff and helping teachers get developed. This study elaborates on the informal aspects of the appraisal process: what are the sources of information principals relied upon? Are there certain methods used more often than others to collect data? Is there a connection between the nature of informants and the kind of information they bring, for example, to whom does the principal listen to in order to identify a poor performing teacher? How do they give feedback about their impressions?

The practices of teachers' appraisal reflect not only the routines of individual schools, but also the national contexts, such as Ministry of Education procedures; community pressures for higher achievements; emphasis on values of teachers' accountability; local or national surplus or shortage of teachers, political games (Bridges & Groves, 1999) and other national and international factors (see Middlewood & Cardno, 2001). The following section will provide some concrete examples of teachers' appraisal practices in United Kingdom and the USA. An attempt to provide a comprehensive survey of appraisal practices is beyond the scope of this work

Teacher appraisal in the UK

During the 1970s and 1980s grew a sentiment for improved professional personnel decision-making in schools and increased accountability. The move to a market economy in education, with school and college income tied firmly to recruitment, increased the salience of the market model (Bush, 1994a, p. 324). These changes have gradually reshuffled traditional relationships, power structure and organizational responsibilities among those internal and external to schools. An example of that ideological and practical shift was the 'Aims of appraisal in England and Wales', set out in *The School Teacher Regulations* (1991), which emphasized improving schools

management, professional development, assisting failing teachers, career development, and recognition of achievements. In addition, the bitter struggle over teachers' pay in 1987 and the piloting of appraisal schemes in 1992 introduced more strongly the notion of teacher appraisal (Middlewood, 2001). More recently, the consultancy group of Hay/McBer reported its study's results on teacher effectiveness (Hay/McBer, 2000b). The report states three main factors within the teacher's control that significantly influence pupil progress: teaching skills, professional characteristics and classroom climate. The Government adopted the report's criteria for performance management (DfEE, 2002).

The scheme prescribed classroom observation (two sessions), an appraisal interview by the principal or other senior managers, and setting of targets. If some concerns were raised then a second follow-up meeting may have been scheduled. There was considerable attention paid in the regulations to the right of appeal (in case teachers object the appraiser's final conclusions), and to the confidentiality aspect of the process. Each school developed its own method of appraisal and the relevant questions. Only rarely has assessment been done through peer appraisal. (Barber et al. 1995; Middlewood et al. 1995; Pennington, 1996). The first results were met with enthusiasm, but declined later due to some drawbacks (Nixon, 1995). It was realized that appraisal could not remain non-judgmental and non-threatening. Such 'soft' practice, almost 'equivalent of the confessional' (Kedney & Saunders, 1993) omitted any chance for a more rigorous personnel decision-making, and it called for greater governor involvement in order to increase teachers' and managerial accountability (Ofsted/TTA, 1996). It was also realized that certain groups, such as part-time staff members and supply teachers are not easily included within the system of personnel appraisal that developed. More serious concerns grew out of findings that in many schools the appraisal never began to be implemented (Ofsted/TTA 1996; Stokes, 2000) and that 'in many schools there appeared to be no relationship between appraisal and wider school issues' (Hopkins & West, 1994 p.13).

Formal evaluations of the appraisal scheme (Barber et al, 1995; Middlewood et al. 1995; Hopkins & West, 1994) presented pictures of limited effectiveness. Middlewood (2001) offers several explanations to that limited success. The historical background of disputes over pay and conditions and the suspicion of many teachers that any form of

appraisal was to weed out poor teachers created a negative climate. In addition, the scheme lacked real accountability, emphasizing a non-judgmental guidance for professional development and they omitted any chance to use the evaluation for HRM decision-making. Further, most teachers could not identify any connection between the process they had been through, and any visible progress for them or the school. The scheme also focused on developing individuals at the expense of organizations. These findings reflect some of the inherent difficulties as well as 'childhood sicknesses' in the implementation of such complicated and sensitive endeavor. Middlewood (1997) offers some solutions:

For appraisal of any kind to be effective, in both its developmental and evaluative aspects, it needs to be embedded within the culture of the organization. The establishment of this culture, within which performance is monitored and feedback given, remains perhaps the key task of senior managers (p. 178).

In addition to teachers' improvement, the government also tried to establish a procedure of payment by merit. Despite the firm resistance raised by teachers unions, teachers have been allowed to put in a claim to go above a salary 'threshold' and gain an annual bonus of 2000 pounds. School principals were given the task of sifting through those applications and then approving or not approving the teacher's raise in pay. The clear conditions set out for what justifies the teacher going beyond the threshold did not prevent the situation where processing an enormous amount of paperwork ends with accepting almost every claim (Dean, 2001).

Teachers' evaluation in the USA

In the past, teacher evaluation in the USA has received little attention, in part because improving the quality of teachers has not been seen as critical for improving the quality of education (Darling-Hammond, 1990). Schools were led according to the scientific principles, as an assembly line, with each worker (teacher) having a highly specific, carefully time-managed task. The managers were assumed to be highest in the organizational and professional hierarchy.

Those higher in the hierarchy are presumed to know more about teaching, learning and other matters of schooling than those lower, and thus the person at the next higher level evaluates each person in a school. (Sergiovani, 1994, 216)

The push for teacher quality has developed from the modern school reform movement. The first phase began, like many other reforms with the 1983 publication of *A Nation at Risk* (National Commission on Excellence in Education). The commission has focused on improving the curriculum, altering school management methods, and developing new reform programs. In the second phase in the 1990s the Commission has focused on the role of challenging academic standards for students and the use of effective methods to assess those standards (Danielson, 2001). The third phase began with the 1996 publication of *What Matters Most: Teaching for America's Future* (National Commission on Teaching and America Future). That paper propelled the concept of teacher quality to the forefront of the policy agenda.

In response to these new perceptions, states and local school districts initiated a wide range of policy changes affecting the certification, evaluation, and tenure affecting currently employed and prospective teachers. A large number of states have adopted teacher competency tests as a prerequisite for teacher certification. Other measures such as preliminary tests for admission to teacher education programs; higher standards for admission to colleges of education; replacing lifetime teaching certificates with requirements for continuing license holding; supervision and evaluation programs for beginning teachers, and continuing education. Most states have legislated requirements for teacher performance evaluation; some have gone even further to specify which instruments to use. Some states have mandated the use of procedures for merit pay or as a prerequisite for promotion (Darling Hammond, 1990; Jacobson and Battaglia, 2001). The vast array of schools and educational settings across the USA does not enable the description of the countless variations of teacher's appraisal methods.

Teachers' appraisal in Israel

In principle, appraisal is formally implemented by MoE inspectors, but the supervision in Israeli schools is pervasive – curriculum, induction to work, timetables, school structure and classes, to name a few - except for the pedagogic component. Israeli teachers enjoy full autonomy (Friedman, 1990; Nevo, 1987), and informal colleagues'

evaluation replaces external assessment (Kremer-Hayoun, 1993). Eden (1998) has identified in a small-scale research (one high school) three indirect mechanisms of supervision: informal staff control, clients (students, parents) feedback, and teamwork. All these means replace other formal measures and principals are less pressured to use formal methods. From an administrative standpoint, personnel decisions (promotion, dismissal) within the Ministry of Education are rarely substantiated by formal documentation from heads. Even schools inspectors, who are legally and administratively in charge of personnel management, have no formal procedures for evaluating teachers.

The Ministry of Education via its department for evaluation holds each year a comprehensive appraisal of fifty schools across Israel (see MoE, 1997). These surveys explore general aspects like implementation of curriculum; teachers' development plans; stakeholders' satisfaction, and students' achievements. Unlike the Ofsted evaluation in the UK (Ofsted/TTA, 1996), the detailed results and recommendations submitted to the principals hold no sanctions for negligence or poor performance. The only formal procedure of formative and summative appraisal was initiated two years ago with regard to first year teachers (MoE, 2001). Attending teaching proficiency training, which include a two-hour weekly workshop at a teachers college and being supervised by an experienced colleague teacher is mandatory for being licensed. The appraisal is held twice a year, once in January, as a formative act and at the end of school year where the supervisor fills in a summative form. A formal committee considers the evaluation and may decide whether the teachers are eligible to continue teaching or need an additional training year, or should be denied a license.

Obstacles on the road for teacher appraisal

It now becomes clear that despite its potential importance, teacher appraisal is a relatively young practice that suffers several serious 'childhood sicknesses.' The first one is the subject being evaluated: what is considered as effective and good teaching? The daily experience shows that people hold strong personal views on what is effective teaching, which they can defend, quite persuasively, but others believe that many of its aspects are conceptually and methodologically unclear.

Perhaps the major unresolved validity issue from both the testing specialist's and the lay person's point of view is the absence of technically, logically, educationally, and ethically defensible criteria for good teaching. (Dwyer, 1995, p. 38)

It is relatively easy to set effectiveness criteria for simple jobs. The number of letters a secretary has typed in a certain day is one example, but appraising outputs of complicated jobs (e.g. department manager, inspector), or evaluating an organization producing no tangible outputs is much harder. To make it more complex, the evaluation depends also on the observer perspectives. Parent's point of view may significantly differ from that of a staff member. With so much relativity inherent, it would be safe to conclude that as there are many aspects that should be included in evaluating schools (e.g. student achievements, social climate, administrative effectiveness) (Nevo, 1997), so teachers may excel in different aspects and no unitary scale can do justice to everyone. In order to develop a sound appraisal system, the first step is to define clearly what is considered as good teaching; who are the appraisers and what exact aspects are being evaluated. Each system is therefore unique to a certain extent, and cannot be replicated in other contexts.

Another issue that affects the appraisal effectiveness is difficulties in measurement. What aspects of the teacher performance are selected? Like searching for a coin under a streetlight, performance criteria give the principal only a limited scope, and hide many other bright or darker sides of the teacher's functioning. Many factors are beyond the teacher's control. Does the evaluator take that in account? What appraisal methods are used? Some are more reliable than others, for example, 360 degrees appraisal gives a more comprehensive account than self-assessment (Barber, 1990; Dyer, 2001). Other methods, such as portfolio (Dyer, 2001; Oakley, 1998) may tremendously substantiate the principal's random impressions. Further, with regard to rating scales 'there is not any substantive evidence to support the appropriateness and especially usefulness [of its use] within teachers evaluation systems' (McGreal, 1990, p. 53). Another dilemma is who are the appraisers? Are they really acquainted with the teacher? Do the teachers participate in developing the appraisal tools?

The goals and organizational conditions, such as climate of trust and cooperation contribute significantly to the implementation of appraisal. Once these conditions are not strictly observed and the evaluation process is misused, trust is difficult to restore (Dyer & Carothers, 2000). Since the management role is designed to maximize employees' cooperation and output production it often portrays them as not trustworthy, even under team management systems (Fantasia et al, 1988; Applebaum & Batt, 1994). Once the gathered data is used to make judgments about placements, status, salary, or conditions, the evaluation is naturally summative and involved with less trust and increased concern and anxiety. Only once the data is fed back to the teacher for their use in improvement and *never* used to make judgments, is the evaluation system formative.

Another dilemma: who is being appraised? It is easier for principals to assess novice teachers, but once these teachers have obtained tenure, their evaluation is driven primarily by parents and students complaints. Only recently new appraisal methods more suitable for experienced teachers (Howard & McColskey, 2001; Danielson, 2001; Painter, 2001; Sawyer, 2001) began to replace the 'complaint-driven approach' used by administrators (Bridges, 1990).

Teacher evaluation is a mechanism, among other means, aimed to supervise and control staff behavior. The control must be balanced with relationships of trust and autonomy in order to preserve high level of political stability and certainty in the relationships between management and workers (Katz & Kahn, 1978). Submitting feedback is maybe the most sensitive, anxiety-provoking encounter (Cardno, 2001), and it can be compared to the ordeal of submitting bad news. When such a message is potentially threatening for both sides'; personal and professional self-esteem drives both, the sender and the receiver to save themselves from that experience. That well-known *MUM effect* (Rosen Tesser, 1970), the tendency to keep Mum about Unpleasant Messages and avoiding of transmission of bad news stems from the ambiguity of social norms concerning such behavior, and personal costs such as unpleasant changes in mood, and the fear of a strong emotional reaction from the recipient (Tesser & Rosen, 1975). Some principals simply cannot handle that stressful situation. They replace keeping high professional standards with maintaining good relations with the appraised teacher.

They ignored or overlooked the poor performance, filled written observation reports sprinkled with glowing generalities such as “I really enjoyed my visit”. They used double-talk in written evaluations to muffle criticism of the teacher performance, and inflated performance ratings in the mistaken belief that these evaluations would act as positive reinforcement. Only when numerous complaints from parents and students surfaced the subsequent teacher evaluations has been changed (Bridges, 1992, 148).

Finally, on a more general level, the race for personal and organizational improvement may drive schools’ managements to use measures, which Walker and Stott (2000) compared to the use of anabolic steroids in sports. Overdose of such measures, including teachers’ appraisal can take heavy toll: first, it is time consuming (Turner & Clift, 1988). Secondly, it may create social pressure and endanger the good relationships among staff members. Appraisal procedures raise the level of personal discomfort and anxiety (Smith et al., 2000). For example, it was found that women teacher more than men teachers and elementary more the secondary teachers are more prone to suffer the stress involved in appraisal (Travers & Cooper, 1996). Further, even with regard to its declared aims, introducing a performance management system may lead to the sad conclusion that:

The appraisal component of the present system clearly had deleterious effects on staff members’ organizational commitment and attitudes toward supervision, particularly among high-performer employees. (Taylor & Pierce, 1999, p. 448)

No wonder an anonymous person once explained that appraisal ‘is given by someone who does not want to give to someone who does not want to get it’ (quoted in Bowman, 1999).

Summary

Identifying specific profiles of skills and traits of outstanding teachers has theoretical and practical advantages. It enables the improvement of the selection of proper candidates and helps train novice teachers to become good professionals. Several authors believe that appraisal’s most critical benefit is that it creates the opportunity for

dialogue about performance based on observation and reflection on practice (Cardno & Piggot-Irvine, 1997; Hutchinson, 1997; Middlewood, 1997). Ideally, feedback builds a platform for launching possibilities for development (Middlewood, 2001, p. 11), but more often than not hidden human hesitations and fears defeat these clear organizational benefits, and turn a potentially precious interpersonal experience into a technical activity.

When teacher appraisal appears to be such a problematic link along the chain of coping with poor performing teachers, it remains to explore what role leadership qualities and managerial practices take with regard to this challenge. The next chapter is devoted to the behavioral aspects within the three-component model.

Managerial behavior and leadership styles

Coping with teachers' difficulties is only one among many duties managers need to fulfill every day. Management represents a very complicated encounter between leaders and followers. Klein and House (1995) inspirationally compared leadership to a flame created by three elements: The spark – the leader; the burning material – the followers; the oxygen - the situation. The three elements not only enable the lighting of the fire but also determine its vigor. The theories relating to leaders in organizations can be categorized into those, which emphasize the quality of an individual leader or even propose an ideal leader, and those which emphasize the importance of situational variables interacting with the leader, the later known as contingent theories (Dessler, 2000). This study examines the relationships between these three elements – the principal, the teachers and the context of the situation

Figure 4.1. A Contingency Schema for Understanding Leadership

Adapted form Hoy & Miskel, 1996, p. 376.

Bold - variables examined in this study.

This chapter provides the theoretical foundation of managerial behavior, which later would enable one to analyze how principals cope with challenging teachers. It begins with some more general reflections on management in comparison to leadership. It is then followed by a discussion on managerial behavior, which later helps to build the notion of management styles. An additional element, which initially presented here and later assists the analysis of the results, is the leader-member exchange theory (LMX). The second half of this chapter elaborates on the author's model of management along dimensions of demanding and giving (Yariv, 1999). More specifically, the styles of hard-leading, soft-leading, and balanced leading are introduced and compared to other dual process models.

Management and leadership

Out of the many roles, the principal is first and foremost a leader of the organization, the one who uses 'effective influence' (Argyris, 1976, p. 226) in order to 'build cohesive and goal-oriented teams' (Clark et al, 1993, p. 177). But the principal also wears the manager's hat. A clever distinction states that 'a manager does the thing right; a leader does the right thing' (Bennis and Nanus, 1985, p. 22). The first role is about carrying out a policy by shaping the structures, and processes to produce the desired goals. The second role formulates that policy by shaping people around her commitment or vision. Zaleznik (1975), a psychoanalyst of Harvard Business School brilliantly describe the differences between managers and leaders:

Managers goals, arise out of necessities rather than desires; they excel at diffusing conflicts between individuals or departments, placing all sides while ensuring that an organization's day to day business gets done. Leaders, on the other hand adopt personal, active attitudes toward goals. They look for the potential opportunities and rewards that lie around the corner, inspiring subordinates and firing up the creative process with their own energy. Their relationships with employees and coworkers are intense, and their working environment is often, consequently chaotic (p. 61)

The current work is based on the individualistic view of leadership, but recognizes the influence of situational factors. Effective performance by an individual, group or

organization 'is assumed to depend on leadership by individual with the skills to find the right path and motivate others to take it' (Yukl, 1999 p. 292). There are scholars who challenge that view, claiming that the leader's impact on the organizational outcomes is relatively minimal (Kerr & Jermier, 1978; Jermier & Kerr, 1997). Since most employees, for most of the time, appear to know what to do, leadership therefore is merely a phenomenon in the eyes of the beholder (Robinson, 2001). According to Gronn (2000) organizational influence is frequently reciprocal and even though the actors perform different operations, they depend on each other, and the leadership is distributed and passed down to others in the organization. This work relies on Yukl's attitude, leaving contingency theories like Fiedler's (1967) influential work and others' contribution on leadership to be examined elsewhere.

If management, according to the well rehearsed aphorism, is getting things done through other people, then:

An organization needs good management, not necessarily good leadership, to survive – that is people who can deal with the day-to-day functions, activities, and routines. Otherwise, the organization falls apart from the bottom up.... It's only after many years that poor leadership takes a toll on the organization – that is, when trends or events catch up to the organization (Lunenburg and Ornstein 1996, p. 113).

Since this work aspires to contribute useful knowledge on management, it remains within the daily experiences of school principals and focuses on the practical behavioral aspects of management. *Managerial behavior* depends on how "managers" and "behavior" are defined (Hales, 1995). For example, convening a meeting or monitoring others' performance may be done in a context other than of management. The term is not necessarily synonymous with what "managers", as an occupational category, do. As for "behavior", one needs to distinguish between managerial *work*, *jobs* as clusters of work and *behavior* within jobs; between what managers are *expected* to do and what they *actually* do; and between the *ends* (tasks/responsibilities) and means (actions/behavior) of managerial work. Caution is needed therefore with respect to these nuances.

Dimensions of managerial behavior

The behavior of managers and leaders has been the subject of research since the beginning of the 20th century and it was intensified after World War II. The ever-growing demand for managers in business and non-profit organizations has encouraged researchers to develop new management theories and help by which to improve the training of novice managers. For many years the professional literature focused on planning, coordinating, organizing and monitoring as the four central elements of management. By the 70's Henry Mintzberg (1973) and others claimed that the study of these four functions hinder what managers actually do, and the focus of studies has turned to examine dimensions of daily behavior. Several researchers asked for example what behaviors make an excellent management (Bennis & Nanus, 1985; Kotter, 1990; Peters & Waterman, 1984).

Blake & Mouton (1981, pp. 336-344) classify two categories of theories according to the number of dimensions they use to analyze leadership:

Monistic models of leadership - The behavior is measured on a one-dimension continuum, such as boss-centered control at one extreme to subordinate-centered at the other. This influential model suggested by Tannenbaum and Schmidt (1973) assumes that the boss has the ability to exercise full authority but the participation of the subordinates in the decision-making process reduces the manager's power.

Dualistic models of leadership

According to that classification, two different and unconnected measures of behavior are used to determine a person's leadership style. The score on each dimension is added to (or subtracted from) the result of the second dimension and together they create an arithmetic concept of leadership. In studies on leadership at the University of Michigan (Likert, 1961, 1967) two kinds of orientations were discerned: concern toward employees and concern toward production. *Employee-oriented leaders* focus on the individuality and personality needs of their employees and emphasize building good interpersonal relationships. *Job centered leaders* focus on production and the job's technical aspects. Blake and Mouton (1978, 1985) developed probably the most popular approach - *the managerial grid*. The grid was built to assist supervisors to understand their managerial style and improve it (Blake & McCauley, 1991). The model is based on two dimensions: concern for production and concern for people. Figure 4.2

shows 81 possible variations of the two aspects of management. Blake and Mouton focus on the four extreme positions, as well as on the middle 5,5 style. Blake and Mouton (1981) maintain the managerial grid has a third motivational dimension – the desire to gain affection, or not to lose love (people-oriented) and the quest to perform the task and not to lose control (task-oriented). The model does not explain how that dimension adds to the overall scheme and to what predictions it leads. They also argue that the most effective leaders are high on both production and people concern (9,9).

Figure 4.2. The academic administrator grid

Adapted from Blake and Mouton, 1981, p. 12

Figure 4. The Academic Administrator Grid

Yukl (1998) notes that managerial behavior must be relevant to the situation in order to be effective, where group members, as well as the leader, can contribute to the leadership needs of a group. Blake and Mouton's model never actually states such a specific (and important) linkage.

Groups benefit from this behavior [concern for people and production] when members as well as leaders exhibit it. Thus, the most appropriate leader behavior may actually depend on the group. If a group contains members who can provide one of these necessities, then the best behavior for the leader might be to provide the other. (Berry, 1998, P.311)

At about the same time of the Michigan studies, researchers at Ohio State University studied leadership from different perspective (Halpin & Winer, 1952; Halpin, 1966). They suggested a two dimensions scheme of *initiating structure* and *initiating consideration* (or 'social-emotional support'), and based the research tool they developed – *leader behavior description questionnaire (LBDQ)* on these dimensions. Four major findings emerged (Halpin, 1966):

- Initiating structure and consideration are fundamental dimensions of leader behavior
- Effective leader behaviors tend most often to be associated with frequent behaviors on both dimensions.
- Superiors and subordinates tend to evaluate the contributions of the leader behavior dimensions oppositely in assessing effectiveness. Superiors tend to emphasize initiating structure; subordinate are more concerned with consideration.
- Only a slight relationships exists between how leaders say they should behave and how subordinate describe that they do behave.

Several other two-factor models were developed: Hersey and Blanchard (1977) suggested a situational approach to leadership with interaction between directive and supportive behaviors, which can be modified according the nature of the task and the level of development, experience and commitment of the subordinates. In this situational theory they attach the level of commitment and professional experience to the worker's position in the organizational hierarchy (e.g. novice worker, middle manager). For example, the *delegating* leader lets the subordinates themselves decide what to do. Such style works best with the most committed and experienced staff members who are willing to do the job and know how to perform it. Other styles are *participating*, *selling*, and *telling*. On a different track, several authors (Spence and Helmreich, 1978; Bem, 1974; Gray, 1989,1993) introduced the

variables of masculinity and femininity, where females use a collaborative and ‘people-oriented’ style of management and males a formal, autocratic, achievement oriented approach. Leary (1957) suggested a cross with two axes – the x-axis ranges from hostility at one end point through neutrality to affection at the other end. The y-axis ranges from dominance through neutrality to the other end of submissiveness.

Dimensions of content and form in managerial behavior

Another classification of managerial behavior (Hales, 1995) is made along dimensions of *content* - what managers actually do? And *form* – how they do it? Such works examine from different perspectives both specialist/professional and general managerial elements; not all included in the content of one job. For example, Yukl (1998) identified four basic behavior categories and eight administrative practices:

Table 4.1 Leader’s behavior and administrative practices

<u>Building Personal Relationships</u>	<u>Deciding</u>	<u>Motivating</u>	<u>Communicating</u>
Mentoring	Planning	Recognizing	Informing
Team Building	Problem Solving	Rewarding	Listening

Handy and Aitken (1986, p.32-33) discuss the managerial practices and its connection to broader organizational policy:

1. Decide on their key tasks and the constituencies that they serve (the *strategy*).
2. Divide up the work to be done (the *structure*);
3. Find ways of monitoring what is going on (the *system*);
4. Recruit the right people and keep them excited and committed (the *staff*);
5. Train and develop them in the competencies required (the *skills*);
6. Work out the best way to lead and relate to the people (the *style*);
7. Above all, create a sense of mission and a common set of beliefs (*shared values*);

A more recent approach to defining the manager’s job has focused on management competencies. These are defined as a cluster of knowledge, skills, and attitudes related to effective managerial performance. One of the most comprehensive

competency studies has come out of the United Kingdom (Carrington, 1994 and others). It is called the management charter initiative (MCI). This analysis is based on management activities and focuses on what effective managers should be able to do, rather than on what they know. The MCI sets generic standards of management competences and behaviors. For example, as with the basic competence “create, maintain and enhance effective working relationships”, the middle manager is expected “to identify and minimize interpersonal conflict”.

Other ‘content’ elements used in the analysis of leadership are the conception of managers as subjects to “demands”, “constraints” and “choices” (Stewart, 1982,1991), the configuration of management as ‘interpersonal’, ‘informational’, and “decisional” roles (Mintzberg, 1973), the view of managers as having their own “agendas” through “networks” of contacts (Kotter, 1982), and the analysis of the expectations surrounding managerial positions (Machin, 1982).

Other studies examine the *form* of managerial behavior – the frequent characteristics of managers’ work. The main findings within the school context are (Hoy & Miskel, 1996, p. 324):

- Management is feverish and consuming work. School administrators work long hours at an unrelenting, physically exhausting pace.
- School leaders rely on verbal media. They spend a great deal of time walking around the building and talking to individuals and groups.
- Administrators’ activities vary widely. They are concerned with ad hoc, day-to-day activities and constantly change gears and tasks.
- The work is fragmented, with commuting between short, interrupted activities. They frequently react to, instead of initiate activities.

Leadership styles

‘Management style’ is one of those all-inclusive terms in social sciences which are open to many interpretations. The term style ‘is roughly equivalent to the manner in which the leader influences subordinates’ (Lunenburg & Ornstein, 1996, p. 139).

Fiedler (1967) maintains that *leadership behavior* denotes the specific acts of a leader in directing and coordinating the work of group members, while *Leadership style* refers to the underlying need structure of the leader that motivates behavior in various

interpersonal situations. In essence, leadership style is a personality characteristic; it does not describe a consistent type of leader behavior.

Among the most influential leadership styles we may count the classic study of Lewin, Lippitt and White (1939) who identified experimentally three known styles: *autocratic*, *democratic*, and *laissez-faire leadership*. More recent styles were the *transactional leadership* (Hollander, 1985) and *transformational leadership* (Bass, 1985; Howell & Avolio, 1993; House & Howell, 1992). The notions of transactional and especially the transformational leadership style have been generating much interest and research (see Bass, 1985; Yukl, 1998; Popper, 1999), but they are beyond of the theoretical scope of this study and will not be discussed any further.

Management as a social interaction

Management is not only planning or making decisions. It also deals with relations between superiors and their subordinates. This study examines what are the informal aspects of relation in addition to the more role defined elements.

Simple acts of give and take, the sense of closeness and the pleasure of working together are not often mentioned within the framework of content and form of managerial behavior. Yet, relations are extremely important component in management. For example, Fiedler and Garcia (1987) found that the quality of leader-member relations is the most important factor in determining the leader's influence over group members, followed by task structure and position power. The relative importance of the three components has been shown to be 4:2:1 ratio. Focusing on relations represents an interactionist perspective, which has long been established within research in social sciences (Robertson, 1987). For example, the social exchange theory (Blau, 1964; Homans, 1961; Thibaut & Kelley, 1959) and the equity theory (Adams, 1965; Messick & Cook, 1983) discuss various aspects of daily exchanges and the expected results in case of imbalanced relations. Such approach is the *leader - member exchange model* (also called LMX - *the vertical dyad linkage model*). Since supervisor and subordinate are staged on different levels of the organizational hierarchy, they form a vertical dyad, which determine the roles, behavior, and outcomes of both parties. (Dansereau et al, 1975; Graen & Cashman, 1975; Greenberg, 1996; Lee, 1997; Boyd & Taylor, 1998).

The development of these interactions is described as a series of steps that begins with the initial acquaintance between the members of the dyad (Dienesch & Liden, 1986;

Liden et al, 1997). These mutual interactions are followed by a sequence of exchanges in which individuals “test” one another to determine whether they can build their relations on trust, respect, and obligation necessary for a high quality exchanges to develop (Uhl-Bein et al, 2000). If the responses are not positive (e.g. not reciprocated, or fail to show competence) the relationships will not develop.

LMX relationships were identified to have four dimensions (Dienesch & Liden, 1986; Liden & Maslyn, 1998) – *contribution* (e.g. performing work beyond what is specified in the job description), *affect* (e.g. friendship and liking), *loyalty* (e.g. loyalty and mutual obligation), and *professional respect* (e.g. respect for professional capabilities).

Leaders may use different styles with different members of the same work group. They tend to divide their subordinates into an ‘in’ group and an ‘out’ group and treat them accordingly. The relationship is initiated when the boss likes the worker and views him or her as capable and motivated (Dockery & Steiner, 1990). The social exchange within the in-group dyad enables the worker to assume more responsibility and to receive in return recognition and support from the leader. The leader benefits from the member’s loyalty, respect and even better overall performance (Vecchio & Godbel, 1984; Duarte, Goodson & Klich, 1993). Out-group exchange occurs when the leader does not value the subordinate, and views him or her as neither well qualified nor motivated. The leader behavior becomes more directive and authoritative, allowing little responsibility and the communication is one-way. As a result the subordinate shows little loyalty and motivation. That classification of ‘in’ and ‘out’ is usually based on very little information. Yet, perceived leader-member similarities, such as gender, age or attitudes are usually important. Even a personal characteristic such as extrovert behavior is perceived positively (Phillips & Bedeian, 1994), presumably because it is outgoing and friendly in general. The differences in the quality of interactions have significant implication to the individual and the organization. A meta-analysis by Gerstner and Day (1997), for example, suggests that there are significant relationships between LMX and job performance, satisfaction with evaluation, overall satisfaction, commitment, role conflict, role clarity, member competence and turnover intentions.

The silent power of demanding and giving

Human relations are certainly important in managing others, but how do we translate them into meaningful and observable terms? This study adopts an interactionist approach, based on simple behaviors of giving and taking, which may act as the building blocks to more complicated human relations of trust, understanding, or disagreement. These simple social exchanges may substitute the broadly defined dimensions, such as 'supportive behavior'. Since these interactions are embedded within human behavior, their translation is referred to here in terms of giving and demanding. Taking, needless to say, cannot be seriously considered as an act of management (though many managers have been accustomed to take), so it has been substituted by an active behavior of 'demanding'. Based on the author's earlier work (Yariv, 1999) this study combines the two dimensions into a scheme, similar to other two-factors models, especially the managerial grid (Blake & Mouton, 1985),

Demanding

Demanding is defined here as any action that conveys a direct request, including raising expectations, asking persons to perform, a follow-up and responses (i.e. sanctions) aimed to ensure the request has been fulfilled. The linguistic definition – 'to ask for (something) as if ordering or as if one has a right to' (Oxford dictionary, 1993, p.202) contains several important elements.

1. A certain ***role definition*** in which one person has formal or informal authority to demand ('has right to'). Authority may stem from different sources: organizational (an army officer and soldier), social (an informal leader and a gang member), designated roles (the client and the cab driver).
2. Unlike a suggestion or advice, a demand is transmitted with ***expectation for performance*** or even obedience.
3. The nature of the request is of a ***burden***. The recipient, normally, would have not committed the mission unless asked. Demanding is almost unnecessary when the task is easy and rewarding.

In schools, principals have formal authority and they use it to transmit many requests everyday. They convey their expectations in private discussions and collective

meetings, orally and in writing, at their office, elsewhere in school or at home (by telephone). Heads demand that the teachers come to work on time, expect high levels of teaching; request teachers to organize ceremonies, and participate in staff meetings. They usually manage to match the task to the right person and divide the burden fairly among the staff members. It is easy to demand from others when they agree to co-operate. It becomes more difficult when the missions are vague or complicated, time consuming and perceived by the teachers as unnecessary.

‘The test of an organization is the spirit of performance ...and the first requirement of organizational health is a high demand on performance’ (Drucker, 1974, p. 456). Managers stand in the front line to establish that command. But somehow the verb ‘to demand’ sounds stern and in contradiction to the zeitgeist (spirit of our time). Modern professional management has evolved out of military organizations where soldiers had to obey officer’s commands (Drucker, 1992). That discipline has been copied into commercial organizations but was later substituted by a democratic framework, such as teamwork. More ‘approved’ management styles could be identified more strongly with models of transformational leadership style, people oriented and the feminine style. With the erosion of hierarchy in organizations, reducing departmentalization, and limiting the line staff, designated managers are no longer necessarily responsible anymore for people but for subjects. Also the boundaries between managers, professionals, and non-managers have become less clear-cut. In schools, for example, professional teachers are almost entirely autonomous in managing their job. Yet, someone has to make sure the work is being done, especially when some workers are not necessarily Y type motivated (Hertzberg, 1966). So, the request, the expression of expectation and even the direct command are inevitable tools within the manager’s arsenal.

Why do people conform to the expectations of others, comply with requests and obey orders? Perhaps the most common form of social influence occurs when people respond to direct requests. People are more likely to comply with a request when they are taken by surprise and when the request sounds reasonable, even if it does not offer real reason for compliance. When the request is a command, and the requester is a figure of authority the resulting influence is called obedience. Several studies (Milgram, 1974; Meeus & Raaijmakers, 1987) showed that in certain circumstances

people easily obey, even when orders are meant to inflict pain to others. Compliance and obedience depend not only on the person's personality but also on other situational factors. Nevertheless, social impact theory (Latane', 1981) predicts that in all cases, social influence depends on the strength, immediacy and number of source persons who exert pressure relative to the target person who absorbs the pressure.

Demands, needless to say, are not well liked, even when they are carried out. The reason, according to the theory of psychological reactance (Brehm & Brehm, 1981) is the demand limits the person's freedom to choose what to do, hence making the banned options more attractive.

Giving

Giving is a common human act. Kissing a child, leaving a tip in the restaurant or explaining to a tourist how to find the museum are all frequent daily experiences. Linguistically, the word has broad range of meanings – to provide, to allow, presenting, to offer and the like (Oxford dictionary, 1993, p.202).

Giving is defined here as any act of providing physical, symbolic and organizational elements to subordinates. There are six kinds of resources to distribute (Fox, 1998, p. 202): relating or loving, status, information, money, services and physical goods. Principals trust their teachers, listen to them and encourage them; promote them, inform and guide them as how to perform a job. Principals also supply materials but unfortunately their hands are usually tied with regard to paying their teachers and administrative staff. Giving, it goes almost without saying, is a relative term. What may satisfy one teacher will not seem enough for another.

Giving reflects first and foremost an act of 'parental' support. But it also causes the recipient to respond, almost automatically by reciprocal giving. The principal's compliments may drive teachers to work harder. Cialdini (1985) argues that the rule of reciprocity was established to promote the development of reciprocal relationships between individuals so that one person could initiate such a relationships without fear of loss. So, the endless small acts of assistance and taking an interest by principals should not mislead teachers into viewing them as philanthropic naïve efforts. Reciprocity is the silent power of the managers to lead others to keep working. Sometimes the reciprocity equation may not be balanced, as when the relationships

become 'dry' and lack personal involvement or alternatively when the relationships are overprotective. Studies show that (Brehm & Kassin, 1990) relationships satisfaction is greatest when the ratio between benefits and contributions is similar for both partners. In inequitable relationships, both the over benefited and the under benefited partners experience negative emotions, but the over benefited are more satisfied. (p. 289)

Management styles by demanding and giving behavior

Practices of giving and demanding help principals achieve their goals. The 'carrot' and the 'stick' are apparently relative terms. Some teachers would regard scheduling an evening staff meeting once a week as reasonable, while other colleagues would complain the frequency is 'unbearable'. The specific combination of using harsh and soft means depend on the principal's personality, management style, job demands and other factors. The style is dynamic and varies according to the situation.

Figure 4.4. Management styles by dimensions of demanding and giving

		Demanding	
		Much	little
Giving	Much	balanced leading	soft-leading (nurturing – spoiling)
	Little	hard-leading (tyranny)	apathy

Principals have a certain image among their staff as how tough or soft they are, should they be more considerate, sensitive or 'strong'. Much or little giving and demanding create four different combinations of management styles:

Soft-leading style

When principals hesitate to insist on punctuality, do not take disciplinary measures against the misconduct of teachers, relate considerately to staff members, pupils and parents even when it is inappropriate to the situation, maintain an image of a 'nice guy' – that is a 'soft leading' style which entails much giving and low demanding. Two words are associated with this style: spoiling and nurturing. Immense giving enables

teachers and pupils to develop and grow. The word nurturing has all-good connotations. It is balanced by the word spoiling, which means (1) to pay much attention to the comfort and wishes of a person, (2) to harm a child's personality by too much kindness or lack of discipline. It also means (3) to make something useless or unsatisfactory (Oxford dictionary, 1993, p. 743). The definition clearly connects between a certain treatment (excessive 'soft and sweet') and its bad results (corruption).

The term spoiling is mainly identified with a child's upbringing. It is a kind of over-protection given by parents who fear their children would not be able to cope with the real-world hardships. Such a 'soft' management style is aimed to save the stress and conflicts that accompany the need to enforce a tight schedule and fulfill ambitious goals. The central motivation of the nurturing-spoiling principal is to help others and maintain good relationships at almost any cost, in order not to lose their affection. The fear of being socially rejected overpowers actions of enforcing requirements, which inevitably raise tension and conflict. Yet, the 'soft' style does not eliminate conflicts, though it may postpone them. Sooner or later teachers will wish to satisfy personal needs (i.e. teach at more convenient hours) and gain more independence. Hesitation or inconsistent responses, especially with regard to problem teachers, could be interpreted as sign of weakness.

Hard-leading style

Hard-leading style describes the imbalance between high expectations, stern demands and punctual follow-up (sometimes accompanied by sanctions), without compatible support, encouragement and just treatment. The principal is concerned with fulfilling his or her personal goals - to set a national record of graduates who received 'A' in mathematics, to produce a special ceremony etc - without paying attention to their needs. Hard-leading style may be defined, somewhat extremely, as a tyranny. For example, the Israelites complain to Pharaoh: 'you do not give straw and yet you demand of us to make bricks' (Ex. 5, 16). The principals' central motivation is to gain power and control over others and achieve success. What frightens them most is any sign of losing control. Any indication of (what is perceived as) revolt would be treated harshly, even at the cost of losing the emotional and social support of the teachers. Maintaining good relationships plays a minor role for this type of behavior.

The hard-leading style has advantages (given the principal has good management skills) - running a well-organized and quite successful institution. Staff members know their roles and obey the expectations. Yet, performing difficult duties without much assistance may reduce motivation and job satisfaction, and decrease the sense of responsibility. They would find reasons (e.g. reporting of being sick) to avoid fulfilling certain duties, but their compliance does not necessarily mean peaceful acceptance of the situation. Facing tough bosses who insist on fulfilling their demands, as sometimes expressed by impatient American superiors "it is my way or the highway" may lead subordinates to feel anger and frustration. Workers could exhibit signs of conquered aggression – spreading rumors and jokes behind the boss's back, and may displace their aggression into deliberate actions of damaging the organization (e.g. theft, letting inner stories leak to the media).

Should the principal act soft or tough? In his article 'The hard work of being a soft manager' Peace (1991) maintains that tough management does not necessarily mean effective management. Self-confidence can be a cover for arrogance or fear, 'resolute' can be a code for autocratic, and 'hard-nosed' can mean thick-skinned. The principal's dilemma is how to satisfy at the same time the organizational needs and interpersonal concerns (Cardno, 2001). The principal knows that something must be done to ensure that the school's expectations are fulfilled, but the poor performing teacher is supported, especially during difficult period. Peace (1991) describes his decision, against the advice of his closest aides, to meet alone with 15 people he had just laid off. The encounter was emotionally bruising, just as Peace knew it would be. He sat and listened to his former employees poured out their grief, anger, and bewilderment. When they were through, he patiently explained why the survival of the business required that he let them go, even though there was nothing wrong with their performance. And then he explained again. Paradoxically, Peace's display of vulnerability and accessibility was seen for what it was: a sign of strength, not weakness.

Apathy

Apathy is the state of having no wish to act and no enthusiasm (Oxford Dictionary, 1993, p. 33). It applies here to a principal who refrains from demanding, and offers his or her staff very little. Such behavior may be driven by specific attitude, such as the *laissez-faire leadership style* (Lewin, Lippit and White, 1939), or it may reflect the lack

of abilities and resources (e.g. burn-out). The central motivation of the indifferent-style principals is to let the current situation remains as it is and not 'rock the boat'.

It is assumed that no principals will openly admit that they are apathetic. Rather, they would prefer to cover their shortcomings by boasting about achievements never gained, or blaming others for their shortcomings. That management style (closely resembling Blake and Mouton's (1978) type 1.1) has some innate merits. It keeps the calm atmosphere and the convenience of not doing much; in comparison to the "high blood pressure", which characterizes other styles. Its disadvantages are clear: low achievements, sense of hopelessness, and less effectiveness.

Balanced leading style

The combination of much giving and much demanding represents balanced leading competencies, which are quite similar to type 9.9 (Blake & Mouton, 1978). Such a style requires investing much effort, monitoring teachers' and pupils' work, initiating activities, solving conflicts, encouraging and or punishing when necessary. The central motivation is to achieve the educational goals by collective work, in which workers are full participants. Unlike the hard-leading style, which lays most of the responsibility on the teacher's shoulders, and the 'soft' principal who acts as almost the sole person to do the job, the balanced-leading style is characterized with equal share of the burden. The apathetic head neither demands much from himself or herself nor from teachers so many aspects about running the school daily life remain not taken care of.

It is hypothesized that effective management is achieved when both forces are balanced and complement each other. The intensity should be adapted to the needs and the personal and professional level of development of the subordinates. Principals have a certain image among their staff as how tough or soft they are, should they be more considerate, sensitive or 'strong'. Much or little giving and demanding create four different combinations of management styles:

Two-factors models compared and reviewed

Maybe the most established typology of management was developed at Michigan State University and at Ohio State University. The two-factor model describes two levels of

production-oriented behavior, which interacts with two levels of people-oriented behavior, and helps create four distinct leadership styles. A comparison follows between the two factor models, Rahim's (1985) conflict management style and the current model of demanding and giving.

Table 4.2 Leadership styles outgrow two-factors models

	<i>Ohio State University studies</i> Initiating structure and consideration	<i>Managerial Grid</i> Concern for production and people	<i>Current study</i> Giving and demanding	<i>Conflict mgt. style</i> Concern for self and others (Rahim, 1985)
High task-oriented, Low people oriented	Designated Structured leadership	Authority-Compliance (9,1)	Hard-Leading Style	Dominating
H' task, H' people	Dynamic Leadership	Team Management (9,9)	Balanced-Leading Style	Integrating
M' task, M' people		Middle of the Road Management (5,5)		Compromising
L' task, H' people	Considerate leadership	Country Club Management (1,9)	Soft-Leading Style	Obliging
L' task, L' people	Passive Leadership	Impoverished Management (1,1)	Apathy style	Avoiding

There are many common features between the styles. For example two styles taken out the managerial grid: The 'country club manager' (1,9) is concerned about the workers' feelings, their attitudes and needs. This type of manager strives to provide subordinates with work conditions that provide ease, security and comfort. This style is close to the 'soft leading style' and to the 'considerate leadership.

The 'middle of the road manager' (5,5), not mentioned in the two other models, is concerned both for production and people. The 5,5 manager seeks compromise among these inevitable conflicts of organizational and personal needs. The manager assumes that practical people know they have to work to get the job done and that the compromise, trading, and paying attention to both job demands and personal needs will allow subordinates to be relatively satisfied.

The above-mentioned comparison may raise the question: Is there a need for an additional dual model of management? Unlike established models, the current scheme translates the over-arching construct of leadership into basic human interactions, such as acts of give and take, and later into a dual factor scheme of giving and demanding. These dimensions represent the two active, outward oriented behaviors that are presumably necessary to lead others. Demands, elicit compliance, which stems from the concern of not being socially rejected and punished, while giving, elicits reciprocal responses. Demanding and giving *are not* mutually exclusive dimensions. For example, directing others inherently includes aspects of providing information, while supplying materials and assistance may silently convey expectation for action. Despite the fact that demanding is a 'task-oriented' behavior, it may sometimes be considered also as 'people-oriented', since it helps to build relationships between superiors and subordinates. Meanwhile 'people-oriented' acts of giving can transmit 'task-oriented' expectations for performance. The established classification of 'people versus production-oriented' behavior is considered therefore to be arbitrary and overlooks important nuances. Demanding and giving reflect the underlying psychological motives and intentions of the leader – giving helps to build relations and gain affection, while demanding assists the accomplishment of the task and to gain control.

Summary

Management and leadership have fascinated human interest for generations. The intensive study within the last fifty years have generated ample theories and evidences about the nature of leaders, their relations with their followers, and the importance of the situation. Among the several typologies of managers, the dual process model, which emphasizes people versus task-oriented style, is very popular. The current study suggests a similar model, which analyzes management in terms of its basic elements – demanding and giving.

The next chapter elaborates on emotion as the third theoretical aspect of management presented in this study. It follows the subject of leader-member relationships (LMX theory). The mutual emotions are supposed to reflect the relationship between managers and their workers.

Emotions

Reading professional literature may lead to the impression that school management is a 'cold' and rational process. In reality the opposite maybe true. Influencing teachers and students, solving problems, getting involved with 'political' issues and many more daily social encounters are likely to be involved with strong emotions. Traditionally, emotion has not received that much attention from organizational behavior researchers compared to cognitive aspects such as decision-making (Rafaeli & Sutton, 1989). Yet, the last ten years have brought an influx of scientific interest (see Forgas, 2001) after it was realized that relying on the study of cognitive process 'can lead to theory and research that portrays organization members as cognitive stick figures whose behavior is unaffected by emotions' (Mowday & Sutton, 1993, 197). Affect is an important ingredient within the organizational fabric, which should not be overlooked.

How do emotions correlate to behavioral aspects of management? What is the connection between emotions and cognitive aspects, such as teacher's performance appraisal? Is there a connection between emotions and the success (or failure) in coping with the challenging teachers? Can the study of emotion contribute to our understanding of management? Can it assist managers? These are some of the interesting questions this study explores.

Emotions – basic components

What are emotions? Unlike motivation, which is activated from within and is aimed to satisfy inner basic needs like hunger or love, emotions are usually triggered by external events. Emotional reactions reflect the perceived personal importance of the external stimuli and help organize the response directed toward it. Another distinction (Atkinson et al., 1993, p. 417) is that motives are usually elicited by a specific need, while emotions can be elicited by a variety of occurrences. A drive to eat is raised by the sense of hunger, while many possible external (and sometimes internal) occurrences may cause someone to feel angry or happy. When they become relatively strong, emotions interrupt cognitive processes and/or behavior (George, 1995, p. 50).

Synonyms for 'emotions' like affect, sentiment and feeling will be mentioned in this work interchangeably.

Emotions are a complicated phenomenon and are not easy to define. According to researchers (see Ben Ze'ev, 1998; Oatley & Jenkins, 1996; Scherer, 2001) emotions are tightly related to the context in which they occur. Sometimes the same situation may lead to different responses. Personality traits and mental abilities like sensory perception and imagination also contribute significantly to the appraisal of the situation. Second, emotions are not perceived one at a time but tend to get mixed with other feelings. Third, the linguistic expression of emotional terms is confusing. Most people would define words like anger and love as feelings, but what about words like boredom, surprise or loneliness? Further, some expressions include emotional terms without being meant to express affect: 'I am afraid it can't be done'. Fourth, unlike binary categories (all or none), which have clear defined borders and unitary level of inclusion (e.g. being a pregnant woman), emotions are less clearly defined. The inclusion of a term under a 'basic category' is done according to its 'close of fitness'. Words like 'liking' and 'friendship' are closer to 'love' than the word 'pride'. But even the word 'love' represents both a typical mental state as well as specific feeling. Further, the love for our child is different from the love we feel toward an old grandmother or a remote relative. Another important aspect of emotions takes into account the time frame and its influence.

Emotions – mind and body

Emotions have two basic components: physiological responses and a cognitive component (Atkinson et al 1993). Feelings of anger are accompanied by rapid heartbeats, fast respiration, increase of perspiration; the hair on the skin becomes erect and other bodily responses caused by the sympathetic division of the autonomic nervous system. The system gears the organism for energy output. It is later balanced by the parasympathetic system – the energy conserving system, which takes over and returns the body to a normal state. Intense arousal accompanies emotional response and is immediately felt. It can be also easily measured, as used with a polygraph to detect lies. Such bodily stimulation significantly contributes to the cognitive perception of the level of emotional intensity. Rapid heartbeats may be interpreted, as 'I am getting nervous and angry now'.

When individuals experience an event they interpret the situation according to their personal goals and expectations. Cognitive appraisal is the second component in the process of perception and creation of emotions. Fischer (1991) suggested how these perceptions, arousal, and reactions are combined. Their scheme is based on the assumption that emotions play a basic social adaptive role by structuring activities and thoughts (Lazarus, 1991). Each emotion represents a specific judgment about a situation, which later produces a particular patterned response, called 'action tendency' (Frijda, 1986). The model is described in an analytic sequence of stages, but the assumptions are that the process occurs in parallel, is unconscious and is held virtually automatically after initial learning.

In addition to the aroused emotions, the appraisal of the situation also produces action tendencies. These are organized plans for acting in relation to the perceived events, and they are often preemptive. The body sets priorities and prepares itself physiologically to respond, producing changes in expression, exposure, heart rate, and the like. Roseman et al. (1994) explain that action tendencies also include effects on the perception and judgment, such as biases toward detecting specific kinds of events and evaluating self and others as responsible for an action. In anger, for example, people tend to produce angry facial expression and voice tones, increased tension and activity, increased heart rate, aggressive acts, a bias toward blaming someone or something other than the self; and often an effort to control aggression and anger by inhibition or redirection.

The various manifestations of emotions

There are several manifestations of affect: emotions, mood, and trait-related emotions. Ben-Ze'ev (1998) defines a fourth kind - prolonged emotions (sentiments). Emotions tend to be short lived, unstable, highly intensive and specific. Emotions have clear antecedent, usually provoking ones (Frijda, 1994). The other forms are less intensive, more general in nature, more stable and tend to endure for a longer time. Moods are low intensity; diffuse feeling states that usually do not have clear antecedent (Forgas, 1992). Moods, usually defined as being bad or good (happy), and may last for days and weeks, compared to the short span (minutes, hours) of emotions. Thayer (1996) proposed that mood depends on the level of energy (high/low) and the amount of relaxation/tension we feel. Prolonged emotion like love or hostility may stay for

months and years while trait-related emotions can last for decades. The differences can be explained with regard to anger, hostility and bad temper. A teacher would feel angry (emotion) shortly after the principal reprimanded her. Hostility (prolonged emotion) is expressed by bitter feelings, not necessarily related to specific situation, while bad temper, as a personality trait is the tendency to respond with anger to any person at any situation.

Prolonged emotions are not only tendencies. They influence feelings, attitudes and actual behaviors. The appreciation a teacher shows toward the principal will not necessarily be outwardly expressed, but it will be reflected by the desire to be closer, to consider what activities to initiate she would appreciate, to support her point of view. Prolonged emotions tend to mold hot emotions into a moderate and stable formation. For example, the teacher's admiration may become the end result after an enthusiastic first acquaintance, which later gets moderated. Generally speaking, first impressions that lead to intensive emotional response are connected with the need to induct resources for a quick response in case of emergency. When we later get accustomed to a person or a situation our perceptions and daily relationships get more balanced.

Prolonged emotions should not be mixed with trait-related affect. Love or hate that people feel can be changed with different situations, but the inclination to experience positive or negative emotions is a steadier state. More specifically, that tendency to paint oneself, others and the world in dark colors is considered as a pervading personality disposition called negative emotionality (Watson and Clark, 1984).

Negative emotionality is not a simply generalized way of perceiving environmental circumstances and personal experiences but it also can result in chronic, though possibly fluctuating or intermittent emotional and physical disturbance (Ostell and Oakland, 1995, pp. 44).

Watson et al. (1988) examined also the positive emotionality – a personality predisposition that reflects enthusiasm, mental alertness, energy and determination. More generally, it is the individual 'pleasurable engagement with the environment' (Ibid, p.1020). Based on factor analysis, they found that both negative emotionality and positive emotionality are largely independent dimensions of affect or mood.

Table 5.1. Manifestations of emotions

<i>Emotions</i>	<i>Mood</i>	<i>Prolonged emotions (Sentiments)</i>	<i>Trait related emotions</i>
Short-lived Minutes, hours	days, hours	longer lived weeks, months	→ years, life span
Unstable		stable	very stable
Highly intensive		moderately intensive	
Specific	non-specific good/bad	Specific feelings	non-specific negative/positive
Related to Specific antecedent	influenced by level of energy & tension	influenced by nature of relationships	personality trait partly inherited
Anger	bitter mood	hostility	bad temper

The new construct of prolonged emotions seems to fit best the subject of management. It enables the exploration of specific aspects of feelings and relation within the teacher-principal dyad. Since there is no accurate scale to separate prolonged emotions from other transient feelings or trait-related responses, the separating line is somewhat relative – affect should prevail longer than several hours but should not endure a lifetime. A safe definition would explore the mutual relationships within a time frame of one month. Four weeks is enough time to let very intensive warm or bitter moments gradually erode and sink among many other emotional experiences. Such memories create more generalized and less specific picture of the feelings we have toward significant others.

Emotions – monitoring and responses to social situations

Emotions play an extremely important role, helping to navigate our social life. Potent affective reactions are tied to the degree to which people are included in meaningful interpersonal relationships. Such reactions, when accumulated, help to build an inner social monitoring mechanism - self-esteem. Leary et al (1995) defines self-esteem as a ‘sociometer’, a psychological system designed to help us avoid rejection and promote

affiliation. It is highly sensitive to indications that social status is in jeopardy. It operates constantly with or without your awareness, so threats to your social status are detected no matter what else you're doing; and it makes you feel uncomfortable when it spots such cues. Such situations for example of a shame reaction may have a patterned sequence, called by Shaver and his colleagues (1987) 'prototypical social scripts'. Shaver et al. studied stories people tell about emotions, and analyzed them according to their patterns and sequences. Such gestalt of activities is often composed of antecedents, responses, and self-control procedures (Scherer et al 1986). Fischer (1991, p. 151) such describe social script:

Table 5.2 Proposed prototypical script for adult shame

Antecedents: A person acts in a dishonorable way, says something deplorable, or evidences a characteristic that is disgraceful.

Someone (other or self) witnesses this action, statement, or characteristic and judges the person (self or other) negatively.

Responses: hiding, escaping, sense of shrinking, feeling worthless

The person tries to hide or escape from observation or judgment; he or she feels small, exposed, worthless, and powerless.

The person lowers his or her head, covers the face or eyes, or turns away from other people. Sometimes he or she strikes out at the person observing the flaw.

Self-control procedures: undoing and redefinition

The person may try to change the negative action, statement, or characteristic; disguise it; deny its existence; or blame someone or something else for it.

Families of Emotions

Many classifications have been suggested as how to sort families of emotions. The simplest classification is that of positive and negative emotions (superordinate categories). A positive emotional state is characterized as active, elated, enthusiastic, excited, and strong. Negative feelings are characterized as distressed, fearful, hostile, jittery, nervous, and scornful (Watson & Tellegen, 1985). Positive and negative emotions can be divided into basic versus complicated emotions. The term 'basic' means simple and indivisible emotions. Complicated emotions (subordinate categories) combine two basic emotions or an addition of a non-emotional element to a basic

emotion. For example, embarrassment can be described as a fear coupled with anger or a low self-esteem.

There is no agreed definition among researchers as to what the basic families are. Ben-Ze'ev (1998, p.146-150) offers a classification based on several categories:

Development- basic emotion emerges early in the human development and early in the development of each individual. 2. Function - basic emotions express behavioral tendencies, which are extremely important for survival and reproduction 3. Universality - basic emotions are evident among all human beings. 4. Frequency - basic emotions are perceived more frequently than other emotions. They are used in everyday language, and also they are extremely common across cultures and among people within cultures. 5. Singularity - basic emotions are characterized by the uniqueness of expression, sensation and physiological responses. 6. Intentionality - basic emotions sometimes lack defined object of the intention.

Social scientists use various theoretical and methodological paradigms to classify emotions. Psychologists explore personal experiences, self and others' behaviors and intention, which lead to emotional reaction. Philosophers concentrate on defining what emotions are. Biologists survey emotional and physiological responses among animals and human beings. Anthropologists examine differences of affect expression among cultures and the like. Shaver and his colleagues (1987, 1992) bring an example of anthropological classification of emotions. They asked people in the United States, The People's Republic of China and Italy to group emotion words (in their respective languages) according to similarities and differences (see figure 5.2). The analysis showed five basic similar families of emotions across cultures - anger, sadness, fear, love, and happiness. Two cultural differences should be emphasized: first, love changed its evaluation from positive in the western countries (the United States and Italy) to negative in eastern culture (China). That is why it is called '(sad) love'. Secondly, the sixth basic emotion family of shame that is used so commonly in China' was missing in the Western countries. Words like guilt, embarrassment, and related emotions formed in Italy and the USA a subfamily under sadness. At a lower level within the hierarchy, these families divide into subordinate categories. For example, anxiety, panic and nervous anticipation constitute three sub-families under fear.

Figure 5.1 A hierarchy of emotions' categories
Based on Shaver et al. (1987, 1992)

Other than the evaluative dimensions of emotions (positive and negative), which arise as dominant in virtually all studies of affective meaning (Lazarus, 1991), two other important dimensions are also commonly found: an activity or active-passive dimension, and a relatedness or engaged-disengaged dimension. These three dimensions can be thought of as organizing the basic emotion families and subordinate categories. Another perspective is the defining of some emotions, like pride and shame as self-conscious. These emotions entail self-awareness and a process of evaluation of the self against some standard (Lewis, 1993). Key self-conscious emotions such as shame, guilt, pride, and embarrassment, are intimately related to the nature of how we evaluate others and ourselves. Another classification is suggested by Ben-Ze'ev (1998) who takes in account the focal subject of the emotion (self or other), the appraisal of the subject's situation (negative or positive, actual or possible) and the valence of the emotion (negative or positive). For example, fear is an emotion created when a person (self) expects the situation would get worse (possible, negative).

Emotional aspects of management

Until some ten years ago, the main aspects examined with regard to affect were job-

satisfaction and the influence of stress on job performance and burnout (Rafaeli & Sutton, 1989). These studies mainly concentrated on negative emotionality. Only recently have researchers begun to explore new aspects: how self-awareness, drive control, empathy, and other social skills are related to success and failure within organizations. Affect has been used to better understand the nature of supervisor-subordinate interactions (Glomb & Hulin, 1997), employee withdrawal behaviors (Pelled & Xin, 1999), performance appraisal judgments (Robbins & DeNissi, 1998), and organizational justice (Weiss et al, 1999). Much research is devoted to the mutual influence of cognitive and affective processes (see Forgas & George, 2001). For example, researchers examine the impact mood has on the process of thinking, that is how people deal with a given task. There is now strong evidence that positive mood promotes a more internally driven, flexible, and generative processing style in comparison to negative mood (Bless, 2000; Fiedler, 2000). Another avenue of research examines the influence of mood on the content of thinking, that is what kind of information people recall, attend, select, interpret, and learn as a function of their affective states (Bower, & Forgas, 2001; George & Jones, 1997).

The construct of emotional intelligence (Mayer & Salovey, 1997; Mayer et al. 1999), namely being able to identify, understand, process, and influence one's own emotions and those of others to guide feelings, thinking and action has raised much interest among researchers. Daniel Goleman's book *Emotional Intelligence* (1995), which translated the research findings into popular terms managed to raise public awareness and encouraged attempts to incorporate emotional ingredients within many areas including the field of management. The development of the Emotional Intelligence Scale (EQ) (Cooper & Sawaf, 1997) and Goleman's (2000) typology of six leadership styles, which are identified according to specific emotional characteristics are two examples. As an over-arching construct that combines two supposedly contradicting mental domains- cognition and emotion (Ben Zee'ev. 1998, p. 232), it is tempting to use the concept of emotional intelligence. Yet, the lack of solid empirical evidence that substantiate that somewhat vague construct, and especially the poor connection between laboratory experimental findings and real life situations (e.g. effective management), leads to the use of more established and scope-limited constructs (e.g. mood as input) in this study.

Finally, affective states and influence is not limited to individuals. Mood and emotions in small groups and work teams has become a new field of research (see Kelly & Barsade, 2001).

Expression of emotions in Israel

A growing number of studies on cross-cultural aspects of emotional expression, mainly along collectivist vs. individualist cultures have been published recently (see Suh et al. 1998; Mesquita, 2001; Eid & Diener, 2001). According to the common division (Hofstede, 1980; Triandis, 1995) Israel is rapidly moving from a collectivist to a western oriented individualist society. Yet, as a country that absorbs Jews who immigrate from many cultures, such division does not always capture all the nuances of the social fabric (Sagy et al, 1999). Discerning an emotional profile of emotional expression always remains relative. For example, in comparison to respondents from other European countries (Scherer et al, 1986), Israelis are much more influenced by emotional experiences caused by news (e.g. military casualties or victims of political terrorism), political events, and society-at-large situations. They also showed a higher achievement orientation, reflected in more frequent joy over achievement and less frequent fear of failure. And finally, the Israelis reported more anger at injustice.

The European experience of emotions tend to be influenced more by interpersonal antecedents, while the Israeli experience of emotions is more impersonal and more strongly related to global social and political forces that affect society-at-large. (Ibid. p. 250)

According to these findings, Israelis hold strong collectivists norms (Eid & Diener, 2001). A Somewhat surprising example of that - the Israeli respondents portrayed themselves as more reserved and inhibited than the European: their emotions were of lower intensity, and they reported more control, fewer and less intense visceral symptoms, and fewer bossy gestures and voice changes. These results contradict the stereotype of the Israeli born 'sabrá' and other Mediterranean countries as noisy people who intensively express themselves with body gestures. Zimbardo (1977) who surveyed cultural differences in shyness found that only 30 percent of college-age Israeli students reported being shy, versus 60 percent in Japan and Taiwan. The researchers (Carducci & Zimbardo, 1995) explain these results by the nature of the

parental education: in Japan, if a child tries and succeeds, the parents get the credit. But if the child tries and fails, the child is fully culpable and cannot blame anyone else. In Israel, the attribution style is just the opposite. A child who tries, gets rewarded, regardless of the outcome.

Consider the Yiddish expression *kvell*, which means to engage in an outsize display of pride. If a child tries to make a kite, people *kvell* by pointing out what a great kite it is. And if it doesn't fly, parents blame it on the wind. In such a supportive environment, a child senses that failure does not have a high price - and so is willing to take a risk. With such a belief system, a person is highly likely to develop *chutzpah*, a type of audacity (Carducci & Zimbardo, 1995 p. 64)

Some research questions

Based on the three-component model, management by principals of challenging teachers is analyzed in this work through its cognitive, behavioral and affective manifestations. At the closure of the literature review it is time to suggest more explicitly several preliminary hypotheses. Since the management process is not open to direct observation, we may look for several connections between the three components. For example, when the teacher is perceived to perform well, it is accompanied by the principal's positive feelings and continuous mode of high level of giving and low level of demanding. The opposite hypothesis may occur with a poor performing teacher. The principal is assumed to feel negatively and respond with decreased level of support and increased level of insistence. In addition, transmitting negative feelings (based on negative appraisal) is expected to generate negative emotions on both sides.

Since the teachers were asked to report about the same aspects, the results would enable the exploration of the mutual emotions within the principal-teacher dyad. It is hypothesized that principals' emotions would match the teachers' emotions, namely principals' positive/negative emotions will correlate positively the same feeling by the teacher. Such an hypothesis seems trivial with regard to sharing positive, where 'emotional contagion' takes place by the relatively automatic and unconscious tendency to 'mimic and synchronize facial expressions, vocalization, postures and movement of other person's overt behavior (see Hatfield et al, 1994). But what about

the negative feelings which are not transmitted openly and directly? Most people believe they can hide their feelings (most of them negative) and fake, in return, more positive emotions. Empirical evidences (Zuckerman et al, 1981, 1986) show it is possible to a certain degree, but some 'leaking' is inevitable. It is easier to pretend in more controlled channels, such as verbal content and facial expressions. Meanwhile body language is more difficult to control. While examining how people perceive the transmission of communication, Zuckerman and his colleagues (1981, 1986) found that the verbal content carried more positive affect, while body language was perceived as transmitting more negative information, all related to the same communication. Another practical implication, which follows the 'mood as input' model (Martin et al, 1997), states that the principals' awareness of their feelings can serve as a sensitive clue to examine their interrelationships with teachers, pupils and parents. Such awareness can help them to understand the hidden streams of negative feelings and change their own behavior to better deal with them.

Summary

Emotions are the hidden but forceful sunken part of human behavior. Recent studies describe emotions not only as an automatic response to external occurrence but rather as an active mediator, which shape the way in which we perceive these events and respond to them (e.g. Lerner & Keltner, 2000). Emotional experience resembles not only feelings and thought but also actions' tendencies, and actions (Roseman et al. 1994). Emotion can therefore play an invaluable part in understanding cognitive processes and various aspects of interrelations within the organization.

The development and validation of the research tools to measure the emotional, cognitive and behavioral aspects, as well as the research procedure is discussed in the next chapter.

Research design and data collection

This work focuses on an emotionally loaded and relatively little researched subject: what characterizes Israeli challenging teachers and how do their school principals cope with their shortcomings? The study also explores what characterizes principal-teacher relationships in terms of the principal's management style, the perceptions of the teachers' performance and the mutual emotions of the dyad.

The sensitiveness of the subject raises formidable methodological challenges. Planning research entails interplay of resources, practicalities and methodological choices, personal judgment and creativity (Patton, 1987). After setting goals the question arises as what to measure and how, whether to use quantitative or qualitative tools. According to the positivist approach, quantitative methods enable the explanation of the nature of reality; "knowledge is only significant if it is based on observations of the external reality (Easterby-Smith et al. 1994. P.77). Using scientific methods and quantifiable techniques (e.g. observations, questionnaires) enables the collection of objective and standardized data such as the measured amount of demanding and giving practices, and teacher's evaluation. On the other hand using the interpretive approach helps to "understand the way in which individuals create, modify and interpret the world" (Cohen & Manion, 1994, p.5). Collecting qualitative data from interviews would give in-depth information on how principals and teacher think, react and perceive emotions they feel about themselves and others. Consequently, the research objectives could best be met by using both methods of data collection. However, both qualitative and quantitative methods have strengths and weaknesses, which have to be considered in advance.

Qualitative techniques are best suited to the exploration of complicated issues such as interrelationships, emotional reactions and cognitive processes, which cannot be categorized into small and simple definitions. Interviews, although a lengthy process, enable the catching of individual differences, and the understanding of nuances and the 'meaning between the lines'. Unlike questionnaires that have already defined the exact requested information, open questions (especially in one to one encounters) offer ample

opportunity to explore subjects the researcher did not foresee. Further, since this study examines personal negative feelings that people prefer to hide (or maybe are not aware of), a personal encounter will help to reduce suspiciousness, clarify wrong perceptions, and get more accurate and authentic information.

On the other hand, quantitative methods fit diverse opinions and experiences into predetermined response categories. They facilitate comparison and statistical aggregation of data and give a broad, generalizable set of findings. The disadvantage of that approach is the lack of precision between predetermined categories and the actual personal experiences perceived by the respondents (Cohen & Manion, 1994, p. 85). Despite its drawbacks, it was decided to use a survey method due to some of its major advantages: it is highly economical; it is possible to study large number of people and to assess a wide range of topics. Adding some personal and organizational background information will enable the formation of groups of respondents (e.g. novice vs. veteran teachers), and discern what connections these variables have with personal experiences and behaviors.

Validity and reliability challenges

Several challenges faced this study with regard to the validity and reliability of its methodology and findings.

1. The main concern was that people would refuse to cooperate due to the sensitiveness of the subject. The initial stage of interviewing representatives of the main protagonists (principals, teachers, MoE and teacher's union officials) not only refuted those fears but also enabled one to get a clear and comprehensive picture. Triangulating the viewpoints of most of the relevant sources (parents and pupils were not included) certainly increased the *internal validity*, namely 'the extent that the research findings accurately represent the phenomenon under investigation' (Bush, 2002, p. 66).
2. Developing a valid and reliable research tools entails a thorough first-hand acquaintance with the subject. Such requirement led, as a second stage, to establish a pilot group of principals and teachers, who through a gradual process of acquaintance enabled one to unveil many hidden aspects. The pilot's

participants' help to develop the questionnaires certainly guaranteed getting a more valid data.

3. The study's major weakness, in terms of validity, was the reliance on one source of information, the principals' description of the teacher's case.
4. Another obstacle - the principals' presentation at the interviews was not only one-sided, but it also appeared to be censored and defensive (e.g. blaming others, lack of self-reflection about own mistakes).
5. Despite the careful preparations, the warm and close relations at the interviews with the principals led the researcher to empathize with their point of view in the initial stages of the study. The supervisors' guidance assisted the researcher to adopt a more balanced approach and to describe the cases in a more neutral manner.

The specific considerations and measures taken to address these challenges and secure valid and reliable data are discussed throughout the remaining of this chapter.

Sampling

The sample included all the principals and 131 teachers who work in 40 elementary schools located geographically under the supervisory of the Ministry of Education's district of Haifa. The region is stretched over an area of 40x20 km in northern Israel and has 225 schools; most of them (188) public (secular) schools and the rest (37) are religious institutions¹. Most of the population live in cities (Haifa, Hadera etc) and the least live in kibbutzim and other rural settlements. The sample has been limited to the Jewish, Hebrew speaking population. Due to methodological and validity constraints of translating research tools into Arabic, Muslim and Christian population were not included. In order to avoid confusion it was decided to sample only elementary schools where the organizational structure includes only two hierarchical layers, and principals directly manage each staff member. Middle and high schools' chain of command

¹ Details given by Ms. Nurit Kahana, spokeswoman of the Ministry of Education's Haifa district. 5.10.1999

includes three and sometimes even four layers, where teachers may report to more than one manager

To what extent is the sample is representative? No district can perfectly match the characteristics of the general population, but the region's population dispersion is heterogeneous and includes one of the largest four cities in Israel (Haifa, pop. 300,000), five medium-sized cities (pop. 50,000-20,000), and many smaller towns and rural settlements. Another statistical indicator – the percentage of teachers out of the general working force in Haifa County (11.2) and Hadera County (12.1) are very similar to the percentage in other counties in Israel (range 10.0-13.7) (Central Bureau of Statistics 2000, 12.13). It would be safe to say that the sample represents most of the mainstream aspects of the population in general (e.g. ethnic, economic) and in terms of external validity (Denzin & Lincoln, 1998, p. 186), the findings may be generalized to similar elementary schools throughout Israel.

Using probability systematic sampling (Cohen & Manion, 1994, p. 87), each fourth school was selected from a full list of elementary school in the district. Novice principals, who had worked less than one year, were not included since they were not familiar enough with the staff and did not have the time to gain significant influence. Out of 58 schools 3 were found not suitable (novice heads), 3 principals did not answer, 5 canceled after setting a meeting and 5 principals refused to be interviewed. Each principal was asked to select four teachers, two of whom had been identified as poor and two as excellent. Selecting two teachers of each category enabled a reasonable representation, not too small (one teacher), which may bias the results, and not a large number (4-6 teachers), which may draw the sample toward the average. If more teachers are sampled, there are good chances their characteristics would lean to the average.

Sampling the cases of the challenging teachers used the 'critical incident technique' (Flanagan, 1954). That technique is based on the premise that a subject matter expert (SME) describes incidents in which an employee has been very ineffective. The Principals were asked to select an extreme case ('critical') of a poor performing teacher and report about it in detail.

Research tools

Two main tools were used: A four-section questionnaire and an interview with the principals. The questionnaire included four scales (see appendix) all of them, except for the Teacher's perceived effectiveness scale (Lev, 1996) were developed especially for this study:

- A. A cover letter with several questions about personal data - gender, age, education, years of professional experience (for teachers only).
- B. Demanding and giving to individual teachers (teacher/principal versions).
- C. Demanding and giving to staff (teacher/principal versions).
- D. Mutual prolonged emotions scale (teacher/principal versions).
- E. Teacher's perceived effectiveness scale (teacher/principal versions).

The interview (see appendix) focused on describing a case of a problematic teacher and the methods by which the principal coped with him or her. It also included collecting background data about the school - number of teachers and students, type of school (secular/religious), teachers' turnover rate within the previous two years and the like. Based on the general format of this study, which equates aspects of management to the structure of attitude, each component – cognitive, affective and behavioral – was explored by qualitative and quantitative instruments. For example, principals were interviewed about their management style, and also filled in a questionnaire about their giving and demanding behavior.

Procedure of tool development

Approaching such sensitive issues required collecting information from various sources, which were familiar to the subject. Initial interviews were taken with current and former officials in the Ministry of Education, the teachers unions, principals and teachers. Based on the collected material and initial survey of literature review, the second stage of developing the tools took place. The participants in the pilot were two female elementary school principals and one male head of a middle school (referred as pilot schools A, B, C). They were 38-45 years old and had had 3-6 years experience as principals. Also were included four teachers from those schools. The process was made gradually, one subject at a time. It began with the issue of management style. The material collected by the interviews, a participant observation (Bailey, 1978) of one principal and a diary another principal agreed to complete, enabled the completion of a

preliminary list with 60 statements. The participants added their remarks and the best items upon which there was full consensus of their validity were selected to prepare the final draft. Developing the tools began with less sensitive topics and later touched upon more delicate aspects (e.g. mutual emotions, ineffectiveness). The better acquaintance and open relationships with the teachers and the principals brought more genuine and accurate material. The use of Delphi Technique (Nicholson et al.1995, p. 354) by getting continuous feedback enabled gradual improvement of the validity, reliability and other practical issues (clarity of questions, connivance of data processing). Specific details about the development of each research tool are given separately.

The interview

The interview was mainly based on Bridges' (1986, appendix) and Balser & Stern's (1999 p. 1050) works and was aimed to achieve two goals: first to collect background data and second to get a 'story' on how the principal coped with a challenging teacher. The interview included a mix of open and closed questions and some were in a sort of a checklist. The first stage of the interview presented its rationale

Principals do their best to help teachers who have difficulties. Along with the competent and devoted teachers, there are also staff members who do not teach well, have discipline difficulties at their lessons, whose students complain about them. In some cases, parents, colleague-teachers and students draw your attention to the problems they have. Treating such problems is sensitive and sometimes painful. Could you please help me understand this issue?

After getting an informed consent and describing all the measures taken to protect anonymity and confidentiality, the principals were asked several background questions about the school and themselves. Then the issue of the challenging teacher was presented.

As you know, in each organization there are about one-third of employees who perform below the average. It is estimated that 5% are poor-performing workers who do not bring the expected results and cause some difficulties. Managers would have been happy not to have them in the organization. Within the field of education

I define these teachers as ‘challenging’, those who pose a challenge to the principal as how to work with them.

The principals were asked how many ‘challenging teachers’ had enrolled in the staff within the last two years and how many of them had tenure. Several ethical precautions were taken at this stage (see below a further discussion). Phrasing the shortcomings in a general manner, and the soft definition of the teacher (‘posing a challenge to the principal’) were meant to minimize ethical dilemmas as how not to stigmatize any one of their workers. In addition, asking to recall a case of a challenging teacher whom they had worked with enabled them to select any case (e.g. that happened long time ago, as some did) or even not answering at all (all of them cooperated willingly). As the interview proceeded, principals were asked more sensitive questions. A pilot interview with an experienced elementary principal (referred as pilot school D), followed with a feed back discussion assisted to improve the procedure and the questions. After describing the tools development stage, it is time to give more details with regard to the tools themselves.

Measuring dimensions of demanding and giving

The terms giving and demanding are frequently used in the family setting, in workplaces and elsewhere. These words express generalizations from particulars - smiling, helping, punishing, raising expectations etc. Each word represents an idea and action. It is also expressed in body language and non-verbal communication. These concepts are supposed to represent a piece of reality. So, one has to take several precautions while translating these terms into operational definitions:

First, the number of classifications we establish is limited only by the size of our vocabulary. The cogent question is whether the verbal categories we posit correspond to events in the real world, whether the events assigned to these categories are in fact mutually exclusive (Halpin, 1966, p.9-10).

The theoretical and practical challenge of validating these concepts is at stake here:

Construct validation requires the gradual accumulation of information from a variety of sources. Any data throwing light on the nature of the trait under

consideration and the conditions affecting its development and manifestations are grist for this validity mill (Anastasi, 1976, p.151).

The first task is to operationalize these two concepts, by using several methods of research, qualitative as well as quantitative.

The second snare in using taxonomies is that we run the risk, say, of mixing oranges and battleships. We are seldom sure that the rubrics we have established are at similar level of ordinality. There is further danger that we may mix phenotypic and genotypic categories quite indiscriminately. The essential snag, of course, is that the taxonomic method - as we have ordinarily used it in education is based upon the Aristotelian as opposed to the Galilean mode of thought (Halpin, 1966, p.9-10).

Demanding and giving are rather labels, which are not aligned on qualitative poles of one dimension (*i.e.* extroversion-introversion). Such categories can be defined as nominal variables². Meanwhile, each concept can be ordered along some continuum (e.g. more or less demanding). Like the psychological scale of stress (Holmes & Rahe, 1967) in which people are asked to count the number of changes (marriage, moving, new job etc) they have made during the last six months, similarly teachers can reflect how many times the principal has praised them. These ordinal variables can be described by numbers, which state existence and frequency (more or less) of the sampled behavior. Yet, we can not assume, for example, that the difference between 10 points and 15 points represent the same difference in levels of stress or giving behavior as the difference between 40 and 45 points.

Scales of demanding and giving

Developing taxonomies involves picking sound elements and leave out sorrowfully

² Some authors consider the topic of measurement scale as crucial while others think it is irrelevant. In an excellent paper entitled 'On the Statistical Treatment of Football Numbers', Lord (1953) argues that numbers can be treated in any way you like because, 'The numbers do not remember where they came from' (p. 751). Howell (1997) suggest 'we should do our best to ensure that our measures relate as closely as possible to what we want to measure, but our results are ultimately only the numbers we obtain and our faith in the relationship between those numbers and the underlying objects or events' (p. 8).

many others. It is assumed that a relatively small sample of daily behaviors of giving and demanding sufficiently represents the managerial style. One could argue the necessity of including a certain category, for example including 'sense of humor' as a dimension in the managerial grid (Blake and Mouton, 1978), but the explanatory power of the theory and the findings, as well as its practical implications (e.g. assist heads to alleviate tensions while resolving serious conflicts) are at stake here.

The scope of this research covers general managerial elements as well as professional educational management. It was decided to develop the scales as a combination of the most common managerial practices (Hales, 1995, p.315) as described in terms of demanding or giving. Some examples follow.

1. Acting as a figurehead, representative, and point of contact of a work unit or a team ('I support team work, establish groups and help their operation').
2. Monitoring and disseminating information ('S/he disseminates detailed information to the staff').
3. Negotiating with subordinates, superiors, colleagues, and those outside the organization.
4. Monitoring workflow, handling disturbances, and solving problems ('When problems arise, s/he tries to find out what were the reasons').
5. Allocating human, material, and financial resources ('S/he takes care of the working conditions of the teachers, purchasing equipment for classrooms and the teacher's room')
6. Recruiting, training, directing, and controlling staff ('S/he assists teachers with the curricular and educational programs they initiate').
7. Networking, forming contacts, and serving as a liaison person with others.
8. Innovating, by seeking new objectives or methods of working.
9. Planning and scheduling work ('S/he meets with teachers to decide together what the targets are that they are expected to perform').

These scales (see appendices 1,2) were not built as a checklist supposed to measure systematically what principals actually do. Not every aspect of management is related to demanding or giving. Several statements cover some elements while others are mentioned only once or twice, but ascribing these dimensions to the common practices ensures that all the relevant duties of managers are represented. Since individual

teachers, face only a small fraction of the managerial duties referred specifically to them, it was decided also to build a scale that describes the principals' management style toward the staff as a whole. Staff members have quite a broad acquaintance, from watching and hearing, of the their head functions. Discerning principal-teacher and principals – staff management style provides various manifestations of the principal's leadership manners toward individuals and group.

Two additional subscales were initially included: An 'insistence measure', aimed to explore to what extent the principal insists on fulfilling his/her demands (e.g. 'When teachers object to my requests, I insist they should perform them'). The second scale described demanding as a series of actions: P' requests → (T' comply or not) → P' response (e.g. praise when task properly performed or reprimand when task was not performed). Computing factor analysis (see table 6.2) revealed that none of the scales was found to be valid.

Measuring emotions

Emotions are inner experiences, which are not open to direct measurement. We know very little about them, especially when they are not responses to extreme situations. Searching for emotional traces has been concentrated mainly with four observable aspects (Atkinson et al. 1993, p.417):

1. Internal bodily responses, particularly those involving the autonomic nervous system.
2. Belief or cognitive appraisal that a particular positive or negative state of affairs is occurring.
3. Facial expressions.
4. Reaction to the emotion.

Two kinds of research - experimental laboratory and naturalistic field researches have been used (See Lewis & Haviland-Jones, 2000; Scherer, 1986). Despite its advantages, researchers began to realize that measuring the observable emotional aspect portrays only half the picture. Emotions, like preferences, attitudes, moral judgment and other psychological phenomena are private experiences, which are not easily subject to public exposure. It seemed reasonable to assess feelings by asking a person about them. Such direct probing may bring faked answers, but no better tool, at least at present, has been invented to study internal processes objectively. Trusting self-reporting with regard to measuring emotions may seem somewhat more evasive and less valid than

studying problem solving or moral judgment. Given the important role of self-concept and social norm influences on many psychological processes, studying emotion by direct questioning is not less justified than any other subjective experience (Scherer, 1986).

The evidence concerning the accuracy of self-reported expression and physiological responses is inconclusive but seems to be equal and fairly valid (see Scherer, 1986). It would be economical and feasible to study emotions in a naturalistic context by questioning the person involved. The method of in-depth interview is not most recommended since emotions are often connected to intimate events relevant to self-esteem. It is assumed that subjects may respond less truthfully than in a more anonymous procedure. The survey method, including public and commercial polls, is so often used in social sciences, that most people have been exposed to it that in way or another. Standardized questionnaires administered in a very professional manner in anonymous context may be a promising mode to reduce skepticism and encourage honest cooperation. Many pencil and paper devices have been developed through the years. Perhaps the most established is the measurement of emotional process: the antecedents, appraisals, action tendencies, expressive display and regulation attempts (Scherer, 1986, Ekman & Davidson, 1994).

Several personality inventories has been used to measure mood and trait-related affective tendencies - The Neuroticism scale of the Eysenck Personality Questionnaire (Parkes, 1990; Payne and Hartley, 1987), Taylor's Manifest Anxiety Scale (Taylor, 1953; Brief et al, 1988), and the Multidimensional Personality questionnaire (MPQ, Tellegen, 1982).

Methodological limitations

Despite the growing wealth of studies, some basic questions still bother researchers. Unlike the study of cognitive processes, where there are fairly clearly defined outcome criteria, such as solutions to problems and other variables like latency time, emotions consist of internal subjective experiences and physiological changes. Cohen (1965) has vividly pointed out that:

‘Thurstone once said that in psychology we measure men by their shadows. Indeed, in clinical psychology we often measure men by their shadow while

they are dancing in a ballroom illuminated by the reflection of an old-fashioned revolving polyhedral mirror' (p.102).

There are some basic dilemmas here: Is it possible to compare the intensity of the perceived subjective emotions among different people? Do our tools accurately differentiate between various kinds of emotions? Are the anger and love one feels similar to the same emotions felt by another person? Are emotional expressions culturally dependent or universal? Do people fake the use of emotional expression as part of normative social behavior (e.g. lying).

Are there general similar responses to certain stimuli? Responses tend to change according to gender, age, social status etc. Moreover, there is a strong interaction between person and situation characteristics (Endler & Magnusson, 1976). Emotion episodes and private feelings do not always correspond - one can 'be' angry without feeling angry. With dramatic skill, an emotional display can be used strategically or politically in organizations to attract attention or influence decisions or relationships (Fineman, 1995, p.52). Another difficulty stems from the social regulation of emotional expression. A century ago Wilhelm Wundt emphasized that:

'Civilized man attempts to control affect expression in line with the expectation of others, by whom he feels observed, through appropriate manipulation of his gestures and facial expression; trying to mask certain affects and to express others more strongly' (quoted in Fineman, 1995, p. 56).

Ekman and Friesen (1969) have coined the term 'display rules' for such socio-cultural pressures on the manipulation and control of affective control. For example, Israeli public opinion was divided several years ago over the question of whether combat soldiers should externalize their personal grief at the funeral of their fallen comrade. Norms of masculinity and toughness (the 'appropriate' behavior for worriers) conflicted with the zeitgeist of liberalism and the openness to express "feminine-like" emotions. No doubt that there are internalized norms concerning the kinds of emotions that it is appropriate to experience in specific situations, including physiological arousal as well as subjective feeling states.

Measurement of mutual emotions

Since emotions are transient, intensive and very specific mental states, intercepting the

feelings at a certain moment may portray a limited and unreliable picture. If an interview takes place shortly after a bitter conflict or an intimate pleasant talk, it would override other, sometimes contradicting affects. In order to get a more general and representing information, one has to slightly withdraw the magnifying lens, and concentrate on less immediate and less intensive sentiments. Such prolonged emotions (Ben Ze'ev, 1998) reflect meaningful ongoing interpersonal processes with a significant other, rather than short intensive episodes. Since the concept of prolonged emotion is newly defined, it has not been researched yet.

Self-report instruments are commonly used to assess emotional states, and the participants in the preliminary stage were well aware of many aspects of their emotional responses in different situations (especially in extreme one) and toward meaningful persons (Yariv, 2000). Yet, care is needed so that prolonged emotions should not be assessed both as traits and states:

Emotion as a trait (i.e. positive affectivity and negative affectivity) refers to a general tendency to experience a particular emotional state whereas emotion as a state refers to how an individual feels in the short run. Emotion as a state tends to change over time. Therefore the danger exists that researchers may think they are measuring emotions as states when actually they are assessing underlying traits (George, 1995, p.52).

The directions lead respondents to focus on the nature of their relationships within a clearly defined timeframe (marked bold below):

As a principal you have close relationships with your staff members. Emotions, some positive and some negative accompany these relations. Some feelings are short lived while others stay with us for long time.

*When you think about your relations with _____ please indicate to what extent have you felt the below mentioned emotions **in the last month**.*

Based on considerations presented earlier with regard to the families of emotions (see Ch. 5), respondents were given a list of 16 common emotions (fear, anger, pride, shame, gratitude, happiness, admiration, envy, rejection, sadness, indifference, superiority, hope, despair and guilt). These terms were selected as the emotion-terms

most frequently mentioned in Hebrew (Balgoor, 1968), about half negative and half positive. The ever-popular term 'love' seemed unrelated to the organizational context, and was replaced with 'admiration'. On each emotion, they were asked to appraise on a scale from 'very much' (4), 'to 'not at all' (0) how much they felt that affect within the last month within their relationships with the teacher/principal. Asking respondents to indicate to what extent have they felt certain emotions, without pointing to whom the emotion was directed (self/another person) was meant to encourage openness. It was assumed that having emotions, especially negative ones, remaining unspecified, make them less threatening to answer.

Instead of an open-ended format, which is not easily prone to standardized coding it was decided to use of a forced choice format that enables one to describe the relation within the dyad along 16 different emotion-terms (see Sorolla [2001] for an almost identical tool). Forced-choice format is not free of limitations - it limits the scope of responses. It may also have a 'cueing' effect in that subjects may be motivated to indicate a specific response which they consider appropriate and likely under the circumstances but which they may not exactly remember to have experienced (Scherer, 1986, p.20). In order to compensate for these limitations, principals were asked to recall in the interview how they felt toward the challenging teachers. These (both constructed and the open-ended questions) were meant to bring uncensored authentic responses, yet, there is no reliable method that prevents respondents from faking or distorting, consciously or unconsciously, emotions they experienced.

Preliminary results of the prolonged emotions scale

The two versions of the scale (principal/teacher) appeared clearly phrased and took respondents 3 – 5 minutes to fill. All of them reported that the questionnaire demanded reflective thinking and was met with surprise due to the unexpected information they were asked to give. The respondents were not aware of the psychological meaning of each emotion. The participants were surprised at what ample information is hidden within that simple tool and how accurate was the analysis of their mutual relationships profile.

The results (Yariv, 2002) show that the scale successfully identified different emotions. It elicited positive feelings, as well as less 'accepted' and less easy to expose negative

emotions. These emotions, it was reaffirmed in the follow-up interviews, positively correlated with real events and genuine relationships. For example, a senior teacher described her feelings of envy, appreciation and hope toward her principal (Pilot, school A). She later confided how she admires her head, wishes to imitate her professionalism and leadership, and even replace her someday. The scale enabled differentiation between emotions one teacher felt toward several principals (within subject), and emotions of several teachers toward the same principal (between subjects). The result also proved the scale was not only sensitive to positive and negative feelings, but it also captures nuances and ambivalent emotions. This point should be elaborated. Many studies discuss simple aspects of negative vs. positive mood, while others describe affect as a circumplex of two orthogonal dimensions of valence (pleasant-unpleasant) and activation (activation-deactivation). These models (Watson & Tellegen, 1985; Cacippo, Gardner & Brenston, 1997; Russell & Carroll, 1999) hold pair of opposite emotions such as calm-tense and excited-depressed. Although affective experience may be typically bipolar, Larsen et al, (2001) described short-lived situations (e.g. watching the film *Life is Beautiful*; graduating from college), which encompass 'bittersweet' emotions of happiness and sadness. The current study deals with various ongoing prolonged negative and positive emotions, each representing a specific perception of a situation (e.g. having fun together, expressed as happiness). With no predetermined hypothesis, several kinds of emotional profiles emerged (mainly positive, mixed, mainly negative), some reflected ambivalence, while in others a certain emotion appeared to be dominant, shadowing all the rest. Such methodology offers more suitable and richer account of emotional aspects of interpersonal relations.

Teacher's appraisal measurement

The use of employee appraisal was aimed at exploring what aspects of the teachers' performance and qualities lead principals to define them as excellent or weak. These questions are examined qualitatively within the interview and quantitatively in a questionnaire, which the principals and the teachers filled. The remainder of this section will be devoted to discuss various aspects of developing and validating the quantitative instrument.

Raters - several stakeholders can appraise the teacher performance: principals, pupils, colleagues, instructors, inspectors, parents, and the teachers (self-assessment). The most comprehensive method is called 360 degrees, in which workers are appraised by anyone who is above (boss), below (workers), and aside (colleagues and clients) to the assessed person (Robbins, 1998). Each source has a different point of view and a different yardstick (Wragg et al. 1999). Teachers may judge their fellows by their acceptability or otherwise as a staff room colleagues, and in many cases have not actually witnessed them teaching, whereas pupils see them every day in the classroom, but rarely in social context. Heads are often dependent on indirect evidence such as plaudits or complaints from parents, the sound or absence of noise from their classroom, and more visible features, such as punctuality, dress, behavior at staff meetings, reports writing or contribution to out-of-school activities (p. 11). Due to the enormous resources it demands, only two sources were picked to evaluate the teachers' performance in this study – the principals and the teachers themselves. Such triangulation is aimed to increase the information validity and reliability.

Tools - performance evaluation is aimed to achieve one of three goals: employee improvement, decision making for administrative action, and organizational research (Berry, 1998, p. 198). Since the appraisal is used here for academic purposes only, and the professional implication are very limited (See below the section on ethics) it saves many organizational and legal and relational aspects usually considered with regard to the first two goals. For example, when the evaluation is not transmitted to the employee, the evaluator is much less bothered by dyadic influences and may agree to report more openly.

Performance information can be achieved from objective sources, such as productions measures (e.g. students' achievements) or personnel data (e.g. absenteeism). The evaluator may also count on subjective impressions and judgmental measures (e.g. relationships toward pupils). Yet, many organizations use appraisal-rating systems in which job performance is compared against another criterion (Barber, 1990). For example, the Behavior Summary Scale method (McGreal, 1999) anchors performance-rating scales with more general or abstract benchmarks. Another popular method is the Behaviorally Anchored Rating Scale (BARS) (Smith & Kendall, 1963). It gives the evaluator a detailed list of very specific behaviors, which the worker is expected to perform. The rater then evaluates the worker by assigning a numerical value to each

statement. Other instruments are the Behavioral Observation Scale (Latham & Wexley, 1977) and the Mixed Standard Rating Scale (MSRS) (Blanz & Ghiselli, 1972). There are also non-rating evaluation methods such as various checklists (e.g. weighted checklist, forced-choice technique), and comparison methods.

After screening various tools, it was decided to use the 'principal's evaluation of a staff-member' section in a questionnaire on teacher's commitment to work (Lev, 1996). The development of this tool had included several stages: a group of principals discussed what they consider the most important aspects of teachers' work. Six dimensions emerged: The interest teachers show in their students; the use of various teaching methods; advancement of weak students; relationships with students; connections with parents; coping with discipline difficulties. Those subjects were translated into behavioral statements, which later were evaluated by several judges who decided whether the statements are behaviorally oriented and closely related to the subject. The final version includes 22 pairs of statements aligned on a continuum. The principal is asked to circle the answer, which mostly fit his/her view:

3	Many pupils appreciate the teacher	1 1 1 1 1 1	Many pupils do not appreciate the teacher
---	------------------------------------	-------------	---

The principal version was adapted also into a self-assessment teacher's version (e.g. 'many pupils appreciate me'). This tool (see appendix 3) was selected for several reasons: First, it is relatively short and very clear. Second, it takes advantages of each personnel appraisal approach - it evaluates success, but in behavioral terms, and it covers more aspects other than classroom observation. Third, having been written in Hebrew and already tested increases its validity and enables the comparison of the current results to the original outcomes.

Evaluation limitations

Appraisal methods are susceptible to many kinds of errors, and human resource experts invest much time to develop and improve the validity of rating instruments (Barrett & Kernan, 1987; Sulsky & Balzer, 1988). The use of appraisal for academic purpose only, as in this study, does limit the range of limitations in comparison to procedures of performance improvement and personnel decision-making procedures. For the sake of simplicity, this broad subject is discussed here shortly, focusing mainly on the content

validity and other causes of rating errors. In addition, teachers' distortion may reflect methodological artifacts. Critics of self-assessment tools raise several limitations (Barber, 1990):

1. Individuals tend to regard themselves as proficient, and honest/objective evaluation is difficult – some consider it impossible. Unlike most professions where teamwork is very common, teachers perform their duties by themselves, with no colleagues joining them in the classroom.
2. Evaluation may become a form of self-justification (e.g. an incompetent person may not realize he or she is performing at an unsatisfactory level).
3. Mediocre teachers tend to be less accurate in self-assessment than superior ones.
4. Self-rating frequently have little agreement with the observation of students', colleagues', and administrators' ratings (Carroll, 1981). The greatest agreement is shown when they are used to compare one's own performance with that of colleague.

Content - the methods principals use to evaluate teachers have been criticized both for their lack of rigor and for the content of what is evaluated. Darling-Hammond (1986) states:

The most important aspects of teaching are ignored in favor of measuring the measurable, no matter how trivial. (p. 535)

She criticizes the 'ticking evaluation' in which heads evaluate teachers by ticking specific of items allegedly desirable behaviors such as 'keeping a brisk pace of instruction' and 'starting classes on time'. It ignores human relations skills or the ability to relate to children and, she believes treats teaching as an unvarying didactic exercise that is unresponsive to the individual characteristics of students or the nature of learning. Even direct behavioral methods of data collection such as classroom observation may suffer the same kind of limitations:

State of the art classroom observation acknowledges that the same behavior may be appropriate in one situation and inappropriate in another, and depends on the professional judgment of an assessor who may accept different specific

evidence for the same indicator, depending on the situation. (Haertel, 1991, p. 22)

Rating errors - the use of ratings assumes that evaluators are reasonably objective and precise. Yet, certain well known errors occur during such process. For example, *Halo error* results when the evaluator has difficulty in evaluating the worker's characteristics separately. It happens when the teacher performs exceptionally well or exceptionally poorly (black mark). The evaluator resorts to using a general impression to rate specific dimensions. Study of halo error indicates that it coincides with the rater's general impression of the person (Lance et al. 1994). Another error, *Recency effect* occurs when the rater bases rating on the most recent behavior or a major event that took place shortly before the evaluation. Other errors relate to cognitive limitations (Bowman, 1999). Cognitive information processing theory maintains that appraisal is a complex memory task involving data acquisition, storage, retrieval, and analysis. When confronted with large amount of information, people generally tend to simplify it. Raters may use a subjective mode of data processing called '*compatibility*' ('similar to me' or liking), comparing the worker appraised to their own qualities. In some cases a *spillover effect* occurs when the appraiser is impressed by a 'shining' trait or action, while overlooking many other aspects. Finally, contrast error happens when teachers are compared to other colleagues rather against performance standards.

Another type of error relates to the source of information. When the supervisor or peers make the evaluation it is found to be rather objective (Herold et al, 1987; Kane & Lawler, 1978) while self-appraisal was proved to be a more convenient but less accurate method (Harris & Schaubrock, 1988). Self-appraisal may be affected by personal and cultural attributes. For example, more accurate self-evaluations were obtained from persons with an internal locus of control, high intelligence, and achievement orientations (Meyer, 1980; Furnham & Springfield, 1994).

The pilot stage

The pilot stage included a sample of seven schools in the same district, and it was aimed at validating the research tools and improving the procedures. Throughout the initial interviews certain important changes were made, which significantly improved the procedure's effectiveness. The respondents' remarks and the results of the statistical analysis helped to weed out redundant, inaccurate or unclear items. The results of the

reliability coefficients were found to be high (see table 6.1), which enabled leaving the questionnaires intact for the rest of the study.

After transforming the valence of all the questions phrased negatively (e.g. ‘she refused my requests’) basic statistics were computed. The first step was measuring the internal reliability in order to ensure that all the questions measure the same basic constructs in each questionnaire and the interpretability of the scores (Kralhwohl, 1998; Jones, 1986). Since the research method held only one session and only one questionnaire form administered each time (without cross validation), the conventional procedure calls for splitting the measure into halves and examining the consistency of the scores between them to find reliability. There are many possible ways to split randomly, each slightly different, and four methods of finding internal consistency (Kralhwohl, 1998). For our purpose the most suitable procedure is Cronbach alpha (Cronbach, 1951), which assumes that each instrument randomly samples all possible items that measure its domain. It estimates how well the measure represents the universe the domains of which they are sampled.

Table 6.1 Questionnaires reliability coefficients

Scale	N of items	N of cases	Alpha	Range of alpha if items deleted
Head's demanding (teacher)	9	123	.7107	.6484 - .7153
Head's demanding (Principal)	9	71	.5248	.4225 - .7635
Head's giving (teacher)	9	123	.9196	.8995 - .9257
Head's giving (Principal)	9	73	.5921	.4766 - .6221
Head's demanding from staff (teacher)	10	114	.6893	.6418 - .6853
Head's demanding from staff (principal)	10	73	.7313	.6843 - .7313
Head's giving to staff (teacher)	11	119	.8446	.8118 - .8553
Head's giving to staff (principal)	11	73	.6744	.5722 - .7078
Teacher's effectiveness (teacher)	22	102	.8124	.7953 - .8293
Teacher's effectiveness (principal)	22	67	.9622	.9585 - .9668
Principal-teacher mutual emotions (teacher)	16	116	.9263	.9251 - .9327
Principal-teacher mutual emotions (principal)	16	71	.9258	.9132 - .9366

Unlike the Kuder-Richardson reliability (Kuder & Richardson, 1937; Cronbach, 1990), which is applicable to tests whose items are scored as right or wrong, the Cronbach alpha is suitable to multiple-scored items, as in this study (Anastasi, 1976, p. 116-118).

The reliability coefficients found for all the four questionnaires and its sub-scales has reached satisfactory levels - $\alpha = .60$ and above. Closer analysis exposes several differences: the last two questionnaires – the Teachers' Effectiveness Scale (Lev, 1996) and the mutual emotions scale were found to have higher inner consistency and less variability between the two groups of respondents than the DGB scales. The measure of demanding seems to be the least consistent. Omitting the three questions relating to monitoring increased the teachers' reliability to $\alpha = .6842$ but decreased the principals' reliability to $\alpha = .6561$.

The mutual emotions' high reliability coefficients ($\alpha = .92$) mean that positive feelings (e.g. pride, happiness) align on one dimension, and so with the negative ones (e.g. anger, fear). The same line of thought applies to the various sub-scales of the teachers' performance evaluation, which were found to create one unitary construct. The favorable reliability coefficients seem to reflect the thorough procedure and deep thought given to that stage of tool's development. Hence there was no necessity to change any item.

Factor analysis

In order to determine the underlying patterns among the various aspects of demanding and giving, a factor analysis was computed on these scales. Cohen and Manion (1994, p. 320) maintain that such procedure is particularly appropriate in research where the aim is to impose an orderly simplification upon a number of interrelated measures. When all the scales were thrown into one basket (demanding/giving X individual/staff X principal/teacher) a clear distinction between the dimensions was found, namely the construct of demanding did not mix with aspects of giving and vice versa (see Appendix 6). Meanwhile several similar questions were provided in two versions (mean for triangulating information) and they sometimes appeared to create a factor.

According to the factor analysis (table 6.2) principals appeared to have 'soft' and 'hard' style of demanding from their staff. Similar results appeared where teachers perceived the style of giving from the staff to combine a 'regular' task-oriented approach (e.g. 'publicize achievements of teachers') and a 'highly-soft' style (e.g. 'never refuse to exceptional requests').

Table 6.2 Factor analysis of principal's style of demanding from staff
Teachers' perspective

	Component	
	1	2
Tries to find out reasons for difficulties. (7)	.80	.15
Decides together about targets (9)	.69	-.12
Monitor advancement and difficulties. (4)	.67	-.06
Directs teachers by asking questions. (8)	.65	-.03
Express expectation about plans. (1)	.54	.21
Remarks to teachers who misbehaved (5)	-.01	.78
Insists on implementations of tasks (3)	-.14	.78
Reprimands teachers (10)	-.11	.73
Ask to take care for urgent matters. (2)	.23	.56
Provides duties to perform. (6)	.38	.53

Data processing and content analysis

The questionnaires with the closed questions (Cohen & Manion, 1994, pp. 102-104) were pre-coded (see appendixes 1,2,3) and processed statistically with SPSS. The qualitative tool, semi-structured interview, includes sections containing closed questions (e.g. number of teachers who took maternity leave), sections that include broader categories (e.g. eight criteria for the teachers' shortcomings), and fully open ended questions (e.g. describe in a chronological order what measures the principal took). After defining the categories, the next step was to determine the units for a quantitative and content analysis (Anderson, 1997, p. 341). Some units appeared to be reliably quantified (e.g. kind of people who assisted the teacher), while others entailed integrating much material with a less reliable ground to determine the exact criers (e.g. rates of success and failure). The specific considerations on each subject are presented, with some examples, in the results chapters.

Procedure

Principals are usually very busy during a 'normal' school day. Requesting them to spend precious time on discussing a sensitive topic for research purpose was expected to be met with resistance. In order to alleviate suspiciousness and encourage cooperation, several 'foot in the door' techniques (Freedman & Fraser, 1966; Beaman

et al, 1983; Dillard et al, 1984) were used. Reaching participants was made by phone, an immediate channel (mail requests were found to be totally ineffective). The initial step was introducing oneself giving names and asking the principals if they were familiar with the researcher's publications. Most of them were. That edge of reputation and personal acquaintance made them more attentive, curious and cooperative. After a short explanation of the study's purpose, the researcher asked; 'this is an important issue and I would like to learn from your experience. Are you willing to meet with me for an hour of interview?' Most of the principals did not resist the flattering request. They asked only a few questions and agreed to make an appointment. Surprisingly, only five out of fifty eight refused to cooperate.

At the interview, the principals were given a signed copy of the author's book. That act at the beginning of the session was the first in a 'sequential request strategy'. Cialdini (1985) in his fascinating book 'Influence' described how a small present set a trap for compliance. The interview itself has been developed so that more sensitive and personal aspects were discussed after a 'warming up' section of answering neutral informative questions. The principals were promised that the material would be kept confidential and is intended only for research purpose. Another technique, 'negative politeness' communication (Morand, 2001), that helps to bridge hierarchical gap and make requests seem less infringing, was used. Principals were asked by the end of the interview 'to do a favor' and fill a questionnaire about a weak teacher. Once they finished they were asked 'for the last time' to fill another questionnaire about one of their best teachers. By then the respondents were asked to help the researchers have the two selected teachers and two additional teachers (one above average and one below average teachers) fill short questionnaires.

After some experimenting, the most convenient procedure was found to be that by the end of the interview each principal was handed four stamped envelopes with the teacher's version of the questionnaire. On the envelopes with the researcher's name and address were also written the school code and a number – 01 or 02 for the problematic or the excellent teachers, respectively, about whom the head filled a questionnaire, and 03 or 04 for a selected another problematic and an excellent teacher, respectively, on whom the principal had not filled a form. The principal was asked to choose the four teachers and write their names on a private confidential note to make sure their names are remembered. The four selected teachers who received the questionnaire from the

principal, filled it and returned the sealed envelop to the school's secretary who sent it by mail to the researcher.

That procedure was found to overcome several practical and ethical obstacles: first, it was only the principal who knew by which criterion the teachers were selected. Handing out the questionnaires to a heterogeneous group of four teachers reduced the principal's concern of unwanted exposure of his/her views about them. That confidentiality also helped avoiding a situation in which the researcher would unintentionally or unconsciously transmit that information. Being included in a relatively big and heterogeneous sampled group was aimed to alleviate the resistance of some suspicious teachers. Second, teachers are very busy during a school day, and they are rarely free to spare the time and find the calm atmosphere needed to fill a questionnaire. Filling the form at their free time at school or home, and returning it in a sealed envelop enabled them to invest the necessary time. They could also feel confident about its anonymity. Third, the teachers more willingly complied with the principal's request, as they probably would assist the researcher. Finally, that procedure enabled the researcher to visit each school only once and avoid the sometime exhausting and humiliating experience of chasing after teachers in the middle of a short recess.

The interviews took 60 – 90 minutes. The heads were surprisingly sincere and cooperative, and expressed gratitude at the end of the session. Filling the questionnaire took no more than 10 minutes. In terms of limitations, some teachers remained suspicious about the purpose of the research: they carefully sealed the envelope with scotch tape, mailed the envelope directly to the researcher's address. Some did not respond at all (29 out of 160 teachers), but having 81% of returns should be considered as a success. In 27 out of 40 schools all the teachers sent back their questionnaires, In 4 schools three teachers sent back, in 2 schools two teachers sent their envelopes and in 3 schools only one teacher sent back her questionnaire. In 4 schools no one sent back. One of the initial concerns was that the challenging teachers would prefer not to send back their envelopes, but the results show the scatter of the designated teachers was almost equal (8 – 01, 5 – 02, 8 – 03, 9 – 04).

Ethical aspects

Ethics are the rules or standards of right conduct (House, 1997), for example for doing research in moral responsible way. There are three broad areas of ethical concern in scientific research (Singleton et al. 1993, p. 475): first, the ethics of data collection and analysis, which deals with issues such as biased presentation of results and dishonesty in research. Second the ethics of responsibility to society, which touches upon aspects of ideology and values in research, cultural relativity, the participation of minorities, destructive use of scientific discoveries (e.g. the nuclear bomb) and the like. The last aspect concerns the ethical treatment of human subjects.

Basic ethical principles accepted in our cultural and legal tradition demand that research participants be treated with respect and protected from harm.

Historically, however, these principles sometimes have clashed with scientific practice, generating a great deal of controversy. (Singleton et al. 1993, p. 475)

Four problem areas have been identified most often regarding the treatment of human subjects: potential harm, lack of informed consent, deception, and privacy invasion (Diener & Crandell, 1978). Following many authors who have emphasized these moral aspects, this section elaborates upon the moral and practical implications.

Topic of inquiry

Early decisions about the topic of inquiry, the research design, the sample and other methodological aspects influence the obstacles and ethical dilemmas to be encountered. The starting point here is the nature of the topic. In a book called 'Doing research on sensitive topics', Lee (1993) argue that 'sensitiveness' means the subject poses a threat in three broad areas:

The first is where the research poses an 'intrusive threat', dealing with areas, which are private, stressful or sacred. The second relates to study of deviance and social control and involves the possibility that information may be revealed which is stigmatizing incriminating in some way. Finally, research is often problematic when it impinges on political alignments, if 'political' is taken in its widest sense to refer to the vested interests of powerful persons or institutions,

or the exercise of coercion or domination. In these situations researchers often trespass into areas, which are controversial or involve social conflict. (p. 4)

The current topic - managing incompetent workers, clearly relates to these criteria. It deals with private and stressful cases of deviant behavior, which should be met with social control. The study's possible implications, needless to say, refer to labor relations and their legal and political aspects. Because of the threat they pose, sensitive topics raise difficult methodological and technical problems, which according to Lee (1993), encourage the production of methodological innovations, as clearly happened in this study. The detailed, thoughtful pilot stage of tool development touched upon many practical and moral questions. But even careful planning could not prevent certain dilemmas, which emerged later.

Access

The first step in getting access to schools was by getting the approval from the director of Haifa district where the data was collected, and from the chief scientist in the Ministry of Education. A committee of Experts in the Ministry of Education screened the outlines of the research design and tools and approved it. That committee's aim, like the Institutional Review Boards in the U.S. (Kralhwohl, 1998) is that the purpose of the study and its method would follow certain scientific and ethical standards. Based on the MoE general director guidelines (circular, 1985 46/5) the researcher was also asked to sign a standard contract, which included a commitment to abide by the law (e.g. law of privacy, 1981) and to preserve the anonymity of the respondents. Other stipulations dealt with the manner of publication of the results and the researcher's responsibility toward the Ministry of Education. In case of a doctoral study, a representative of the university (Prof. Tony Bush) had had to co-sign the contract. Since the contract has been written in Hebrew and was to be implemented in a foreign country (Israel), the representative faced a somewhat awkward situation: taking responsibility to oversee a study taken overseas with little control over its implementation. In order to increase confidence, the researcher translated the contract into English (no formal translated version was available) and expressed in a letter a commitment to do his utmost to preserve its terms and spirit.

The Ministry of Education's approval relieved heads' concerns and opened more easily the access to schools. It justified what Festinger and Katz (1966) advised about the

economy in going first to the very top of the organization, especially when it has clear hierarchical structure, as in the educational system.

The geographical location of the sampled schools, the Haifa district, was picked not only due to its resemblance to the general population but also due to its proximity to the researcher's residence. Practical considerations such as convenience and efforts to reduce research costs are legitimate once they meet all the methodological requirements. Yet, it was decided to omit from the sample the city where the author works as a school psychologist in the municipal educational psychological service. Concerns of role conflict (e.g. the possibility of betraying the privacy of teachers whom the author has worked with while discussing their difficulties with a principal) have lead to choosing another city with the same characteristics, which is located in a neighboring district.

Informed consent

Securing informed consent in social science research is one of the most fundamental of ethical principles. That principle arises from the right to freedom and self-determination (Cohen & Manion, 2000, p. 51). In order that subjects would understand and agree to participate, that consent should be based on four elements (Diener & Crandall, 1978): competence, voluntarism, full information, and comprehension. Involving only adults in this study satisfied three conditions: they were competent; they could easily grasp the research requirements and participated voluntarily. The principals received full information. They were informed initially by phone about the research topic, its rationale, the university under which that doctoral study is handled and the request for an hour of interview. They were not told about the rest of the procedure in order not to raise unnecessary concerns and the possibility of refusal to complete several questionnaires (most of them felt fed up with researchers and studies). Once the interview began they were given the rest of the details in writing and verbally:

In order to protect the anonymity of your school, your teachers and yourself, I ask you not to mention any name and other identifying details. I am committed to secure any part of our discussion, and not transmit it to anyone. Upon request, I will send you a full transcript of the content of this interview for your approval.

*Also, if I decide to quote things you said, it would be without any identifying details.
Please answer sincerely.*

During the interview principals were given detailed answers to any question they raised, and for that matter it resembled sort of debriefing session (Burns, 2000; Kralhwohl, 1998).

However, the researcher faced a serious ethical dilemma with regard to informing the teachers. It was realized that the nature of the study and the sensitivities surrounding issues of teachers' competence would raise enormous barriers in recruiting teachers. For example, teachers might reject the humiliation of being identified as 'incompetent'. Furthermore, there would be a danger that some teachers would find out as a result of their involvement in the research that they were perceived by their principal to be 'incompetent'. This would mean that the research process could lead to unfortunate emotional consequences for some participating teachers. It was therefore decided, after extended reflection, to take the serious step of withholding some information. The teachers, who were not known to the researcher, were informed in the covering letter to the questionnaire that the study was about educational management. This was in fact true. They were promised that the information would remain anonymous and confidential. The exact topic of the study – coping with teachers' poor performance was not mentioned. They also remained unaware of what the criteria were by which the principals selected their teachers.

Getting consent based on partial information clearly put much responsibility on the researcher's shoulders. Frankfort-Nachamaias and Nachamaias (1992) suggest:

The principle of informed consent should not...be made an absolute requirement of all social sciences research. Although usually desirable, it is not absolutely necessary to studies where no danger or risk involved. The more serious the risk to research participants, the greater becomes the obligation to obtain informed consent (p. 67).

On the positive side, that decision enabled the researcher first to explore the topic of competence in a way that avoided teachers' defensiveness. Second, it protected

teachers from potential anxieties that may arise from their awareness that perceptions of their competence were being explored. The intention was to keep the 'costs' to the teachers as minimal as possible, and the decision was not taken lightly, and careful consideration was given to any potential negative consequences for teachers. Among these potential negative consequences is the possibility that principals might, as a result of their involvement in the study, make decisions affecting teachers' circumstances.

Another concern related to the act of asking principals to identify poor performing staff members, discuss their difficulties and evaluate their performance. The source of tension principals may have experienced here, according to Aronson and Carlsmith (1969) was the collision between two values – the desire to assist with a scientific inquiry in pursuit of truth and knowledge; and a belief in the dignity of individuals. In order to guard the teachers' dignity, the researcher discussed briefly the ethical dimensions with the principals before they engaged in the research process. Some principals spoke openly while others felt uneasiness, at least in the beginning of the interview. All of them were aware of the ethical implications and gave a respectful, matter-of-fact description, despite the concern most of them felt toward their teachers. Only few principals 'bleached' their words, while few others used quite blatant phrases. Some principals who faced serious dilemmas tried to use the interview to consult how to solve management problems. But being aware of a possible shift in the nature of the interview and taking strict empathic listening without expressing any opinion helped to enable the avoidance of such an undesirable occurrence.

Had the request to identify challenging teachers, discuss their shortcomings made an impact on the principal's thought? Had filling a questionnaire posed any harm to the teachers? Since these ethical drawbacks were identified earlier, it was decided to employ several measures. In a telephone call the researcher made to the principals several weeks after the interview some of them admitted the discussion was thought provoking, emotionally loaded but also helpful. No doubt that for many principals the open climate in the interview led to an experience, almost similar to a therapeutic session. The expression of gratefulness by the end of the meeting clearly reflected that sense. All of them said the interview did not change their behavior toward the challenging teacher. The researcher advised the principals that it would be unethical if the interviews had any negative effects on the principal or, especially, the teacher. An

additional letter was sent to all of the principals several months later with a reminder that the interview was meant for scientific purposes only and should not lead to any negative consequences with regard to the relevant teachers.

Privacy

The study's procedure protected the privacy of the teachers, who remain anonymous. The principals and the schools identities were obviously known to the researcher but were kept confidential by several methods during the data collection and the publication of the results, including (Cohen and Manion, 1994, p. 368):

- A. Deletion of identifiers (e.g. names of schools, location).
- B. Using crude report categories and submitting general information rather than specific (e.g. age in broad interval rather than exact years).
- C. Micro aggregation - the construction of the average teacher from data of individuals and the release of these data, rather than data on individuals.
- D. Error inoculation – deliberately introducing errors into the presentation of individuals, while leaving the aggregate data unchanged.

Despite the many precautions used in the study, teachers' privacy was shattered once in a rural school. The principal who collected the sealed envelopes secretly opened them to read how her teachers rated her. One of the teachers happened to see the principal skim through the questionnaires and reported that to her colleagues. That incident has been brought to the researcher's awareness by an anonymous call of a lady who identified herself as a psychologist, and a friend of several of the respondents. She explained that the school had suffered for a long time a social climate of suspiciousness, and the principal's act of betrayal was just another example. Cohen & Manion (1994) explain that breach of trust 'is often a consequence of selfish motives of either a personal or professional nature' (p. 368). Since the case was kept secret among the all the relevant persons (the teachers did not want to reveal they witnessed the ugly behavior, let alone the principal), the only outcome of the discovery was the addition of a written note for the remainder of teachers on how to seal the envelope and send it by mail, a further safeguard of privacy.

On three occasions participants could have reviewed what they had said. The first was through transcription of interviews sent to the participants in the pilot stage. They were

asked to approve its content. The second occasion took place when principals received a letter, which expressed gratitude and offered them results about their staff management style as they described it in comparison with the four teachers' aggregated perceptions. To materialize that option, the principals were asked to get the teachers' permission and promise them that the combined results of the four questionnaires would not breach anonymity, and would not relate to inter-personal aspects (e.g. perceived mutual emotions). About one quarter of the principals used that opportunity. Third, where principals were directly quoted or when the case they described was mentioned in the thesis, they were sent the specific extract to approve its publication.

Cost/benefit

To sum up this section, researchers must consider the cost/benefit ratio (Frankfort-Nachmias and Nachmias, 1992), namely to weigh the likely social benefits of the study vis-à-vis the personal costs to the individuals taking part. With regard to the benefits, the subject of weak teachers is rarely investigated and its findings shed new light on aspects of manager-worker relations and conflict management within such a tense situation. This study carries some theoretical and practically meaningful new implications in the field of educational human resource management, which could be of benefit to principals, teachers and the effective management of schools and the long-term benefit of students. For example several suggestions are given to principals and teachers on how to solve difficulties associated with teacher performance and what actions should and should not be taken.

Throughout the study's stages many necessary precautions were taken to keep the respondents anonymity and confidentiality. From the outset of the planning and the pilot stage the principals considered the subject to be very important and volunteered to participate. A surprisingly low number of principals refused and the rate of teachers who volunteered to answer the questionnaires was very high. The sincere cooperation and the words of gratitude and appreciation expressed by the interviewees by the end of the sessions proved the procedure was highly professional, gratifying and handled properly from an ethical standpoint. A follow-up telephone calls to revealed that the interview left no 'side effects' in terms of the principals' behaviour towards the teachers. All the principals were also reminded in a letter about their professional responsibilities to ensure that the research had no ill effects on the teachers. Frankfort-Nachmias and Nachmias (1992) count some possible personal costs to the participants:

affronts to dignity, embarrassment, loss of trust in social relations, loss of autonomy and self-determination, and lowered self-esteem. Every effort has been made to avoid such costs. The only known exception was the case of the principal who opened the sealed envelopes of her teachers. No other violation or unpleasantness has been discerned.

Was there any other viable way to study how principals manage their poor performing teachers? Ideally, this study could have been conducted in an entirely different way. For example, selecting a large randomized sample of teachers and examine the principals' perceptions of their performance without any direct reference to poor performance. This would have given ample data, and would have prevented the need to identify a failing teacher (see Sparks & Lipka, 1991, 1992). Yet, such procedure appeared to be not only impractical (demanded heavy resources, which were not available), but also would have omitted the very essence of the study, exploring what are the criteria by which principals identify their challenging teachers and how they cope with their shortcomings. Being aware to the current procedure's possible ethical drawbacks, it was decided to take from the beginning several precautions in order to protect the participants, to ensure that none would be harmed.

Finally, the teachers and principals who participated in this study immensely enriched our understanding and it is hoped that through the research findings and outcomes they have contributed to save the experience of failure and anguish of generations of teachers to come. The aim was that they should pay no personal price for that contribution.

The schools and the principals

The schools

Visiting the sampled forty schools became almost like a short journey through the history of the educational system in Israel. Most of the schools were built shortly after the declaration of the State, when tens of thousands new immigrants arrived each year. The rapid demographic changes forced the government to build new neighborhoods. Little efforts were made to maintain the architecture either aesthetically or well suited to its goals. The school building, with its simple two-story u shaped and courtyard remind one of a factory or even a prison rather than an educational setting. Only few trees shade the hot uncovered playground surface, and except for the asphalt yard, mostly used for the boys' football matches, there is little outdoor furniture. The large glassy windows do not protect against the strong sun. Some classrooms are not yet equipped with air-conditioning. The painted inner long corridors are decorated with art posters, children's drawings and banners with citations from the Jewish tradition. Other facilities like libraries, science-room or gym exist in some schools, depending on whether the local authority managed to get enough resources to build them. In schools built in the 60's and 70's the architecture is characterized with unpainted, bare cement walls, resembling an inner and outer 'castle' look. The long corridors were replaced with classrooms that surround an inner courtyard. The few newly built schools were one story, tiled roof, and a friendly place.

The principal's room was usually connected to the secretary's office and located near the teachers' room. These rooms were often spacious, nicely decorated with large desk, shelves, books, teaching materials, certificates of merits and trophies. Despite its central location the noise and uproar are somehow kept outside.

Unlike the municipal middle schools and high schools, the elementary schools were built within each neighborhood to serve its pupils. The students tended to come from a relatively homogenous socio-economic background, mostly middle class families. About a quarter of the schools were located in poor urban neighborhoods, mainly in Haifa and its vicinity, while the upper middle class neighborhoods, a tenth of the sample, happened to be located either in the affluent sections of Haifa and in recently established nouveau-riche settlements.

The forty schools varied tremendously with regard to size ($M=360$, $SD=173$). Few were very small with less than a hundred pupils, under threat by the Ministry of education to be closed, while others were medium and large (range 72 – 700). Altogether 14,395 pupils studied at these schools. Due to gradual demographic changes, mainly aging in families, one third of the schools suffered an enrollment decline. In comparison, there were last year in each school seven more students on average. Only in five out of forty schools was there growth in population, while more than half the principals reported a stable enrollment.

On average almost thirty teachers worked in each school ($M=29$, $SD=7$), altogether a sample of 1154 teachers. Less than one quarter worked part time, most of them were specialist teachers (e.g. music, sports) whose full time job was divided among two or more schools. Being a worker in several institutions became an organizational obstacle for full involvement within the schools' daily routine. Some of the poor-performing teachers came out of these ranks. As throughout the western countries, teaching is a feminine profession, and 97 percent of the sampled teachers were women.

The turnover rate within the last two years was relatively low. In half of the schools 1-3 teachers took a sabbatical leave while 27 out of 1157 female teachers were on maternity leave. That rate of 2.3 percent is much lower than the national rate of 14.2 percent (CBS, 2001, 12.19). Surprisingly, in 40 percent of the schools there was basically no change in personnel. In other schools only few teachers left ($M=2.4$, $SD=1.8$), most of them retired ($M=1.15$, $SD=1.14$) or moved to another school ($M=0.8$, $SD=1.3$). The low turnover rate meant that most of the teachers in the sampled schools were veteran and very few novice teachers were accepted to work recently.

The principals

The principals impressed as a very professional and mature persons. They were 40 to 50 years old who had been working on average over twenty years (M-23.3, SD- 6.6). It took them 12-14 years of serving in various positions including being instructors and vice principals before they took a mandatory management course and applied for a managing position. Most of the principals worked only in elementary schools but some who taught in high schools and wished to become a school principal decided to pursue the opportunity to lead an elementary school once a vacant position was opened. The whole group happened to be a very heterogeneous with regard to their headship experience. Three equal groups emerged: the novice heads with up to four years of principal ship (14), the more established group with 5 – 9 years of experience (14) and the veteran principals with more than ten years leading their schools (12). The most experienced one was a lady who served no less than 26 years as a principal in the same school. Even though she was about to retire, her enthusiasm and commitment were truly impressive. Interestingly, once they assumed that position, the majority of heads remained in the job for many years. Only 5 out forty principals served in more than one school.

Not surprisingly, most of the principals (85 percent) were women, but the men's representation was five times higher than their share among the teachers' ranks (15 vs. 3 percent). This finding represents a universal trend in which women's participation declines while more men occupy the higher positions in the organizational ladder. With regard to their education, unlike in high schools where having a master's degree is a mandatory requirement to become a principal; half of the sampled principals had only BA degree, mainly on education and humanities. Only one principal was pursuing Doctorate studies.

Being a principal means representing the mainstream values and characteristics of the society. Most of the principals were born and grew up in Israel. Others who had immigrated with their families as young children were educated here. They had already internalized the culture and its norms. Only one young principal who grew up in the USSR and immigrated to Israel 7 years ago, served as principal in a newly built neighborhood where many Russian immigrants lived.

Teachers' evaluation in Israel

Human resource management is based on flowing data on how workers accomplish their tasks, and principals collect information intensively, mostly by informal observations. Since identifying shortcomings and misbehavior, especially when teachers intentionally cover up their deeds, is a difficult task, and principals have been forced to develop their own surveillance methods on how to monitor others' work. Before describing those methods, the national picture of teachers' evaluation in Israel will be considered.

Teachers in Israel may be formally appraised 2-3 times in their career; some of them will not even be appraised once. The department for evaluation in the Ministry of Education holds in depth surveys across Israel in several dozens of schools each year. According to its data,³ most principals do observe teachers in classes, discuss their impressions and guide teachers as how to improve their teaching. Compared to ongoing practices of formative evaluation, no summative evaluation exists within the school system. In order to understand the absence of the use of such important managerial tool it is necessary to understand the nature of personnel management duties executed by school inspectors and school principals. This evidence is based on interviews taken in the preliminary stages of this study with two MoE inspectors, a former district director in the Ministry of Education and a high-ranking official in the teachers' union. The emerging picture is as follow:

Each of the Ministry of Education inspectors has pedagogic and administrative responsibility for at least 15 schools and 300 teachers. Frequently the numbers are doubled. Within the personnel domain inspectors allocate teaching hours, refer new teachers and move surplus workers to other schools. They consult principals on how to solve personnel problems, and initiate a procedure to terminate work of inferior teachers when it is necessary. Principals meet their inspectors several times a year and call them frequently whenever an issue or a problem arises. Inspectors attempt to visit each school at least 2-3 times a year, where they meet the managerial staff and discuss ongoing issues. While at school, they hold class visit to observe a novice teacher who is about to receive tenure. Inspectors are acquainted with only a few out of the hundreds

³Reported by Mr. Rafael Kaufman, a staff member at the department of evaluation at the Ministry of Education. 3/11/1999

of teachers who work under their jurisdiction. Decreasing that ratio would have meant a significant increase in the number of inspectors, but the government is not prepared to raise the allocated budget for that matter. Inspectors are respected for their power but having such a large span of control does not enable them to contribute much to the system they are in charge of.

In contrast, Israeli school principals are locked in a bureaucratic trap where they are held fully responsible but have no power in personnel matters. Heads are not entitled to hire workers, to determine their salary and reward them, or to change their employment conditions. Principals cannot dismiss a teacher let alone find a substitute. These impossible conditions force heads to collaborate with their inspectors but meanwhile use many power tactics to survive.

Formal evaluation does occur several times during a teacher's career:

Selection – novice teachers who have just finished their academic studies must register at the inspector's office. Once a job is vacant, the inspector selects five teachers according to their resume (former experience, achievements at college etc.) and sends them to get interviewed by the principal. Upon the head's recommendation, the inspector invites 2-3 candidates for a 30-45 minutes personal interview. After each candidate discuss his or her experience the inspector evaluates who the best one is to match the school's needs. Only after exchanging impressions with the principal and careful examination of the documents in the districts personnel office, does the inspector give a green light to hire the teacher. Within the first three years the principal guides the teacher and informs the inspector how the novice teacher performs. Unlike in elementary schools, high school principals enjoy more degrees of freedom with regard to personnel issues. Also, novice teachers can get a temporary license and continue to work with it for several years before getting tenure.

Tenure – in the beginning of the third year the teacher is eligible to get tenure. The inspector's formal duty is to observe the teacher at work and approve the decision. The Ministry of Education maintains only few formal requirements (e.g. having a teaching license) and does not hold any standardized evaluation tool. Each inspector develops his or her form of evaluation (the available governmental forms are not used). At their class visit, inspectors examine only the observable competencies such as clarity of explanation, the teacher's standing in the classroom, manner of writing on the

blackboard etc. Such external and superficial appraisal, which is done according to the law and its regulations, overlooks many important aspects: relationships with parents and students, home visits, holding social activities, mainstreaming exceptional children etc. These activities cannot be traced in a short single visit and the inspector is inclined to rely on the head's judgment.

The selection, inducing and granting tenure to novice teachers exemplify how inspectors and principals share roles and responsibilities. Principals manage their teacher through endless daily encounters, while inspectors get involved mainly whenever a formal administrative procedure is needed or when personnel problem arise. Inspector's involvement and decisions are based to large extent on the principal's opinion, and so both of them hold half the power and neither of them is able to manage personnel issues independently.

Since politics enter into personnel decision-making processes (Bridges & Groves, 1999), it is necessary to consider other stakeholders' goals and interests. The lack of formal appraisal reflects conflicting attitudes, which bring to a stalemate any effort to improve the evaluation process:

First, despite the fact that principals are maybe the most reliable and knowledgeable source of evaluating performance and manage their personnel, teachers' unions in Israel object to granting them such authority. The unions are concerned it may be used unprofessionally and unethically. Meanwhile, the government, despite its ability to enable principals to become accountable and autonomous, prefers at the moment to avoid opening an additional line of conflict with the unions and let the situation remain as it is.

Second, if teaching were an independent profession, like that of doctors or lawyers, then the thorough preparation, careful supervision for many years, difficult examinations before licensing, the obligation to preserve an ethical code and other professional standards must be considered sufficient with no need for an ongoing evaluation. For example, only recently judges in Israeli courts raised their concern and rage over a suggestion made by the Lawyers Bureau to rate adjudicator's performance. Somehow, teaching has never matured to become an autonomous profession, despite

certain efforts made by the teacher unions (e.g. efforts to establish a professional code). On the other hand, due to bureaucratic and political considerations the government has never agreed to give up its right to take measures of personnel decision-making. Development of teaching toward the status of an independent occupation would have meant, among other aspects, establishing a procedure of management by exceptions, namely giving heads autonomy to decide how to cope with incompetent teachers.

Third, the curriculum itself, due to the interests and influences on its contents may limit certain activities within the educational system. For example, In addition to its traditional roles, schools in Israel are expected to serve a host of additional social and national goals (e.g. integrating low socio-economic groups, educating traffic safety, preventing use of drugs and alcohol etc). Fulfilling these aims inevitably leaves fewer resources for regular studies and the pressure to evaluate achievements decreases.

Teachers' performance evaluation

The first stage explored how principals get informed about their staff. Unlike more formal questions asked in educational systems in UK and the USA (Middlewood & Cardno, 2001) the principals were asked about the formal and informal methods they use collect information: 'how do you get to know who the excellent teachers in your staff are and who the challenging teachers are?' Their initial responses to the open questions often focused on their philosophy and the most frequently used method:

I do not give [my teachers] grades. We use intensively [the method of] peer supervision. There is a lot of cooperation among teachers and they host each other in their classes. Sometimes I visit a class for few minutes (school 16).

When later probed about other methods they use, principals elaborated their responses, especially with regard to the formal evaluation methods. Several heads proudly presented structured tools they had developed to enhance teaching improvement. Based on content analysis to the principals' answers, six categories of information-seeking methods were discerned:

Unstructured sporadic observations – the principals often walk around the buildings and yards, listen to noises that come out of the classrooms, observe teachers' encounter

with students and staff members. Some stand by the school gate and greet everyone with 'good morning' (and watch the late coming students and teachers), while most of them teach in classes and get first-hand impressions as to the pupils' learning habits, knowledge and discipline. Some principals, literally and symbolically, leave their door open for students, teachers, parents and administrative staff to report or complain about every aspect of school life. Unstructured sporadic observations were found to be the main source of information principals get. Unlike other structured methods that systematically involve other persons, impressions can be collected anywhere and anytime.

Unstructured short classroom observations – as the old aphorism states 'a fleeting guest sees all faults', many heads pay daily short visits to welcome everyone with a good morning, deliver some messages and watch the current activity in the classroom. The unplanned, surprise visit enables principals to get impressions about what goes on in a 'real time', with no earlier preparations and efforts made by the teachers to beautify the reality. All the principals pay short visits, and 57% of them attend classes very often.

Structured classrooms observation - observation is considered as a main tool for improving and evaluating teacher's performance. The sampled heads were divided into three groups: those who vehemently objected (25 percent), considering the visit as a staged show that adds nothing to their knowledge. In some small or rural schools, where comradely relationships prevailed among principals and teachers, an observation was perceived as almost an impolite gesture when the teacher did not request such a visit. The second group of principals strongly believed in observation (40 percent) and visited every teacher at least once a year. They usually announced in advance when the visit will take place and on what aspects it will be focused. Later, they hold a follow-up discussion, which touches upon the strengths and the weaknesses to improve. Some principals fill a form or type a short summary letter to the teacher's personal file, but never for summative purposes. The third group of principals (35 percent) reported they visit classes only when necessary (e.g. when problems arise, as a mandatory step before granting a tenure).

Follow-up discussions – the organizational climate and the common practice in Israeli schools call for frequent and periodical follow up on students' achievements and the

proper implementation of teaching method. Two thirds of the principals reported they hold meetings up to 2-4 times a year while one third meet infrequently, whenever it is necessary.

Teachers' self-assessment – very few principals (15 percent) in this study ask their teachers to evaluate their professional behaviour and discuss their weaknesses and strengths. Filling in a self- assessment questionnaire is a good managerial tool that enables the principal to improve teaching, and better adjust the teacher's characteristics to the nature of the students. Such a tool also clarifies the criteria for good teaching, for example the extent to which the teacher manages to advance her weak students. It raises personal responsibility and accountability and enables the setting of goals for the near future (MBO). Yet, with so many advantages, our principals, like managers and workers all over the world hesitate to overcome its main drawback: self-assessment raises tremendous inconvenience and anxiety. When it comes to evaluating performance, they prefer remaining ignorant.

Structured discussions with pupils - another useful source of data, which cuts the command chain and brings reliable first-hand information, is by having classroom and informal discussions with pupils or having them respond to structured questionnaires. Besides gaining the opportunity to get acquainted with the students' social and academic lives it enables principals to collect information about teacher-students relationships and more specifically to be informed about difficulties that teachers are having.

Table 7.1 Principal's methods for evaluating teachers' performance (percent)

Unstructured observation	Unstructured short classroom observations	Structured classrooms observation	Follow-up on student's achievements	Teachers' self-assessment	Structured discussions with pupils	Periodical feedback meetings	Written evaluation
Infrequently 12	Infrequently 43	None 25	Infrequently 33	Yes 15	Yes 30	Yes 80	Yes 20
Often 88	Often 57	Partly 35	Often 67	No 85	No 70	No 20	No 80
		All the teachers 40					

Most of the principals rely on sporadic unplanned short discussions with pupils as a source of information, but relatively few principals (30 percent) invest the time and efforts to listen to their most precious clients on a more structured basis.

The table clearly shows that principals use many sources of information to evaluate their staff. They welcome any informant, almost any time. These findings support earlier works of Mintzberg (1973) who refuted the myth that managers base their decisions on organizational information collected by formal systems. They rather preferred to perceive the 'music' behind the words and collect 'soft' information like hearsay, speculations and even rumors. The principal of a large high school explained:

There are many [social and professional] circles in the school, and my concern as a principal is how not to lose touch with daily activities and the 'field'. It is easy not to know, to become disconnected. This is the reason why I frequently walk in the school. I encourage teamwork, and the management team is the most important one. As a principal I sometimes join other teams, just to know what is happening. My participation also transmits a message of involvement. I enjoy and appreciate teachers who spontaneously come to report about things that happen in school. (Pilot, school C)

Unplanned impressions are not sufficient and principals also need to reach out and seek more formal data. This takes place in structured meetings with their staff to plan ahead the subject matter to be taught, monitor the progress of the students and consult on how to solve certain problems.

Monitoring teachers' work is not the principal's favorable duty. Some go as far as to define it as 'embarrassing activity' (Bullock, 1988, p. 66), while others prefer to check exercise books and lesson plans rather than observing their staff (Bennett, 1995). Wise (2000) explains that the managerial duties, the drive for greater effectiveness, coupled with the bureaucratic imposition conflicts with the desire to maintain good staff relationships and the expectation of collegiality. Most of the principals in this study held periodical meetings to discuss with their teachers various aspects of their work. They usually took place after a classroom observation or at the end of the school year. The discussions followed a fixed pattern: at first the teachers were asked about their work, feelings and problems they have. Then the principal raised several issues related

to the observation and general impressions of the teacher's work. Principals preferred to focus on 'safe' and less controversial aspects like curriculum planning or discussing a pupil's behaviour. If there was anything to criticize, it was done very delicately. Some principals went as far as to encourage teachers to give them feedback, to consult with them and even criticize them. In an observation of one such meeting (Pilot, school B), the principal did her utmost, physically and verbally, to maintain a calm atmosphere. She spoke in low voice, smiled very often, listened carefully and spoke very little. She gave the teacher, a new immigrant veteran music teacher plenty of praises. She only remarked that he should have invited to school to a formal meeting, one of his students' fathers rather than criticize his son's behaviour in an occasional meeting in the supermarket. He explained that he is confused with regard to the open Israeli climate after so many years of teaching in the tough educational regime in Russia.

Fineman (1996) maintains that different meeting places structure the kind of emotions that are appropriate to express, amplifying or reducing power differentials and making certain emotions safer or riskier to express. Fineman and Sturdy (1999) observed 'the 'low voice' complaining in the public reception areas, and the more open resistance and anger of the manager behind the desk of his office' (p. 648). Our principals seemed to behave quite the opposite, raising openly their concerns in public meetings and softening their personal criticism at the office. Yet, their main desire was to express their emotions without offending individual teachers, hence using the public arena as a safer place. Very few principals gave their teachers written feedback, usually a form filled after an observation. Only one principal who had become an educator after a short career as an army officer adopted the routine of transmitting annual written evaluations to his teachers.

Principals' criteria of evaluating teachers

The principals' professional and moral values are the inner compass, which assist them to transmit expectations and judge their staff members. When asked in the interview, after a series of technical questions, to select only two traits that in their opinion make a teacher good or bad, they were taken by surprise. It took them few moments to reflect upon their values (it is a good practice to have principals reassess periodically their attitudes). The participants recited a vast array of traits: being loyal, stable, responsible, maintaining good communication with children and their parents and the like. Each

principal had a unique yardstick she maintained. The criteria were not necessarily related directly to the formal aspects of the teacher's work and outcomes. Some principals also took into account broader perspectives about the educational system.

We shouldn't use achievements as an index for school's success. Many times it is [affected by] the student intelligence, families that enhance or delay their child's development, the socio-economic situation, the assistance student gets at home. Many students in my school come from immigrant's families who know very little the [Hebrew] language and the [Israeli] culture. It is not fair to compare my school to [name of a private elitist institution in Haifa]. Maybe at the culturally deprived, schoolteachers are more committed and work harder than in an established school (Pilot, school A).

Another example, one principal decided to get ride of a young successful teacher because she lied to her about a course she was supposed to attend but didn't make it. The principals' responses with regard to both groups' traits were accumulated by content analysis into eight categories. Some respondents counted more than two traits while others faced difficulty to count even one.

The two most appreciated and the two most disturbing traits and behaviors relate to the teacher's motivation and sensitiveness to children. Principals also valued a high moral level of honesty and loyalty and the willingness to change and learn new teaching methods. Meanwhile, somewhat surprisingly, principals were less concerned about the professional level of their staff, stating they have the capability to improve it. They were not bothered at all whether some of their teachers are not academically clever. The traits of collegiality and responsibility were important to certain degree.

Closer analysis reveals among the commonalties some important differences. As for considering the favorable traits, being enthusiastic and motivated guarantee the principals that good deeds and a proper climate of accomplishments would prevail. In elementary school a "mother-like" behaviour is also considered as a must for teachers (it is assumed that in high schools that trait would be less important). Since principals, like any manager, prefer to have compliant workers, loyalty and honesty count, even though the traits do not serve the school's main role – teaching and learning. When

teachers work according to these good traits it paves the principals' way for a successful and easier work.

Table 7.2 Principals' criteria of evaluating teachers (percent)

No.	Positive criteria	frequency	Negative criteria	frequency
1	Professionalism	20	Lack of professionalism	15
2	High motivation, initiation, enthusiasm	53	Low motivation, lack of initiation and enthusiasm	43
3	Honesty, integrity, dependability, loyalty	35	Dishonesty, undependable, disloyalty	28
4	Sensitivity and love for children	43	Insensitiveness, aggressiveness, disrespect for children	58
5	Collegiality, good relations with staff	20	Not collegial, bad relations with staff	23
6	Responsibility, accountability	15	Irresponsibility, not accountable	13
7	Wisdom, knowledgeable	3	Stupid, lack of values and culture	8
8	Willing to change, learn new methods, creativity	25	Stiffness, lack of will to change and learn new methods	13

The negative traits, the undesired behaviors mark possible sources of troubles.

Principals know that parents do not show much interest in the exact curriculum being taught, but even the most indifferent parent would object in the case of unjust, brutal and insensitive treatment to his or her child. Further, for many principals the love of children is the main pillar on which the educational building stands, and by insensitive behaviour teachers ruin the moral foundation of their work. Insensitiveness was found to be the most disturbing aspect which principals were so reluctant to tolerate. In several cases principals confided they were considering moving a competent teacher who had offended a child.

The second highest negative trait – laziness, also threatens to tear the delicate working-relations fabric of the organization. When teachers come late to work, refrain from volunteering and do not comply with requests, they simple tie the principal's hands. Not only it does not enable effective management, but also the bad model of their behaviour may 'contaminate' the behaviour of other staff members.

Do the positive and negative values correlate with each other? Do principals who admire one trait condemn behaviors that contradict that value? The basic premise of cognitive consistency theories is that people strive to be consistent in their beliefs, attitudes and behaviors. Inconsistency acts as an irritant or a stimulus that motivates to modify or change them until they form a coherent package (Abelson et al., 1968). The principals were quite consistent about the professional values they believed in. Supporting the positive value of collegiality correlated with strong rejection of in collegiality ($r .49$). Consistency was maintained with regard to the values of professionalism ($r .49$), sensitiveness ($r .53$), and wisdom ($r .56$). Less strong relations were found with regard to the importance of motivation ($r .21$) and responsibility ($r .19$). The willingness to change was strongly correlated with the negative value of irresponsibility ($r .48$), and the importance of collegiality correlated with lack of will to learn new methods ($r .56$). Meanwhile, the correlations among the positive values themselves were found to be weak and mostly negative. Since principals were asked to select only two traits, the wide dispersion of answers possibly lead to a situation where most chances were that one trait would not correlate with another (hence negative) or have mixed results (hence weak or no statistical connection). The same finding was true with regard to the negative traits.

Summary

Unlike many organizations within the private and the public sector, HRM procedure of workers' appraisal is not practiced in Israeli schools, except in the mandatory stage before granting tenure. Yet, principals use various formal and informal methods to become updated and improve their teachers' performance. The methods most often used are unstructured observations and classroom visits. A follow up on pupils' achievements also enables them to appraise learning and teaching. Unlike more structured methods used in the USA (Bridges, 1992; Jakobson & Battaglia, 2001), principals were found to avoid using more sensitive procedures such as open discussions with pupils and parents, or passing constructed questionnaires among pupils (satisfaction) or teachers (self assessment). The principals used to give their teachers a constructed feedback, most often immediately after a classroom visit or on a planned periodical basis. These encounters are typically taken in a supportive atmosphere. The principals avoid raising criticism and discussing sensitive issues.

The sampled principals mostly appreciated motivated teachers who are sensitive to children. Principals also valued honesty, loyalty and the willingness to adopt new teaching methods. Surprisingly, unlike principals in the UK (Wragg et al, 1999; Middlewood, 2001) the Israeli principals were less concerned with regard to the professional level and how able the teachers are. When teachers behave aggressively, teach poorly or manifest low motivation, both the principal and the MoE inspector are expected to take measures. In reality, the lack of clear domains of responsibility and personal (sometimes conflicting) interests lead them to adopt ineffective decisions.

Management styles of demanding and giving

After reviewing the values and methods of teachers' appraisal (cognitive), the next section in the *three-component model of attitude* (Rosenberg & Hovland, 1960; Eagly & Chaiken, 1998) discusses the management style (behavioral) of the principals along with dimensions of demanding and giving (Yariv, 1999).

Principals' demanding

Fulfilling the school's missions means an endless list of tasks. The principal's demanding has many aspects - expressing expectations (e.g. I would like to see an improvement in....), raising questions (e.g. what else can be done?), adding suggestions and stressing what tasks should be performed. If the results do not meet the expected goals, they evaluate to what extent their aspirations were realistic, and what factors brought the failure (or success). But, the first commandment as to how motivate their staff was expressed by an experienced head:

The role model I give to my teachers is crucial. As a principal I can't afford that others would say they do their share while the principal doesn't. (Pilot, school C)

Heads stressed the importance of respectfully requesting from teachers and giving them the sense of full partnership. For example, one principal reported she would never command a pupil to clean dirt she saw in the schoolyard but rather ask others' assistance to do it together. Another principal explained he would rather call to his office a staff member who refused to replace a sick colleague, and avoid a loud confrontation. Teachers are likely to appreciate such style, and hate authoritarian

manners. The internal relations among the staff are complicated and principals consider carefully their steps within the political milieu. The principal's requests from teachers may reflect their mutual relations and appreciation. A principal described how careful she must act in conflict situations.

My teachers learned that I do not shout but when I am getting angry it means a serious situation. Teachers need intensive reinforcements, maybe more than in any other profession. Principals cannot change the teacher's salary but their words are powerful enough. When a principal rarely reprimand teachers, then a "shake-up" discussion becomes a very effective tool. My teachers get anxious whenever I invite them to my office. Even avoiding complimenting is felt as unpleasant sanction. (Pilot, school A)

By sharing their concerns with the staff, the principals avoid a collision with individual teachers. They hope that general, not personally specified, reprimands would reach the right ears and help change the teachers' behavior. Needless to say that the principals balanced demanding with acts of giving, according to the context:

Except in situations of apparently serious or clear breaches of the law, a delicate balance between being helpful and authoritative – close and distant – was to be struck and composure maintained. Similarly managers adopted seemingly conscious strategies of interaction – such as "greenness", friendliness, assertiveness, defensiveness, in order to achieve their objectives (Fineman, 1999, p. 658).

Principals' giving

The principal giving is expressed in countless ways: listening to teachers, trusting them and counting on them. In addition to the respect and the personal regard, they professionally develop individual teachers and the staff as group. They encourage a teacher whose child is sick, offering a ride by the end of the day to teacher who needs to take her child from the nursery, consulting workers that have marital problems.

I maintain an 'open door' policy. My teachers know they are allowed to open my diary and ask to set an appointment. Professionally, when teachers have

difficulties with students or parents they get my assistance. When they ask how to teach a subject I exemplify by myself or ask another senior teacher to do it. Once a year I invite the staff to my home for an informal gathering. I also hold a professional enrichment activity out of town. I try to accompany them in informal and in personal occasions. I invest in my people, because they later return whole-heartedly, with energy, with pride. It [that style] fits my personality. It pays off (Pilot, school A).

Working extra hours and presenting the teachers with a proper model is not only the principals' prerequisite to demand from others. It also encourages the staff to double their efforts and enriches their performance.

Main findings

Based on the participants' responses to the questionnaires, the emerging principals' management style is that of unconditioned support to individual teachers. Heads offer their teachers all the necessary conditions for independent work, and refrain from raising demands or remarking when something goes wrong. Meanwhile, heads use more intensively balanced means when managing the staff as a group. They give more and demand more. Yet, a closer look reveals that when they need to direct individuals, principals wear soft gloves. They express expectations, meet with teachers to set targets together, and use questions instead of transmitting commands. Harsher means, such as insisting on performing their demands and reprimanding undisciplined teachers, are less often used.

Table 7.3 Principals' demanding and giving styles

	Teachers' perspective (N- 128)	Principals' perspective (N – 39)
Principal's demanding from individual teachers	2.77 (.64)	3.25 (.93)
Principal's giving to individual teachers	4.18 (.84)	4.25 (.50)
Principal demanding from staff	3.76 (.51)	3.79 (.50)
Principal's giving to staff	4.17 (.54)	4.34 (.37)

Principals do not demand much from individual teachers. On a scale from 1 to 5 (never to very often), they hardly visit their classes (mean 2.21), do not insist on their requests

(2.17), let alone reprimand them when necessary. Principals prefer to use indirect methods such as setting targets together and monitoring the teacher's performance and students' achievements. Another example is that principals refrained from insisting that teachers would implement the missions once they faced difficulties. Interestingly, teachers perceive the principals as softer than how the principals perceive themselves. Is this the gap between 'want to be' and 'actually is'?

Compared to the low demanding, principals tend to behave generously toward their individual teachers. They trust them (mean 4.31), offer them all the necessary facilities (4.12), listen carefully to them (4.01), and almost never refuse any request. Yet, the principals are perceived by their teachers as somewhat less enthusiastic to help when problems arise. Meanwhile, it was found that principals did insist that teachers would carry on tasks, despite difficulties they faced at the time.

Unlike the relationships with individual teachers, which tend to be more supporting and characterized with raising only little expectations, principals do not hesitate to demand from their staff as a whole. Heads prefer to transmit their requests and insist on them more within the public arena, in staff meeting and in the teachers' room. On a scale from 1 to 5 (never to very often) principals often raise expectations (mean 4.49), ask to take care about urgent matters (3.88), and even from time to time reprimand teachers who did not fulfill their duties (mean 2.95).

Principals giving behavior seems to be supporting even more toward their staff as a whole than toward their individual teachers. Teachers report their heads take care for the working conditions (mean 4.27), enable them to call them any time (4.71), encourage teachers to study and develop their professional skills (4.61), assist them in curricular matters (4.22) and fully back them when problems arise (4.20). Rarely do they refuse teacher's exceptional requests. Principals perceived themselves as somewhat more demanding than their teachers' perception. They maybe wish to believe that have more control over the organization. Other than that, both groups perceived the rest of dimensions to be very similar.

The inter-group correlations reflect a consistency in the perception of principals demanding in private and in collective encounters. So is the case with regard to the principals' giving. The teachers are especially sensitive to principals' generosity and

identify its existence (or lack of existence) in almost every setting. Meanwhile the principals view their giving and demanding behaviors as strongly related ($r .43$), almost as two aspects of the same management style.

Table 7.4 Correlations of teachers and principals demanding and giving styles

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Teacher demanding (1)	-	.06	.41**	-.01	.14	.01	.11	-.08
T' giving (2)		-	.16*	.68**	-.10	.31**	.09	.05
T' staff demanding (3)			-	.21**	.22*	.09	.28**	.03
T' staff giving (4)				-	.07	.14	.14	.22**
Principal demanding (5)					-	.04	.33**	.19
P' giving (6)						-	.17	.33**
P' staff demanding (7)							-	.43**
P' staff giving (8)								-

* $P < .05$

** $P < .01$

The intra-group correlations with regard to the same variables were found to be somewhat lower, especially where teachers interpreted the principals' demanding along different lines than the principals themselves ($r .14$). These differences are later explained when the aggregated data was divided into responses toward problematic and excellent teachers.

Soft and balanced leading styles

Unlike the ideal model of four cells, only two principals' managerial styles toward their staff were found in this study: the soft leading and the balanced leading. While giving and involvement characterize Israeli principals, the hard leading and apathy styles were not evident in their repertoire. In order to exemplify those styles the case studies of two principals are quoted, one was found to be soft and weak (school 37), while the other presented strong and balanced leadership style (school 26). The verbal descriptions are

accompanied by quantitative evidence (tables 7.5 and 7.6), which depict the principals' styles of demanding and giving to their staff as perceived by themselves and by four of their teachers. The tables also compare those results to the sample's average.

Table 7.5 Demanding from staff – perceptions of P's & T's of two schools

	School 37		School 26		Total
	Teacher	Principal	Teachers	Principal	Teachers
Express expectation from the staff with regard to his plans	3.75	3.00	5.00	5.00	4.50 (4.45)
Tends to ask teachers to take care for urgent matters	4.00	3.00	4.50	5.00	3.73 (3.93)
When teachers object his requests, she insists they should perform it	1.75	2.00	4.25	5.00	2.97 (2.83)
Meets with the various teams and teachers to monitor advancement and difficulties	4.25	2.00	4.75	4.00	4.28 (4.29)
Remarks in staff meeting to teachers (without mentioning names) that misbehaved	3.00	2.00	4.00	3.00	2.96 (2.70)
The principal provides teachers with duties they have to perform in upcoming events	3.50	3.00	4.00	4.00	3.74 (4.07)
When problems arise, she tries to find out what were the reasons	3.25	3.00	4.75	3.00	4.20 (4.50)
She directs teachers by asking questions (e.g. should we meet with the parents?)	4.00	2.00	4.50	4.00	3.86 (4.20)
She meets with teachers to decide together what are the targets they are expected to perform in the near future	3.75	2.00	5.00	5.00	4.24 (4.14)
She reprimands teachers who did not fulfil their duties	2.75	2.00	3.50	4.00	2.80 (2.84)
Teacher – staff demanding	3.40	2.40	4.43	4.20	3.73 (3.79)

In parentheses – principals' version

Sharon (45) is a novice principal, leading for the second year a crumbling school with less than 100 students and 17 teachers (school 37). Due to the small size of the school nine teachers work part time, which means they also work in other schools with divided commitment and reduced motivation to contribute to Sharon's school. The pupils come from poor families who live in the neighborhood. After 22 years working as a specialist teacher in high schools and earning BA and MA degrees, Sharon was asked to save an

institution that had suffered a sharp decline in its enrolment. The problems began some six years ago when the former principal had difficulties in staffing the institution and there were poor relationships among the teachers. Due to strange personnel management considerations, the inspector initiated transfer of teachers of whom the less talented were later returned. No wonder the principal counted no less than four problematic teachers, almost one quarter of the staff, who worked at the time. Despite her vast experience as a teacher and the mandatory management course she took, it seemed during the interview that Sharon was not familiar with many theoretical and practical aspects of her work. No one guided her and she refrained from asking for advice.

The principal stated she admires diligence and good relations and hates late coming and aggressive behaviour toward the students. Yet, when it came to monitoring and evaluating her staff, Sharon did very little. Unlike most of the sampled principals, she hardly observed classes and rarely discussed with her teachers their performance. When they misbehaved she did not discipline them. Her soft style becomes evident when she needed to behave more assertively. For instance, she did not insist that teachers would perform duties they don't like, let alone reprimanding them on such occasions. She almost never refused teachers' exceptional requests.

Working under the professional and personal threat of closing her school, with so many incompetent teachers, with below average pupils, and an alienated inspector who does not support and guide, no wonder Sharon expressed in the interview a sense of helplessness. Interestingly, her self-image, in terms of giving and demanding, was found to be much darker than her actual behaviour, as reported by the teachers. Such self-critical principal who is more positively evaluated by his teachers is also described by Cresswell & Fisher (1999, p. 40).

Moses (42) is about to finish his sixth year as a school principal (school 26). After serving 13 years as a teacher, and earning BA and MA degrees in educational management he won the bid for headship against three other teachers (who later left the school). Over 500 pupils and 30 teachers spend their days at the old reconstructed school's building. The turnover of staff (5 teachers who left within the last two years, including three teachers who were promoted to manage other schools) reflects the school's intensive pace. He stressed that no challenging worker has worked in the school within the last two years. Three times a year the principal holds feed back discussions with all the teachers, reviewing the planned teaching programs, the pupils'

achievements and the fulfillment of goals teachers had set in the beginning of the school's year (management by objectives). That is a good opportunity to support and encourage them. Using 'management by walking' and keeping track with other teachers enable him to keep updated.

Table 7.6 Giving style to staff - perceptions of P's & T's of two schools

	School 37		School 26		Total
	Teacher	Principal	Teachers	Principal	
Takes care for the working conditions of the teachers	4.75	4.00	4.75	5.00	4.34 (4.52)
Encourages team-building activities (e.g. take the staff to a restaurant, day trip etc)	2.25	2.00	3.75	4.00	3.79 (4.19)
Publicizes orally and in written material the activities and achievements of her teachers	3.25	2.00	4.00	3.00	3.72 (3.91)
Disseminates detailed information to the teachers	3.75	3.00	4.75	4.00	4.26 (4.44)
Enables teachers to call her at home whenever it is necessary	5.00	5.00	4.75	5.00	4.80 (4.97)
When teachers object his requests, tends to accept their point of view	3.75	2.00	3.00	3.00	3.05 (3.16)
Encourages teachers to study and get professionally developed	4.25	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.71 (4.89)
When teachers object her requests, considers the arguments, do not bend by the pressures, and decide for the benefit of the subject itself	3.25	4.00	4.50	5.00	4.10 (4.53)
Assists teachers with the curricular and educational programs they initiate	4.25	4.00	4.75	5.00	4.34 (4.72)
When problems arise, she fully back his teachers against anyone who complains (parents, local media, Ministry of Education, local authority etc)	4.00	3.00	3.75	4.00	4.29 (4.10)
Refuses to teachers' exceptional requests if they disturb daily routines	1.75	2.00	2.25	3.00	2.24 (2.66)
Teacher – staff giving	3.88	3.40	4.25	4.30	4.10 (4.34)

In parentheses – principals' version

He refrains from observing classes (only once a year) but relies on informal observations to get the proper impressions about the teachers. Moses views the school

as an institution aimed at developing pupils and teachers. He appreciates teachers who believe in their power to advance their pupils. Meanwhile he disregards lazy teachers, for example the novice teachers who adopt the improper norms of their veteran colleagues ('such teachers', he immediately adds, 'do not work here'). He selects the teachers who are not only good at their class but also contribute to the school.

The status of teachers and teaching in Israel is important for me. I am interested in developing teachers who would later move to management positions. It is important that the school should give to its teachers. This is the transactional element within the vision I lead. This is a self-managed school, with emphasis on coaching. We have a team of six teachers who studied how to coach, and it is my goal that the students would also learn how to coach. I concentrate on my goals, and I do not have conflict with anyone. I focus on 'what to do' instead of the 'what for?' and the 'shouldn't'. When the teacher who competed against me in the bid began to criticize me four years ago, I learned how not to listen. It is important for me to know where I go.

Two important aspects differ between the two principals: first is the goal setting and vision Moses had. His managerial philosophy and values were evident in every step he took. He was not just responding to a course of events. Second, the courage he had to make unpopular decisions and the determination to lead others to implement them. Even when faced with difficulties, his teachers knew he would assist and insist on the completion of the mission. Yet, as contingent theories maintain, the nature of followers (the teachers) and the context had a substantive impact on the results they achieved. The favorable condition in the second school, compared to the more difficult situation in the first may have contributed to the management styles of both principals.

The data portray the Israeli principals as professionals and good human beings. They value sensitiveness and high motivation, modeling that behavior to their staff and asking the teachers to follow that pattern. Unlike their fellow principals in the UK and in the USA the Israeli principals valued less high achievements.

The challenging teachers

Who are the challenging teachers? How do their skill and traits differ from those of their successful colleagues? Two samples of challenging teachers were measured, each of them was meant to bring different data. At first, principals were asked to count how many problematic teachers had been working in their school within the last two years. The results show that on average, two (M-2.1, SD-1.2) out of a staff of thirty teachers were considered as having profound shortcomings. Principals defined altogether 84 out of the 1157 teachers (7.2 percent) who worked in the sampled 40 schools as problematic. Counting in a period of two years may slightly increase the numbers (most studies count that rate in one year). Since about one third of the teachers left school at the end of the year, it would be safe to estimate a figure of five percent problematic teachers. Most of the teachers were tenured (96 percent) and worked in a full time job (92 percent). Some principals elaborated about their failing (and successful) teachers whom they counted at the interviews. No tenured teacher was dismissed in a period of two years, but in three schools principals did not extend the contract of untenured teachers. Despite the more inclusive definition, this study's figures match the estimations of 5 – 10 percent poor performing teachers found in other studies (Bridges, 1992, Lavelly et al. 1992; Ofsted, 1996; Tucker, 1997), and the less than one percent of dismissals.

More specifically, only four principals (ten percent) reported having a fully competent staff. In 20 percent of the schools there was one teacher regarded as challenging. The current results generally support Tucker's (1997) findings that about one third of the schools had no incompetent teacher. In 38 percent of the schools there were two problematic teachers, in 18 percent there were 3 teachers and twelve percent had four teachers, and one principal reported of having no less than five problematic teachers.

Causes for the lack or surplus of problematic teachers

These figures raise an intriguing question: what were the causes that enabled such a favorable situation - having no failing teacher, or conversely, schools with up to four and even five such teachers? Two kinds of approaches could be taken to answer that question: First to identify specific features among those schools with little or many failing teachers. The results were disappointing. The four schools with no problematic teachers were not found to have any special feature. So it was in the case of the other extreme. The school with five problematic teachers represents a unique case of a town that was established several decades ago. Due to its geographically remote location and the limited supply of jobs in its vicinity it used to have a low turnover of population. The elementary school was one of the first educational institutions to open its doors. Interestingly, 85 per cent of its young teachers then are still working there after 25 years. Almost all of them are going to retire soon. The principal, who was among the first settlers, could not find a job in her profession and became a teacher. After eight years of teaching she was asked to manage the school. Within the last 15 years of principalship she realized it has been almost impossible to break the comradeship and transfer her weak teachers to other schools. Instead, she assumed the role of a pedagogic mentor, an all-embracing 'mother' for the pupils and the staff. It should be noted that such a situation of limited professional opportunities used to be prevalent in schools located in remote towns and rural settlements (e.g. kibbutz, moshav). But the growth of population and the increased number of schools has opened more opportunities for placement of teachers.

Instead of examining individual extreme cases, maybe analyzing aggregated data would help to identify meaningful connections. More specifically, the lower the number of problematic teachers that is connected with other variables (negative correlation) may help us identify those relevant factors. The main finding is that schools located in poor neighborhoods had significantly more failing teachers ($r = -.40$), compared to middle and above average socioeconomic urban sections. Thrupp (1999) brings similar findings about the situation of school principals in less advantaged neighborhoods in New Zealand:

Principals often struggled to find good staff in any cases.... Senior staff.... were aware that some staff were ineffectual but consoled themselves that such teachers were valuable to the schools in other ways (p. 115).

This finding is open for several interpretations (e.g. schools with more 'difficult' students, lower resources), which are difficult to confirm. Yet, these figures about the low quality teachers in poor geographical regions are closely related to the persistent large gap between the high rates of 12th grade students who live in established cities and succeed in the matriculation examination (up to 70 and 80 percent), compared with the low achievements of students who live in the periphery (about only 30 percent). Numerous studies and many governmental efforts were made through the years to change that trend, but in vain (Sa'ar, 2001).

Other relevant findings were as follows: schools with experienced principals ($r = -.28$) who held open and sincere discussions with students ($r = -.19$) were found to have fewer weak teachers. Meanwhile the principal's style - being tougher with staff members, or acting less soft with them ($r = .12$ and $r = .09$ respectively), supported the initial hypothesis but was found statistically insignificant. Further, the increased efforts undertaken by the principal - holding numerous observations ($r = .17$), getting assistance from the inspector ($r = .15$) and increased teachers' turnover ($r = .10$) were found counter productive (although statistically insignificant).

With regard to other school variables, large schools with more teachers ($r = -.24$) and more students ($r = -.20$) were connected with having less problematic teachers. Parent's involvement and complaints accounted only marginally ($r = -.12$). Probably having more positions enabled principals in better adapting the jobs to the teachers' skills.

The forty cases sample

The second sample included forty cases of challenging teachers with whom the principals have once worked. Using what maybe called an *accidental sampling* (Cohen & Manion, 1994, p. 88) enabled principals to choose freely any case. Some described a teacher with whom they were currently working (purposely using the interview to rethink and consult about the case), while others described a case from the past. Some recalled success they had while others reconstructed a painful case in which they failed. Clearly such a sample is not representative nor a random sampling (for example,

principals may have possibly preferred to select cases where they succeeded). But having forty cases introduces a quantitative as much as qualitative dimension. In some cases principals filled in a questionnaire about the problematic teacher whom they described in the interview. Needless to say that having both sides present their case (that failing teacher also filled her/his questionnaire) give a unique opportunity to understand the delicate relationships between the teacher and the principals. All the forthcoming results relate therefore to the second sample.

Personal characteristics

Gender and age – two important and unexpected findings emerge out of the dry numbers. Male teachers comprise twelve percent of the general teachers population who work in elementary Israeli schools (Central Bureau of Statistics, 2001, 8.27). Most of them work in orthodox and Arabic schools less represented in the district of Haifa. It was found that 15 percent of the problematic teachers were males, a five times higher representation compared to their share among the study's general teachers population. All of them were subject matter professionals, while most of them (4 out of 6 teachers) emigrated from Russia. Secondly, the sampled incompetent teachers were relatively elderly persons with long experience of work. Most of them were over forty years old (M-44, SD-8.5), while one third had already celebrated their fiftieth birthday. Only two teachers were younger than thirty. These figures are quite similar to the average age of Israeli teachers (Hed Hachinuch, 2001 p 13). According to recent survey by the Central Bureau of Statistics (CBS) the Israeli education system is getting older where only 15 percent are novice, ages 25-29, and one fifth of the teachers are over fifty. In the early 1980s high school teachers were 36 years old and in 1998 the average age was 43. The meaning is that the challenging teachers were no exception among the general population. Those veteran teachers had almost twenty years of experience (M-18.3, SD-9.5), but many of them (40 percent) worked only three years or less in their current school (M-10.5, SD-9.3). Is it a clue that being a problematic teacher means lack of stability and frequent moves from one school to another? Does it need long experience of failures before principals realize the teachers' difficulties are not going to disappear?

Teacher's role – about half of the teachers (55 percent) have been serving in a position of educator, namely they taught the lion's share of the lessons and were responsible for the social, academic and personal aspects of their students' lives. The rest taught

specialist subject matter – English (13 percent), sciences (10 percent), sports (8 percent), music (5 percent), mathematics, arts, and Humanities (three percent each). In some cases the principal decided to move educators into less demanding position as a subject matter teacher. These figures generally fit the division – about half of the staff are educators and the second half only teach a specialist subject.

Education – most of the teachers had a BA/B.ED. Degree they earned in 15-17 years of education (M-16; SD-0.9). Only a few had an MA degree (the current official requirement for getting a teaching position is to have at least a first academic degree).

Country of birth – most of the poor performing teachers were born in Israel or immigrated when they were young. Yet, a surprisingly high proportion (23 percent) were new immigrants, most of them came from the former Soviet Union (18 percent). Two teachers (5 percent) emigrated from the United States. About 21000 immigrants who came from the former Soviet Unions proved that they had worked in education (Central Bureau of Statistics, 2001, 12.26), but only about 6000 teachers were accepted to work in the Israeli school system. The rate of challenging teachers appeared to be disproportionate, compared to their share (5 percent) in the national teachers population. These unexpected results need somewhat a lengthy explanation.

Immigrant teachers

About a million new immigrants have come to Israel during the last decade from the former Soviet Union. That immigration has brought educated and professional people. According to the Law of Return every Jew is entitled to immigrate and automatically become an Israeli citizen. The Hebrew word for immigration is 'aliya' which mean 'ascending', where all Jews are symbolically called to climb and settle in the country. Yet, a growing number of non-Jewish immigrants exploit the Law of Return and sometimes even use illegal means to immigrate. Upon arriving, they are given generous governmental package of assistance, including Hebrew lessons, loans for housing, and assistance in finding jobs.

Teachers' absorption - prospective teachers are screened at the MoE and are sent on an 18 months reorientation course, which includes advanced Hebrew studies, an acquaintance with the country and its culture and training in the subject matter of

teaching. The government decision to certify only those teachers (and for that matter also physicians and other professionals) who passed entrance examinations raised bitter objections by immigrants' organizations. They maintained that certification should be made automatically, once the candidate has presented the proper documents (many 'official' documents were found to be faked). Yet, the protests failed and the government continued with its careful selection in order to preserve its responsibility for high level of professional service.

Any relocation is likely to be stressful to some extent, especially if it means uprooting one's spouse and children (Munton, 1990), and the personal resources that a migrant has determines his or her capacity to deal with those hardships (Shuval, 1982). The obvious professional obstacle appears to be the cultural aspect. The essence of education is transmitting cultural values, but the new immigrants were socialized in another culture. Immigrating as a mature professional meant a formidable challenge to absorb within a relatively short time the country's language and culture. Not always had schools paved the road for such absorption. For example, in an interview with former official in the MoE who was in charge of assisting immigrant teachers, he reported about an outstanding high school math teacher who gradually became fed up with the endless instructions on how to teach math in Israeli schools. Finally he announced to his principal that from now on he would teach as he had for twenty years in Russia. The principal in response threatened to dismiss him. In order to increase the chances of good absorption, the MoE gave school principals a budget to hire teachers for two years. The commitment to absorb teachers varied from one principal to another. Some of them did it wholeheartedly, while others invested only the minimal means.

According to that MoE official, the Israeli education system happened to be very selective about offering them placements. More immigrant teachers work in high schools where there is more demand for certain subject matters (e.g. mathematics, physics). In the case of English teachers, unfortunately about 40 percent failed the screening examinations. Meanwhile humanities teachers, elementary and kindergarten teachers also faced severe difficulties in finding a job. The lack of sufficient cultural background does not enable them to carry out such a responsible job. An attempt made in 1982 to train immigrant kindergarten teachers proved a failure within a short time. The men who work in elementary schools usually teach physical education or music.

Berger (2001) found that for the immigrant teachers who were accepted to work, the main difficulties are those of mastering the language. Many were found to have low self-esteem, feel lonely, have difficulties adapting to the teaching methods in Israel, to the culture and the society (let alone difficulties in finding a job). Most teachers changed their rigid attitude regarding the authority of the teacher toward a more progressive child-centered approach. Berger also found that the age and gender of the teacher were marginal, compared to the assistance from the staff and especially from the principals as a crucial factor that determines the successful integration of the immigrant teacher in the Israeli education system. The current surplus of teachers in Israel forces large numbers of immigrant teachers, all of them with academic degrees, who hoped to be integrated within their professional milieu' to find a lower status jobs. Krau (1981) followed 89 migrants who found it necessary to take up a new occupation. Those who were most successful in making the adjustment had superior personal resources, particularly in terms of self-image and interest in the occupation.

First acquaintance with the problematic teacher

When a staff member breaks the professional norms and behaves improperly it radiates restlessness and concern. The bad news is transmitted along many channels in an ongoing dynamic process. Becoming fully aware may take principals weeks, sometimes months and rarely years. During the interview, principals described how they became acquainted with the challenging teacher in particular.

Based on the classification made by Fidler & Atton (1999, p. 3), one out of three basic scenarios may happen: first, when a new principal arrives at the school to assume a management position. As with a guest who comes to visit, the initial period is characterized with mutual learning and stepping on tiptoes. The staff, with fresh memories of the former principal's style, examines carefully the initial actions of the new principal. It takes the principal time to defreeze the formal atmosphere, to alleviate concerns, to begin networking, and gradually get to know each of the staff members. When everybody tries to behave properly; when the staff do their utmost to present to the principal their best face and avoid uncovering the 'family secrets' no wonder the principal does not notice, who among the teachers has profound difficulties. Realizing they watch a staged picture, the sampled principals told that from the outset of their

arrival they preferred to count on their personal impressions. Many intentionally avoided any act of collecting information, including listening to early warnings of inspectors and colleagues about certain teachers.

Benjamin (41) is a new principal who arrived two years ago after 16 years of serving as a teacher and vice principal in another institution. The school is located in a poor neighborhood, which the municipality decided to open its registration in order to encourage competition. After a short period of mutual examination, the staff got used to his leadership style. By December, when the first semester tests' results arrived to his desk he noticed the low achievements of the second grade. Talking to parents, observing and teaching the class focused the difficulties on its poor teaching. Sarah (43) who taught the class has been working in the school almost twenty years. The pupils who loved her and some of the less talented teachers who supported her, strengthened her confidence that she could get by despite her laziness. More silent inquiries clarified to Benjamin that the gradual decline of enrolment was apparently related to parents' dissatisfaction with the poor achievements of their offspring in the first and second grades. Three months later, by March, he made up his mind what to do. (School 5)

The second scenario occurs when the principal acquires a new member to the staff, sometimes in unfavorable circumstances (e.g. initiated transfer). By then the principal has more control on the selection process, and clearly more responsibility for the results. No matter whether the new worker is inexperienced or veteran, she would do her best to present good quality teaching. When difficulties arise, they might be attributed to external circumstances ('difficult class') or personal reasons (haven't accustomed yet to the new teaching methods). Sometimes the picture is mixed, for example when the staff likes the teacher, or if she brought special talents, it makes the judgment even more difficult. It takes time and several types of evidence before the principal can make a more substantiated judgment.

Esther was 45 years old teacher who had worked already for 20 years, and this was her second year at the school. At the initial interview she described her experience, leaving unmentioned some of the less impressive aspects. The lack

of faith in the inspector's integrity had lead the principal not to call him with regard to the new teacher. Esther was assigned to teach the fourth grade. Her students immediately sensed her lack of confidence and resented the old-fashioned teaching methods. They interrupted her lessons, mocked her gestures and sneaked complaint notes to the principal's desk. Other teachers viewed her as 'an extraterrestrial creature' and did not accept her. The parents, who were informed by their kids, complained to the principal about her slow speech, the immense amount of writing she demanded of her pupils, and the insults ('you have watermelon heads and I will fill them with seeds'). The principal observed some of Esther's classes and monitored her students' achievements, realizing she was not coordinated with the second fourth grade teacher.

The third situation takes place when both, the principal and the teacher work together for several years with reasonable satisfaction until a gradual deterioration occurs. The warning signs get mingled with some of the remaining positive aspects, leaving the principal to wonder what exactly happens. Arriving at the conclusion that the noticed change is profound and sometimes irreversible may take months and even years. The hope for spontaneous recovery, coupled with the good memories of working long time together paint the situation with vague and undefined colors.

Hanna (44) is a devoted science teacher. The pupils loved her warm regard and the interesting teaching. Four years ago the principal gradually noticed that Hanna's behavior became more eccentric and unstable (from the beginning she was known to have a stressed personality). When she began to explode and insult pupils, they complained to their parents and to the principal. Some of the teachers empathized with her situation (she was a single person who had aspired to get married and have children), while others thought she needed therapy. Those teachers blamed the principal for protecting instead of terminating her work. Several parents cynically remarked: 'yes, we heard about Hanna, but why don't you get rid of her'. The principal pushed back the assaults, explaining that Hanna has many positive elements, that she activates the pupils and maintains good relations with some of them, but sometimes she stumbles and loses her self-control. The inspector who was invited to watch her class praised her

teaching, but the frequent shouts that were heard out of her lessons left no room for speculations. (School 35)

Sources of information

When asked in a forced-choice format of questions, principals counted their informants about the problematic teachers.

Table 8.1 Sources of information about problematic teachers (percent)

Frequency of transmitted information	Inspector's observation	Pupils' complaints	Staff members complaints	Rumors	Students' achievements, test results	Parents' complaints	Principal's unplanned observation	Other
None	65	40	40	62.5	60	15	20	47.5
Few	35	30	27.5	35	22.5	30	40	52.5
Many		30	32.5	2.5	17.5	55	40	

Like Bridges (1992) and Wragg et al. (1999) findings, principals rely on several sources before they make up their mind about the severity of the case. In three quarters of the cases principals counted four to six different sources. Only one quarter of the principals used three sources or less.

According to the table, principals draw their impressions from two main sources: parents' complaints (85 percent of the cases) and their own impressions (80 percent). Other important sources are the staff-members complaints (60 percent) and students' complaints (60 percent). The role of inspectors happened to be marginal - in 35 percent of the cases, inspectors held an observation and cited some of the difficulties. It happened especially when the principals had good relations with the inspector and asked his or her assistance. Interestingly, some of those observations ended 'fruitlessly' namely the teacher may have staged a well-acted show, which refuted the negative impressions. Rumors among teachers and the administrative staff were found to be a much less viable source of information, both in frequency (35 percent) and velocity. It is not necessarily that staff members do not gossip, but principals prefer to absorb direct information. The relatively little reliance on test results and students achievement (40 percent) coincide with the little importance principals set on that aspect with regard to the evaluation of a problematic teacher.

Principals also cited other sources, like teaching the relevant class, hearing a teacher who shouts at her pupils, observing the teacher outside school and the like. The results indicate the relative importance of the sources. Principals count on their own impressions and also take parents complaints very seriously. Sometimes they matched both sources (r .22).

Why do principals rely on so many informants? Maybe the extreme cases raise a lot of concern and involvement, which drives many people to discuss it. It also seems that the sampled principals used networking effectively to get updated about their domain. Clearly they were easily available to be informed. Meanwhile, the very low correlation among the various informants means their messages arrived independently to the principal's ears.

Yet, the spring of information remains sometimes dry, due to certain communication obstacles. We discussed earlier the desire to leave good impressions and hide pitfalls when a new person (manager/worker) arrives at the organization. Another subtle but persistent obstacle is the norm of collegiality among the staff members. Be it a true friendship between teachers, or the desire to protect each other, which drives staff members to hide the 'family secrets'.

The teachers here take the school as a place for socializing rather than somewhere you work. They have a mentality of hiding, covering up. When the parents understood that teachers do not speak up, they asked their children to report directly to me. (School no. 1)

Another obstacle is the emotional and organizational toll attached to washing the family laundry in public. The fear of staining the school's reputation once the story leaked; the concern of leading the school into a period of inner conflicts; the desire of school goers not to hurt the principals' feelings by delivering the bad news, all these factors help to keep hidden the teacher's shortcoming.

Events that changed the principal's mind

Sometimes what clarifies the severity of the problem is not the amount of messages but rather their serious meaning – when teachers are involved with intolerable deeds. The principal may have already noticed the lack of expected results and improper behavior,

but then, the teacher crosses an unseen red line. When asked if there was any moment or event, which changed their mind about the problematic teacher, about a third of the principals answered positively. For example a case in which the teacher wildly insulted a third grade weak pupil who grew up in a poor family; a case of a sports teacher who did not prevent his students from taking off their shoes in the middle of a lesson, walking bare footed, and throwing their shoes at each other. In a third case, the problematic teacher rudely accused the principal in a staff meeting. Sometimes, it was not the teacher's behavior itself, but rather its reflection on the principal's thoughts ('it had struck me when I realized I can't look in her eyes').

The change in attitude may have gone in the other direction too. Many teachers who significantly improved their performance won the principal's appreciation. Some teachers, who felt the rope on their necks, managed to manipulate the principals' feelings and intention to dismiss or transfer them. They tearfully described their desperate situation, begging for assistance. The principal and staff members could not resist the call, forgetting for a while their original decision.

The teachers' difficulties

The principals identified easily, despite the broad definition, which among their teachers appeared to be 'challenging'. Such definition was found to include all sorts of difficulties, not necessarily perceived as 'incompetent' (some happened to be very competent), 'poor performing' (some performed excellently), or 'marginal' (some used to be very central among the staff members). Principals were found to vary tremendously as to the criteria they used to determine who among their teachers was regarded as problematic. It means, for example, that a failing teacher at one school would perform well in another simply because the principals used different yardsticks or managed to get along better with the teacher. Further, the principals' perspectives should not be considered as a verifiable 'truths' but rather as the informants' opinion. The researcher has tried through the data collection and its presentation to take as much as possible an objective and balanced approach.

When asked in an open question to describe what were the teachers' difficulties, many adjective words – 'lazy', 'stupid', 'childish', to name a few, were dropped. Some teachers were awarded only few while others were given many derogatory citations

(range – 1 to 9; M=4.18, SD= 2.2.). In order to help principals focus their answers, they were asked what was the most disturbing behavior, but many simply replied ‘everything’. Those shortcomings were sorted in a content analysis into categories. The most important ones relate to the results of the teacher’s behavior such as low students’ achievements and discipline problems. Other categories resemble traits, which were mentioned earlier. Before getting into more details a word of caution is needed. Open questions enabled the description of those complicated cases, but the definition of difficulties and its classification may ever remain somewhat arbitrary, relative, and in the eye of the beholder.

Poor teaching

Lack of professionalism was found to be a pervasive phenomenon, qualitatively and quantitatively. Almost two thirds of the teachers were described as suffering from fundamental poor teaching skills. The difficulties had covered many areas.

She does not notice nuances, teaches in a technocratic manner, [she is] very much disorganized. She acts harshly where softness is needed and vice versa. She is not fit to teach in our times.

She suffered from anachronism and cognitive fixation – she could not understand what the pupils need, didn’t take in account their abilities. She has bad relations with parents, and her communication with pupils was not wise, not constructive and not professional.

Not surprisingly, poor teaching strongly correlated with low achievements ($r = .50$) and with discipline problems ($r = .56$)

Discipline problems

About one third of the teachers had difficulties with discipline and their pupils. The prevalence here seems somewhat lower than reports in other studies. Misconduct strongly correlated with gender ($r = .57$), namely men had many more discipline difficulties than women. Since most of the men teachers were subject matter teachers who had emigrated from the Soviet Union, these findings correlated to certain extent with the role of teaching ($r = .28$) and the country of birth ($r = .20$). Another distinct

variable correlated with discipline problems was the grade level. It is a known, and not so well liked phenomenon that discipline problems grow with the age of students.

Low achievements

In one third of the cases, the problematic teachers could not prove reasonable achievements. Their students did not gain the expected progress, in some cases did not make any progress at all, as in the case of the sports teachers who preferred to let the kids play football (when he was not absent from school). Low achievements slightly correlated negatively with the teachers' gender and positively with their age. Namely, it occurred more to men than women ($r = .18$), and less to younger teachers ($r = .23$). Other background variables were found to have no statistical connection.

The combination of poor teaching, low achievements and discipline problem may be the closest profile of the incompetent teacher. An example of a 45 years old third grade educator follows, as described by her embittered principal:

She is stupid. She can't cope with changes. Nothing happens in her class. She duplicates old stuff. She has serious discipline problems. Because of her poor performance parents complained and initiated a meeting two years ago to ask that she would not teach their kids. Since then she makes tremendous efforts to leave a good impression. She simply does not report to parents about difficulties. She also tries 'to buy' them by not giving their children home assignments. When other teachers have difficulties with her class, she denies the problems and does not cooperate to alleviate the restlessness. The parents, who know nothing, are convinced that the teacher runs the business smoothly. She 'ruined' the class I gave her. She always presents herself as a victim. (School 12)

The most profound problem here is not the discipline difficulties and low achievements as such, but rather the teacher's lack of will and ability to face reality without denial. Being afraid to ask for assistance and learn how to cope directly with her shortcomings banned any chance for improvement. The principal noted that the teacher was driven by avoidance response (at times, she was afraid to make eye contact with the principal).

Low motivation

About a third of the problematic teachers were defined as lazy. They used to arrive late in the morning, drag their feet when recess ended; they did not participate in the preparations of ceremonies and events; those teachers tended to take days-off in the middle of a school year, often call in the morning to announce they do not feel well. Somewhat surprisingly, low motivation was not correlated with poor achievements or discipline problems. Interestingly, the signs of burnout were found to correlate with irresponsible behavior and lack of accountability ($r = .32$), such as the case of a veteran sports teacher.

Rachel (45) has worked for 23 years, of which two were at the school. Her lessons were disorganized with many discipline problems. She preferred to let the kids play football instead of running a well-prepared lesson. As a teacher who worked simultaneously in other schools, she was isolated, often missed staff meeting and never showed up to in-school studies. Last September, without early notice, she took a month vacation to celebrate her son's Bar Mitzvah. The principal, who could hardly bear the frequent absenteeism, was outraged and helpless. (School 37)

Rachel's case exemplifies less prevalent phenomena. Some sports and music teachers, mostly men, needed to work in two and sometimes even in three schools in order to gain a full-time job. In these circumstances, no wonder they were detached and isolated, doing only the minimum required.

Aggressive and insensitive behavior toward pupils

Principals described teachers, who shout and insult their pupils, relate to them impatiently, do not listen, and mention loudly and publicly their weaknesses. Some teachers attack indiscriminately while others assault only a few, usually the more problematic or weak students. Some teachers, who might present otherwise good teaching qualities, occasionally explode with verbal and physical assault toward children and adults. In 57.5 percent of the cases the principals mentioned insensitivity as a reason to consider the teacher as problematic. Insensitivity was slightly more prevalent among educators ($r = .27$), who taught lower grades ($r = -.21$).

Abigail was a young and ambitious person who grew up in a poor family. She pushed forward the bright students, but resented her weak pupils and responded blatantly and aggressively toward them and their parents. The instructor was shocked by her behavior. She always argued with him about the suggestions he made. I once saw how she beat her son at a families attendance. It struck me. I realized that the parents' complaints [about her] are true, that she is going to ruin my school's reputation. (School 19)

The principal reflected that Abigail's assertive (and sometimes aggressive) style would have better fitted teaching in high school, where students are more task-oriented and need less the parental warm support as in elementary school. In most cases the selection of profession and the level of teaching is done by teachers themselves. But sometimes certain circumstances lead to the wrong selection, as could have happened with the young teacher.

Inflexibility

Over one third of the problematic teachers were described as old fashioned who refused or could not keep track with adopting new teaching methods. Many principals described their efforts to move the staff forward, to keep pace with the growing demands of The Ministry of Education and sentiments among parents that their kids would achieve higher grades. Principals held in-house trainings, invited instructors and encouraged teachers to pursue academic degrees, but the conservative teachers who dragged their feet enraged their superiors. No correlation was found with other weaknesses (e.g. poor teaching or low achievements), except being related to stupidity and lack of values and culture ($r .28$ $p < .05$). Maybe these teachers were not necessarily ineffective or suffered other shortcomings, but rather taught in an old-fashioned manner.

Examining background variables revealed that the teachers' role, gender and level of education played no role, while age ($r .22$) and teaching experience ($r .24$) were mildly correlated. These findings support studies on teachers' professional development. For example, Huberman (1989) who surveyed 160 high school teachers has defined the later stages of teacher's career as 'conservatism' and 'disengagement'. The relationships between age and conservatism have long been established in the folklore

and empirical studies. Some of the classical studies on stages in life (Lowenthal et al, 1975; Neugarten & Datan, 1973; Ryff & Baltes, 1976) found the tendency, with age toward increased rigidity and dogmatism, toward greater prudence and more resistance to innovations. This general attitude shift appears to accelerate around the fiftieth biological year (Huberman et al, 1997). According to Huberman (1989) the final stage is disengagement, which involves gradual withdrawal and winding down (Fessler & Christensen, 1992). Detaching oneself progressively, without regrets, from professional commitment enables the development of activities outside work. Teachers may begin to channel their energies elsewhere, such as one of the challenging teacher who developed a successful clinic of holistic therapy. That private practice came at the expense of her professional obligations as a teacher (attending staff meetings, adopting new teaching methods).

Do not accept principal's authority

The principal's professional and personal authority among their staff member is maybe their most precious commodity. Challenging the head's ability to manage endangers the organizational stability and introduces tremendous pressures within the staff and principal's relations. About 17.5 percent of the problematic teachers did not accept principal's authority.

She had difficulties in accepting my authority, to accept heterogeneity [within the staff members], to be guided. [As if] she knew everything better than everyone else, including the principal. She often clashed with teachers, the type who enjoys throwing mud. At one point she was expected to join a course I lead about making a change in the school. Instead, she sat in the teachers' room, while I was away from school, and threatened teachers (especially the novice ones) to denounce anyone who would join me. (School 30)

Rivalry against the principal's authority was strongly correlated with poor collegial behavior ($r .48$), and with arrogant behavior ($r .50$). It also correlated with teachers' tendency to criticize others ($r .54$).

Criticizing, embittered

Spreading rumors, blowing up small difficulties into full-scale catastrophes and criticizing the work of others was described by almost a quarter of the principals. Such behavior creates a climate of suspiciousness and demoralization and leads teachers to be careful not to fall into others' mouths. Such atmosphere derails teachers from accomplishing their tasks. Blaming others strongly correlated, almost naturally, with teachers' bad relations with other staff members ($r .53$) and more interestingly with the denial of own difficulties and other aspects of dishonesty and undependable behavior ($r .33$).

Several authors describe veteran teachers (50 to 60 years old) as ardent complainers (Peterson, 1964; Prick, 1986, Huberman, 1993). They complained about the negative public attitude toward education, the confused educational policies, less committed younger colleagues, pupils who are less motivated, less disciplined and poorly mannered nowadays. The low to medium correlation found here between age and criticism ($r .26$, $p < .05$) means that age probably intensified a general negative attitude toward self and others.

She had inner conflicts, always embittered, looking at the half empty glass, searching for the hindrances. She used to come to my office just to report about difficulties and immediately leave. She responded impatiently to her pupils. It felt as if they disturbed her. In staff meeting she always mentioned difficulties, as if she wished to prove her concern for the school but actually she did nothing (school no 16).

The clever Jewish proverb 'who charges others maybe charging them with his own defects' (Babylonian Talmud, Kidushin, p.70a) is clearly described here. Such defense mechanism of projecting on others her own pessimistic and negative attitudes had probably saved her facing those feeling of emptiness and depression. But the provocative behavior may have intensified another psychological process called *projective identification* (McLeod, 1998 p.43), which occurs when the person to whom the feelings and impulses are being projected is manipulated into believing that he or she actually has these feelings and impulses. By mentioning only negative aspects, the teacher hoped the principal and other staff members would adopt that attitude of despair and behave to justify that sentiment.

Teachers' criticism poisoned the organizational climate, especially if not balanced with a sense of commitment and ample evidence of positive actions by the criticizing teacher. No wonder principals selected criticism as intolerable behavior.

Other less frequent shortcomings

Irresponsible behavior - only 12.5 percent of the problematic teachers were described as irresponsible, those who could leave the pupils unsupervised, or those who could take a day off knowing that several classes would be left without a teacher. Other teachers behaved as if they were not accountable for their work. The worst cases were those teachers who worked by the book, who played it dumb.

Dishonest conduct – several teachers (12.5 percent) had difficulties to face their failures, hence trying to deny and distort the painful truth. They sometimes used blatant lies to hide intolerable deeds or to paint their actions with rosy colors.

Stupidity – we saw earlier that principals are not that bothered by lack of wisdom in their teachers. Maybe this is the reason they defined only ten percent of the teachers as stupid, or those who have no values and culture.

Aspects of professional norms

Before closing this section, we need to settle two perplexing findings: First, why Israeli principals were found to favor teachers' 'mother-like' behavior over professional teaching, but most frequently identified challenging teachers by their (poor) professional performance? Second, why Israeli principals value less norms of professionalism in comparison with their European and American colleagues? The discussion here revolves around the general and somewhat vague term of 'professionalism. Most authors agree that:

This [norm of 'professionalism'] communicates a view of teachers not only as classroom experts, but also as productive and responsible members of a broader professional community and as persons embarking on a career that may span 30 years or more. (Little, 1993, p. 133)

According to Kruse, Louis and Bryk (1994, p. 4) teachers demonstrate professional values by five critical elements: reflective dialogue, de-privatization of practice, collective focus on student learning, collaboration and shared norms and values.

It appears that Israeli principals perceived norms of educational professionalism mainly by their narrow aspects of classroom teaching. Once teachers treated pupils aggressively or did not demonstrate a reasonable performance, they were stigmatized as 'challenging'. Other collegial, intellectual or moral norms were considered to be much less important. Unlike their European and American counterparts, Israeli principals were not so concerned whether their pupils (and teachers) achieved predetermined standards. An explanation of these differences may stem from the different cultural backgrounds. For example, in his cross-cultural study on shyness, Zimbardo (1977, also Zimbardo & Carducci, 1995) explains that unlike strong individualist norms in nations like Australia and the USA, the Jewish history bore different outcomes:

Their fear of persecution also had the effect of forcing Jews to withdraw into their own community life, and made the family the important unit and children the center of existence. Thus, communal life is strong, even when individuals are weak; and children are priceless resources, even though their parents are poor. (Zimbardo, 1977, p. 218)

When communal and familial values appear so important, who would dare to overlook insensitive treatment toward pupils; who would care whether these pupils did progress academically, as long as they are satisfied with the care they get at school. Further, the central values of togetherness, like a family, probably decrease principals' tendencies to evaluate and criticize their staff performance in order not to shatter the close social fabric. No wonder that in such supporting climate, a clear manifestation of professionalism is considered to be less important.

The question then arises: after all, are these norms (e.g. accountability, high quality performance) so important? Do competitive nations like USA, England and Australia boast a better schooling system and higher intellectual achievements than less competitive countries? The answer seems to be 'not necessarily'. We reviewed earlier the frequent insufficient and sometime negative outcomes of workers' evaluation. Further, the effective HRM procedures in California, as described by Bridges (1986, 1992) had no influence on the state's low reading scores in the 80's and 90's (McQuillan, 1998; Krashen, 2002). From a global viewpoint, leading competitive economy does not necessarily mean effective schooling system (Bracey, 2002). Despite

Israel being less successful economically (16th among 38 nations), its students ranked in mathematics better (22nd) than more competitive countries like the USA (ranked competitive 2nd and 29th in math), England (ranked 7th and 26th respectively) and Australia (ranked 9th and 17th).

Professional norms also evolve out of the nature of the organization and its climate. For example, in a study that compared school principals and senior executives in England (Hay/McBer, 2000a) it was found that head teachers think of leadership in terms of developing people. Principals use to show their staff where they fit into the scheme of things and support their long-term growth. Meanwhile, business leaders think of leadership in terms of strategy and tend to create a sense of a mission, drive standards and communicate their vision.

It appears that the criteria by which managers evaluate their workers rely not only on 'objective' measures, but also on organizational mission (e.g. business, education), cultural norms (e.g. competitiveness vs. communal values) and the managers' subjective impressions. Any research on practices of teachers' evaluation and management of performance, especially with regard to 'challenging teachers', needs therefore to follow the current study and take in account those cultural and personal influences.

Summary

The principals' stories help us develop a profile of the problematic teachers. First, as Wragg et al. (1999) found, incompetence consists of a cluster of factors, not just a single one. Its pervasiveness is related to the teachers' personal traits, and to the results of their behavior as well. Poor teaching and aggressive behavior toward pupils were the most cited shortcomings, each accounting for 60 percent of the cases. These results support in part Wragg et al (1999) findings and earlier studies, which compared outstanding to marginal high school teachers (Sparks & Lipka, 1991). The first group demonstrated high professional skills and a warm-hearted approach toward their pupils (Sparks & Lipka, 1992, p. 309), while 'not-so-masterful' teachers were described as poor teachers, cool, rigid, shy, self sufficient and inhibited in personal relations. These individuals tended to avoid compromise and might evoke distrust by being insensitive when a group does not go along with him or her.

About half of the thirteen categories, clustered into two distinct profiles: the first resemble poor teaching with many discipline problems and low achievements. Poor teaching accounted for almost two third of the cases. That profile fully support the prevailing definition of poor performing and incompetence. Namely, the teacher who is not able to lead well planned and orderly taught lessons.

The second cluster is characterized with criticizing and arrogant behavior of teachers who do not accept the principal's authority and have bad relations with other staff members. Their behavior seriously damages the organizational climate. The prevalence here is about one third of the teachers.

Other shortcomings – low motivation, aggressive behavior, stiffness, dishonesty, irresponsibility, lack of common sense and values were found to be relatively independent.

According to the principals' accounts, the problematic teachers presented serious challenges that threatened the school's reputation and principals' authority. But that 'mutual dance' also exposed the values and sensitivity of the principals. When faced with certain hardships, some principals were less affected and coped better than other colleagues.

The antecedent conditions for the teachers' shortcomings

Many factors may turn a worker into a successful or a failing one. Sometimes the same situation ('difficult class') would drive one teacher to double her efforts while her colleague might give up. Further, in many cases neither the teacher nor the principals are aware what exactly has lead to deterioration, let alone when they prefer to cover what they already know. The causes are interwoven and separating them may seem somewhat arbitrary. Based on the principals' answers to forced-choice questions and according to Bridges (1986) and Steinmatz (1969) classification, three main sources of difficulties were discerned: a. improper management, poor supervision; b. shortcoming of the employee; c. outside or non-job-related influences affecting the employee.

A. Improper management, poor supervision

The principal's point of view, attitudes and personality clearly take a significant role in defining the teachers' difficulties, and sometimes even intensify them. A mature principal who believes in self-efficacy behavior would respond differently to a

principal whose management style is more protective. As it often happens, a new principal brings different set of values and expectations that may contradict the teachers' habits.

She was a very immature person with childish behavior. The former principal fully backed her (as she did the rest of the staff) and the teacher was accustomed not to take responsibility. Whenever she felt distressed or insulted, she came to my office to complain. (School 17)

About 20 percent of the cases were explained in part by poor management and lack of supervision. In most cases principals preferred to lay the blame on their former colleagues or referred the blame to the Ministry of education's inspectors who granted tenure without careful examination.

As with several other cases, failure happens sometimes when the right person is placed in the wrong position or vice versa. Placement of teachers entails the most delicate decisions principals make each year. It is a zero-sum game where all the empty holes must be filled with the available (human) beans. Poor selection and placement, improper inducement, lack of supervision and guidance can add to unfavorable initial conditions. Principals preferred to emphasize the teachers' failures, but their fingerprints, with regard to poor management, were left on the scene. Such is the case with novice teachers. Difficult pupils, complicated tasks, a criticizing community, to mention several other factors, were found to have a limited influence on teachers' performance. Only 20 percent of the teachers had to cope with unruly pupils and a 'difficult class'.

B. shortcoming of the employee

Lack of knowledge and experience

It takes a new teacher who arrives at the school, several years to adopt the new teaching methods, to immerse within the school culture and to get accustomed to the local traditions. About 27.5 percent of the cases were portrayed as young teachers who have been working only few years and did not fit to the school's educational scheme. The negative correlation with age ($r = -.33$), with total experience ($r = -.40$) and especially with the numbers of years the teacher has been working in this school ($r = -.44$) express in

numbers that impression. Does it mean novice teachers have only a one-year time-slot to prove their ability? Probably yes.

A young teacher who moved with her husband and little baby to a nearby village arrived at the school few days before the beginning of the school year. The inspector suggested she inquire about a job here. Since the teacher impressed the principal as a warm person, and due to an urgent need to fill a position of educating the sixth grade, the principal accepted her with only short interview about her little experience. It was clear from the beginning that her residence was located far from the school and she would later prefer to move to a nearby school. In addition, the concern for her baby consumed much of her time and energy.

The sixth grade class was a superb group with a mix of excellent and weak students. Yet, the teacher was not accustomed to the local organizational culture (e.g. she was very cautious while speaking with the principal), and she was not prepared for the task. Having difficulties communicating with the pupils, and especially the bitter criticism by parents devastated her. The vast amount of assistance she received did not bear the expected fruits, so the next year, to everyone's relief, she moved to teach in a school near her home. The principal reflected that despite the teacher's proper skills and personality, her personal situation combined with the school's characteristics lead to the failure (School 26).

Perceived incompetence

Lack of ability is a broad and relative definition and principals were sometimes confused as to what exactly inability means. The symptoms covered wide range of difficulties, such as lack of ability to learn and the will to get assistance. A perceived incompetence accounted for 27.5 percent of the cases, and did not correlate with age or experience, but rather mildly with gender and grade level. More male teachers ($r = -.21$) and more lower grade teachers ($r = -.20$) were perceived as incompetent. These teachers could be described as stupid ($r = .54$) who invest many efforts ($r = .19$) but gain in return poor achievements ($r = .20$) and discipline problems ($r = .25$) due to poor teaching ($r = .25$) and aggressiveness ($r = .30$). Having mild negative correlation with the other factors

means that either the teacher was classified as incompetent or 'won' another classification.

Laziness

Low motivation accounted for almost 40 percent of the cases. As in the former chapters that shortcoming appeared in three different meanings: as a professional value (diligence), which guides principals as to how to judge the performance of their teachers, as a sheer performance ('dragging their feet'), and as a personality trait (laziness). The differences are marginal and maybe all the concepts resemble one construct, as shown in the very high correlation between the behavior and the trait ($r .76$). Even a similar trait, such as irresponsibility, may account for low performance, as it was found here ($r .49$).

Low motivation may stem from several sources, not necessarily related to being a lazy person. Such is the case when the teacher and the principal's temperament are diametrically opposed. What seems proper to one may seem too slow for another. Sometimes changing position can revive an idle worker, as happened with the second-grade teacher who was forced to teach a fifth grade class. The new challenge worked as a miracle. Further, sometimes the principal's initial wrong impression of a lazy teacher may become a self-fulfilling prophecy. The principal may reduce the workload of the teachers, believing they would not deliver the expected results any way. The teachers may 'read' the message behind the acts and work even slower.

Personal and personality disorders

When asked whether the problematic teacher had at a time a personal disorder (e.g. burned out, severe emotional distress, personal inflexibility, mental illness, alcoholism etc.), over half of the principals (55 percent) answered positively. The most frequently mentioned were burnout and personal stress.

Burn out is one of the most frequent results of working stressful conditions. The term accurately describes its essence – being left without resources. The symptoms include physical and mental fatigue, accompanied with a sense of emptiness, and negative attitudes toward oneself and others (Maslach & Jackson, 1981; Pines & Aronson, 1988). Other aspects reported among teachers include symptoms of tension, frustration,

anxiety, anger and depression (Kyriacou, 1987). Professionals who serve people may feel alienated from their clients, feel they cannot psychologically 'give more of themselves', become cynical to their clients needs, and dissatisfied with their professional achievements (Maslach & Jackson, 1981). Empirically, the mental fatigue represents the most serious aspect of the experience of burned out. To a lesser degree, physical fatigue and the lack of professional self-fulfillment were found among teachers (Friedman, 1992).

Stressful conditions and burnout are usually measured on the basis of the workers' self report (Friedman & Lotan, 1993), but here it was based on the principal's impression. Roughly about one third of the challenging teachers, most of them veteran with over 20 years of experience, were reported as being burned out. Other mental health problems were not mentioned specifically.

C. External influences

The teachers' unsatisfactory performance could be attributed in half of the cases to serious difficulties in their life. Sometimes getting in one trouble perpetuated getting into additional difficulties.

Esther (40) was a talented teacher with an excellent reputation who moved to work at the school several years ago. She taught humanities in most of the classes. As an opinionated person, she soon became involved with intrigues and rumors. The teachers resented her criticism and avoided her companionship. Like the short distance runner, whatever job she did not like frustrated her immediately. She was impatient with the principal who taught her daughter. Things began to deteriorate when her mother died of cancer. Esther became stressful, demanded that the school purchase precious teaching materials for her, asked them to change her position and increase her salary. By mid-year she decided to move to another school, but accepted the requests to continue teaching here. A few months later she bitterly criticized the principal and tried to incite teachers to mutiny, but in vain. In the second winter she was absent many days due to back pains. By the end of that year Esther moved to another school. Through that period her family suffered serious financial difficulties, while her husband frequently threatened divorce. (School 25)

Marital difficulties and financial problems were commonplace. Several of the teachers had gone through arduous divorces while other teachers, like Esther were distracted by continual turmoil in their marriages. Bridges (1992) emphasized that point:

These teachers may have been caught in some vicious cycle in which the problems at home and work fed on one another and created a downward spiral in both settings (Ibid, p.12)

Patterns of difficulties

The causes of the teachers' difficulties varied tremendously from case to case. Several teachers had to cope with only one unfavorable condition while others suffered no less than four, five and even six different sources of hardships (M- 2.8; SD 1.8). But, to what extent did the teachers in this study experience such vicious circle as described by Bridges? Did certain shortcomings and difficulties actually cluster into a group of troubles?

Table 8.2 Correlations of causes of the teachers' difficulties

	Difficult class	Poor management	Lack of experience	Lack of ability	Laziness	Mental disorders	Personal difficulties
Poor management	.21	-					
Lack of experience	.11	.25	-				
Lack of ability	-.16	.11	.00	-			
Laziness	-.26*	.12	-.13	-.24	-		
Mental disorders	.07	.07	-.34*	-.23	.02	-	
Personal difficulties	.12	.12	.05	-.05	-.36*	.50***	-
Other	-.10	-.10	.13	-.33*	.30*	-.28*	-.21

* p < .05

** p < .01

*** p < .001

The results show that three quarters of the combinations were not statistically significant. It means that getting in one difficulty is not necessarily connected with suffering another sort of hardships. Further, five out of the seven statistically significant combinations were negative, and that also supports the distinctiveness of each difficulty in itself. It seems that each kind of antecedent was uniquely related to a different group

of teachers (e.g. motivated but inexperienced teachers, veteran burn out teachers) and that explains the lack of statistical connection.

Of special interest however is the strong correlation ($r .50$) between personal disorders (e.g. stress, burn out) and external difficulties (e.g. marital difficulties), which support Bridges description. It also emerges that whenever personal difficulties arise teachers increase their efforts (correlated negatively with laziness).

Summary

The emerging picture, according to the principals' accounts, is that half of the problematic teachers happened to be veteran teachers who faced a marked internal and external shift in the mid of their career. The seeds of their problems, mainly personality traits such as inflexibility, stupidity, insensitivity and laziness were probably planted early in their lives. Some were reasonably good teachers until a crisis occurred – the sickness and death of a family member, financial difficulties, getting divorced and the like. Being unable to cope effectively with that change brought them to a very low point, professionally and personally. Meanwhile, other teachers performed unsatisfactorily but gained tenure through apathetic inspectors, and were supported for a long time by considerate principals. When a new principal arrived, all the rules were changed and the teachers' shortcomings were exposed. Some teachers tried to revolt, an act, which intensified their conflict with the new principal.

'Incompetence' as such, accounted for about one quarter of the challenging teachers. Its negative correlation with other antecedents and its strong correlation with 'stupidity' implies how principals determine who the incapable teacher is. Another quarter of the teachers happened to be novice workers who were posted in unfavorable positions. And so, without supportive guidance, while facing growing pressures from parents and students, the principals did not have enough patience. They preferred to send the teacher somewhere else.

The principals' reports seem to be somewhat biased. They underestimated their contribution to the problems, mainly with regard to poor inspection and mistaken decisions in human resource management. Principals did not always know about teachers' personal problems outside school. Meanwhile they put much of the blame on

the teachers' personality and shortcomings, while some of the teachers simply did not gain enough experience or enough assistance while facing personal crisis.

Challenging vs. outstanding teachers

After describing the context, the schools, and the principals, it is now appropriate to compare the challenging teachers to their control group of outstanding counterparts. The comparison is made along three axes of the *three-component model of attitude* (Rosenberg & Hovland, 1960; Eagly & Chaiken, 1998): cognitive (performance evaluation), behavioral (management styles on dimensions of giving and demanding), and affective (mutual prolonged emotions). The results here are based on the questionnaires that the principals and their teachers completed.

Main findings

The comparisons reveal, almost naturally, significant differences between the two groups (see table 1). The excellent teachers appear to be more professionally evaluated have more positive emotions toward their superiors and get more support and are less directed than their challenging counterparts. An analysis of variance between groups - two-way repeated measures MANOVA, reveal the same pattern of difference according to the role of respondent (teacher, principal) the teacher's type (challenging, excellent) and an interaction ($F = 31.113, p < .000$; $F = 29.486, p < .000$; $F = 24.387, p < .000$ respectively). Meanwhile, the three groups similarly perceive the public aspects of the principals' management style of giving and demanding toward the staff.

More specifically, on a scale from 1 to 6 (very poor to very good), the principals appreciate their excellent teachers (5.44) and consider their challenging teachers to perform below average (3.46). Surprisingly both groups of teachers perceive their performance as very good (5.22 and 5.50 respectively). Such a favorable professional self-image makes sense with regard to the excellent teachers, but what about the weak workers, were they not aware of their principal's attitude toward them? It would appear not.

On a scale from 1 to 5 (never to very often), principals tended to request more and give less to their challenging teachers in comparison to the second group (table 8.3). Maybe the good performers needed less guidance and facilitated the principals' willingness to offer them more.

**Table 8.3 Management styles, teacher's performance evaluation and mutual emotion –
A comparison between principals and teachers' perceptions**

		Teacher type			
		Challenging teachers	Excellent teachers	F	Significance
Demanding from individual teachers – principals	Mean	3.56	2.94	8.650	.004
	N	36	36		
Demanding from individual teachers – teachers	Mean	2.85	2.69	1.081	.303
	N	30	33		
Giving to individual teachers – principals		4.04	4.47	16.003	.000
Giving to individual teachers – teachers		3.78	4.54	15.791	.000
Demanding from staff – principals		3.78			
Demanding from staff – teachers		3.77	3.75	.022	.883
Giving to staff – principals		4.34			
Giving to staff – teachers		4.03	4.30	3.936	.052
Performance evaluation – principals		3.46	5.44	222.726	.000
Performance evaluation – teachers		5.22	5.50	7.174	.009
Mutual emotions – principals		2.14	3.58	154.659	.000
Mutual emotions – teachers		3.00	3.68	18.527	.000

These findings support the social exchange perspective where relations are perceived to be more satisfying and stable, when there is reciprocity and when rewards for each partner are more or less equal (Buunk et al. 1993). According to equity theorist (Walster et al, 1978) if one partner (the teacher) does not 'deliver' the expected outcomes despite the attempts of the other person (the principal), such unbalanced over-investment (Cogliser et al, 1999) would lead to negative view of the relationship and reduced efforts (e.g. 'I keep giving and giving but get nothing in return'). Whatever the reasons were, the outstanding teachers shared the same attitudes with their superiors. This was also the case with regard to the mutual prolonged emotions. On a scale of 0 to 4 (never to very often) they shared very positive feelings toward each other. Meanwhile the principals were more ambivalent, experiencing simultaneously positive and negative emotions toward their challenging teachers. In contrast to the principals' attitude, the challenging teachers believed the principals treated them like their successful colleagues – with much support and less demanding behaviour. Such perceived relations were followed by quite positive emotions.

Evaluation performance

The current study follows other studies, which compared outstanding teachers to average teachers along certain dimensions or traits (Sparks and Lipka, 1991). On every aspect on a scale of 1 to 6 (very low to very high) principals rated their excellent teachers much higher compared to their weak teachers (multivariate $F(22,44) = 14.2$ $p < .001$). But the highest gap appeared to be the overall evaluation (3.00 vs. 5.91, $F = 206.297$, $p < .000$). Along the six dimensions of the Lev (1996) performance evaluation questionnaire the above average teachers showed higher interest in their students; they used varied teaching methods; further advanced the weak students; maintained better relationships with their pupils; had good connections with parents, and coped better with discipline difficulties.

Table 8.4 Principals' performance evaluation of their teachers

	Teacher type		F	Significance
	Challenging teachers	Excellent teachers		
Genuine interest in pupils	4.12	5.91	47.001	.000
Use varied didactic methods in lessons	2.79	5.53	104.907	.000
No discipline problems at the teacher lessons	3.36	5.38	13.649	.000
Investing efforts in work	2.21	5.65	49.920	.000
Managing to advance weak students	2.18	5.24	49.340	.000
No parents complaints toward the teacher	3.21	5.74	67.852	.000
Students love the teacher	3.91	5.82	48.849	.000
Openness for inventions	2.82	5.41	54.993	.000

Table 8.4 presents a sample of 8 out of the 22 items included in Lev's (1996) questionnaire. It clearly shows the differences between both groups, but the results also reveal areas in which the challenging teachers were perceived to perform reasonably well. For example, they showed interest and respected their students (4.21), and they were quite liked by them (3.91). Meanwhile the principals appraised those teachers as low motivated, not open to inventions, lacking basic teaching skills and rarely using varied didactic methods. When discipline difficulties arise these teachers tend to refer the problematic pupil to the principal more often. Since they do not generally improve the weak students potential (2.18 compared with 5.18 of outstanding teachers), the academic achievements will tend to fall short of the principals' expectations – not all

the students master the taught material (3.58). These teachers do not manage either to keep good relations with parents (3.61).

Earlier studies, which compared outstanding and weak teachers, have shown that interpersonal communication style plays a significant role in encouraging effective learning in the classroom (Carkhuff, 1971; Aspy, 1974). An open, sincere, and honest approach in which the teacher presents her human side increases students' achievements, understanding and self-image. The current results support Sparks and Lipka's (1991, 1992) findings that background variables (age, years of teaching experience and academic degree) played no role while pro-social behavior (e.g. sensitivity, flexibility), and especially teaching competencies significantly differentiated between both groups.

Demanding and giving

Close examination of the principals' tendency to demand more from their challenging teachers reveals some interesting differences (see Figure 8.1). Generally, aspects of monitoring and setting targets were given equally toward both groups. Principals even assign slightly more tasks to their good teachers [see figure 8.1]. But the main difference relates to the use of assertive means. Based on their answers, heads do not hesitate to demand forcefully from or even reprimand their weak teachers. Maybe, unlike the good performers who satisfy their expectations, the principals believed they have to motivate their weak staff more assertively. In comparison, both groups of teachers maintained that their principals only rarely raised demands and almost never used tougher means. The challenging teachers, for example, did not perceive assertive gestures of insisting and reprimanding described by their principals (4.31 vs. 2.37 and 3.29 vs. 2.08 respectively). The current findings resemble Hersey and Blanchard (1977) mainly the *participating and the delegating* style of the leader that lets the subordinates themselves decide what to do.

Figure 8.1 *Principal's demanding from individual teacher*

The principals' giving styles disclose two elements. Based on their reports, principals offer almost equally to both groups the conditions necessary to work. They guide them, arrange the facilities and listen to them. They only favor the excellent teachers when it comes to more sensitive inter-relational aspects. They express full confidence (3.68 vs. 4.94), feel free to consult (3.16 vs. 4.56) and tend to praise more those teachers' successes (3.49 vs. 4.58). Meanwhile, comparing both groups reveal that the challenging teachers feel significantly less supported than the above average teachers. From the principals' point of view they devote their personal efforts and the school's resources to the challenging teachers, but always less than their successful counterparts. According to earlier studies (Dockery & Stiener, 1990; Day & Crain, 1992) supervisors and subordinates focus on different currencies of exchange from their partners: supervisors seek more work-related currencies, while subordinates seek more social related responses. No wonder principals 'paid' with warm relations to the teachers who fulfilled their expectations.

Mutual prolonged emotions

Comparing principals feelings toward both groups reveal significant differences (Multivariate, $F(16,54) = 27.5, p < .001$). They experienced only positive emotions toward their excellent teachers. On a scale of 0 – 4 (never to very often) the principals felt pride, appreciation, gratitude, happiness and hope, and some even felt envy toward their brilliant teachers ($M = .46$; $SD = 1.01$). Meanwhile they experienced mixed

emotions, negative and positive, toward their challenging workers. That ambivalent stance is presented by the lower intensity of emotional perception, as if the principals prefer to lower the 'tone' on both sides of the emotional spectrum. Also the responses varied statistically with regard to the second group, reflecting a more heterogeneous attitude.

The main negative emotions were frustration (2.56). Additional feelings of sadness (2.00), and compassion (1.58) reflected the perception of the situation as negative with no ability to change it. The principals hardly feel guilt (1.06) of being responsible to the teacher's situation or ashamed of him or her (1.28). Emotions that mark aggressive tendencies like anger (1.56) rejection (0.81) or fear (0.44), or competitiveness like superiority (0.61) were found to be surprisingly low. It is not to say that the principals were indifferent (0.67), on the contrary, but their feelings mainly reflected the awareness that the teacher's situation was undeniably sad and somewhat hopeless. The results of the teachers' feelings toward their principals show lower differences between both groups, though statistically significant (multivariate, $F(16, 99) = 3.2, p < .000$). The excellent teachers felt very positive toward their superiors, and so did the challenging teachers, but with lower intensity. For example, the challenging teachers did experience pride (2.59), gratitude (2.46), happiness (2.54) and hope (2.37) to a certain degree. They hardly felt guilt (0.63), anger (.93), fear (0.55) or rejection (0.68). Yet, they were also not indifferent to their relations with their principals (0.50).

Hidden streams

The next section triangulates the principals' and their teachers' perspectives. The correlations brought here, like an X ray scanning, reveal some of the underlying motives and behaviors of the subjects. The forthcoming data is complicated, combining the perspectives of respondents (principal/teacher), type of teachers (challenging/outstanding) management style (giving/demanding), toward recipients (individual/staff), coupled with aspects of performance and mutual emotions. The results are presented from the teachers' perspective and from the principals' perspective (table 8.2). At first glance it seems that more significant correlations were found within groups than between groups.

Similarity between self and collective - the challenging teachers perceived a strong similarity between the principal's demanding toward them individually and toward the staff as a collective ($r .43, p < .01$). Given that neither the principals nor the successful teachers perceived such a correlation ($r .11$; $r .26$ NS respectively), it means the challenging teachers portrayed different managerial practices with the same 'colors'. It would be reasonable to believe that each principal had a unique individual leadership style, which changed at times according to the situation. That assumption was supported by the positive low to medium correlation, which was found by the two other groups (principals + outstanding teachers). Were the challenging teachers less flexible in differentiating between the various settings and responses? Probably yes. The same pattern, even stronger, appeared also with regard to the perception of the principals' giving to individual teachers and to the staff ($r .74, p < .01$ vs. $r .29$ and $r -.10$ NS respectively).

In contrast to the above trend, the outstanding teachers and the principals similarly perceived the same managerial practices – demanding ($r .43, p < .01$) and giving to individual teachers ($r .34, p < .05$), and also demanding from staff ($r .40, p < .01$). Such correlations with regard to the challenging teachers were found to be close to zero ($R .06$; $r -.01$; $r .06$ respectively). The meaning – unlike their weak colleagues, the successful teachers are well tuned to the manager's practices and realistically perceive how the principals lead the school.

To what extent does the principals' demanding carry emotional weight? How does it influence their mutual relations? The answer seems to be in the eyes of the beholder. The principals demanding had no correlation with their emotions toward individual challenging or successful teachers ($r = .01$, $r = .09$ NS respectively). The correlation between the principals' perception of their demanding and the teachers' feelings were found to be mixed and insignificant ($r = .14$; $r = .11$ NS respectively). The teachers' perspective, on the other hand, presents a different picture.

Table 8.5 Management style, effectiveness and emotions – correlations of teachers' perspectives

	Teacher type	Demanding teachers	Giving – teachers	Staff demanding – teachers	Staff giving – teachers	Effectiveness – teachers	Emotions – teachers
Giving – teachers	Below average	-.09	-				
	Above average	-.06	-				
Staff demanding – teachers	1	.43**	.14	-			
	2	.26	-.04	-			
Staff giving – teachers	1	-.16	.74**	.19	-		
	2	.11	.29	.38*	-		
Effectiveness – teachers	1	-.25	.02	-.15	-.22	-	
	2	.21	.11	.27	.14	-	
Emotions – teachers	1	-.34*	.70**	-.18	.58**	.19	-
	2	-.01	.85**	.01	.54**	-.01	-
Demanding - principals	1	.00	.17	.06	.16	.33*	.14
	2	.25	-.13	.43**	.12	.25	-.11
Giving principals	1	-.11	.12	-.01	.07	.17	.02
	2	.36*	.16	.34*	.09	-.01	.26
Staff demand p'	1	.17	.20	.06	.17	.07	-.19
	2	.11	-.12	.40**	-.03	.20	.02
Staff giving p'	1	.06	-.10	-.06	.08	.00	-.36*
	2	-.15	-.15	.10	.14	.25	-.01
Effectiveness – principals	1	-.01	-.21	.14	-.30	.37*	-.06
	2	-.32*	.13	.03	.06	.12	.17
Emotions – principals	1	-.37*	.16	-.15	.01	.26	.42**
	2	-.20	-.02	.02	-.04	-.26	.15

* $p < .05$

** $p < .01$

When the challenging teachers report the principals' management style, demanding is significantly correlated with both, self and principals' negative feelings ($r = .34$; $r = .37$ $p < .05$ respectively), Such is also the case, to lesser degree, with regard to principals' feelings following demanding from their successful teachers ($r = .20$ NS). It appears that what principals considered as demanding had no relations to emotional response, but the teachers' criteria was closely related to negative feelings on both sides. Maybe

principals counted the ‘soft’ aspects of demanding, like setting goals and monitoring (found similarly applied to both groups), while the teachers counted the ‘hard’ aspects like reprimanding (mainly applied to the challenging teachers) and presumably created negative responses.

Giving appears to create different emotions. Generous behavior goes with very positive emotions, while lack of principal’s giving is connected with both teachers groups’ negative feelings ($r .70 p < .001$; $r .85 p < .01$). Such is also the case with regard to the principals’ giving style to the staff ($r .58 p < .01$; $r .54 p < .01$ respectively). It appears that the teachers were sensitive to every sign of support, perceiving their mutual relations by measuring the amount of warmth, trust and assistance they received from their principals.

If giving were so meaningful for the teachers, one would expect it would also be emotionally meaningful for the principals, but the results do not support that hypothesis. Principals do give much, but it only mildly and insignificantly correlates with their emotional response ($r .20$; $r .17$ NS). It appears as if the principals perceive giving as an integral part of their job, regardless of who are the recipients of their generosity, be it a good or a weak teacher. Giving is maybe a managerially pleasant task, but like demanding it is practiced on a professional rather interpersonal basis of liking or disliking.

Table 8.6 Management style, effectiveness and emotions – correlations of principals’ perspectives

	Teacher type	Giving – principal	Staff demand P’	Staff give P’	Effective P’	Emotions P’
Demanding - principals	Below average	.12	.43**	.19	.25	-.01
	Above average	.38*	.26	.21	.01	-.09
Giving – principals	1	-	.16	.49**	.12	.20
	2	-	.21	.20	.21	.17
Staff demand P’	1		-	.42**	.07	-.13
	2		-	.44**	.28	.21
Staff giving P’	1			-	-.09	-.43**
	2			-	.45**	.04
Effectiveness – principals	1				-	.41**
	2				-	.24

* $p < .05$

** $p < .01$

To what extent do acts of giving correlate with acts of demanding? Are they perceived as disconnected or two aspects of the same construct? In computing between groups and within the group of teachers, both with regard to individual teachers and staff, correlations were found to be mixed and mostly insignificant. Meanwhile, when correlations were computed within the principals' group (e.g. P' individual demanding – P individual giving), strong connection was found with regard to their style toward individual teachers (challenging $r .12$ NS; outstanding $r .38$, $p < .05$) and toward staff ($r .42$ $p < .01$; $r .44$ $p < .05$ respectively). The positive connection represents the perception of demanding and giving, as complementary aspects of the same management style.

Effectiveness and management styles

While the outstanding teachers believed that their good performance was connected with less demanding ($r -.32$ $p < .05$), and increased giving ($r .13$ NS), the weak teachers felt no change in the principals' demanding ($r -.01$), but a slight decrease in his or her giving due to poor performance ($r -.21$ NS). The principals, on the other hand, felt they were more assertive with regard to the weak group ($r .25$; $r .01$ NS respectively) and gave more when it come to evaluate their outstanding teachers ($r .45$ $p < .01$; $r -.09$ NS). Based on these figures, what the principals experience as more giving, the outstanding teachers perceive as less demanding, while the weak teachers perceive the principals increased demanding as a sign of less giving. The increased principals' giving is interpreted by the outstanding teachers as an act of decreasing control, maybe a sign of expressing trust. The increased demanding is actually taking a more formal, less supportive stance toward the poor-performing teachers.

The principals' evaluation of effectiveness also correlated positively with their emotions. High appreciation was followed by warm feelings and vice versa. That statistical connection was found to be stronger with regard to the challenging teachers ($r .41$, $p < .01$; $r .24$ NS respectively). Meanwhile no such correlation was found between the principals' evaluation and the teachers' emotions ($r .06$; $r .17$ NS respectively). What emerges is that the teachers did not sense the principals' feelings and attitudes toward them.

One of most curious questions raised in this study was the compatibility between the principals and their challenging teachers mutual emotions. Tentatively, it is

hypothesized that even if words and acts were sometimes meant to mislead, emotions and intuition would not lie. The results justify that common wisdom: a strong positive correlation was found between the principals and their weak teachers' mutual emotions ($r .42 P < .01$) and positive but weak ($r .15 NS$) with their excellent teachers. The principals' mutual emotions were found to be more ambivalent and less positive than those of their teachers (2.14 vs. 3.00 respectively). The current findings mean that principals could not hide negative feelings when they were not satisfied with their weak teachers. The transmission of those sentiments, positive and negative passed to the challenging teachers, even if not perceived correctly by the teachers.

Summary

The challenging teachers perceived themselves to be competent, enjoyed quite positive feelings toward themselves and their superiors and believed they were treated like the rest of the staff. These results quite contradict what the principals felt, thought and how they behaved, especially when compared to their outstanding colleagues. Yet, behind the different opinions, both sides shared the same feelings. Since the principals' behavior significantly correlated with their feelings toward the challenging teachers, but did not correlate with the teacher's appraisal, probably the principals' management style served as a source of information that was communicated and influenced the weak teachers' affective response. The strong correlation between the principals giving and the teachers' emotion mean that lack of supporting was interpreted as a sign of poor mutual relations.

The situation with the good performers appeared to be different. On one hand they were highly appreciated and shared very positive emotions with their superiors. They were also compatible with their superiors, perceiving the same aspects of performance evaluation and management styles, but on the other hand these warm relations were found not to correlate statistically. Such surprising results mean that the ample support and atmosphere of happiness did not necessarily reflect close relations. The principals selected those teachers on the basis of outstanding performance, not necessarily on the basis of mutual liking. Those teachers appeared to be more self assured and independent in comparison to their incompetent colleagues.

Finally, from methodological standpoint, taking a 'control group' of outstanding teachers and triangulating information (e.g. the same managerial practices were described by two and three sources) has tremendously enriched the current study. Two analytical methods were used to examine the differences between the weak and the outstanding teachers - first to measure cognitive, behavioral and affective aspects separately and to compare them later. The second approach was to search for correlations among the groups of subjects and variables. That combination has brought together the subjects perceptions with their underlying motives. The richness of the findings fully justified taking such arduous research method.

Interventions and results

Having already identified the failing teacher forces the principal to act, but the choices are neither simple nor pleasant. They reflect the understanding of the situation; the weight given to each factor and the hesitation to open a direct conflict. Here come to life the shadows of the 'inner theater' (Popper, 1994), the personality and the management style.

After describing the case of the problematic teacher, the principals were asked to describe what measures they took, in chronological order, to solve the problem. Probing questions, which helped to clarify the picture, followed their descriptions. Obviously, those stories cannot be considered as a full account of the many actions they took for months and years, but rather their own remembered responses. Based on Bridges (1992) analysis these measures were divided into tolerating measures and confronting measures. The escape hatches were identified here as a third category of organizational measures (changing position; reducing teaching hours). Each of the three approaches consisted, via content analysis, of several sub-categories of actions. The tolerating mode consists of seven categories and the confronting mode was divided, according the principals' answers, into six specific measures. Two organizational measures were added. Altogether, principals used on average no less than six different kinds of measures, mainly tolerating and assisting ($M = 3.1$), less confronting ($M = 2.1$) and rarely used organizational means ($M = 0.6$). There were other means, such as direct intervention with an undisciplined class or individual talks with parents and pupils, which were used less frequently. The order in which the measures were practiced (except overlooking as an initial response) was changed from case to case. Before describing in more details each measure, the list of measures and their correlations with selected background variables is described.

The low correlations reflect in general that no specific measure was connected to certain background variables. Yet, the table shows that the larger the school (as

measured by the number of its teachers), principals ignored difficulties less, held more discussions with the problematic teachers and used more often the available options to change the teacher's position. Other school background variables (size of city, socioeconomic level of the neighborhood) were found to play no role. Among the principals' background variables, experience had no significance while gender emerged to carry some influence. The positive correlations mean that women principals enacted coping measures more often, like asking other teachers to assist, talking with teachers about their difficulties and sometimes even criticizing. Men, on the other hand, tended more to cut the rope - to offer teachers a change of school and used threats more often.

Table 9.1 Principals' responses and background variables (frequencies and correlations)

Mode of action	Specific measures	Frequency of use (percent)	Length of experience as a principal	Principal's Gender	School's number of teachers	Problematic teacher's age
Tolerating and assisting	Overlooking	50	-.01	.00	-.30*	.07
	Offering additional studies	32.5	-.18	.14	.08	-.15
	Asking other teachers to assist	50	.03	.28*	.17	-.25
	Counselor/instructor assistance	50	.06	.14	.17	-.05
	Feedback discussion	87.5	.08	.26*	.32*	-.24
	Increasing monitoring	37.5	-.28*	.03	.03	-.10
	Modeling/guiding	32.5	.04	.18	.18	-.08
Organizational measures	Reducing teaching hours	17.5	.05	.00	-.10	.23
	Changing teaching position	42.5	.05	.22	.40**	.06
Confronting	Criticizing (orally)	80	.13	.31*	.26*	-.21
	Criticizing (written)	30	-.10	.12	.15	.06
	Offer to change school	15	.10	-.24	.19	-.42***
	Use threats	17.5	.27*	-.17	.07	.18
	Referring to supervisor	47.5	-.19	-.02	-.03	.09
	Terminating job/ initiating dismissal procedure	12.5	-.03	.16	-.25	.05

N = 40

* P < .05

** P < .01

*** P < .001

As with regard to the teachers' age and experience, the many negative correlations mean that principals responded cautiously when it came to their older teachers, both in terms of assistance and confronting (especially not to offend them by the offer to change school).

Tolerating and assisting

Ignoring is qualitatively different from any other measures principals used. In half of the cases principals deliberately preferred to overlook when they first noticed the warning signs. Actually they were selective with regard to the difficulties they ignored: low motivation and laziness ($r .29$), unfriendly relations with other staff members ($r.20$) and teacher's irresponsible behavior ($r .23$) met with quite an indifferent response. Despite the fact that problematic behavior was directed toward their leadership and contradicted the school's daily routines, principals turned their heads and ignored. Meanwhile heads could not tolerate aggressiveness toward pupils ($r -.35$), poor teaching ($r -.26$), low achievements ($r -.33$) and discipline problems ($r -.21$). Those painful 'open wounds' led them to immediate intervention.

Being passive, pretending not to see, reflects the emotional difficulty in facing the 'bad news' and taking action. Interestingly, ignoring correlated positively only with the principal's own observations, while taking more active monitoring after being informed by others. The British psychologist Dixon (1987) claimed that seeking peace of mind causes leaders to use denial, repression, rationalization and projection as defense mechanisms to protect their soul against disturbing realities. It seemed that some principals behaved, as Shakespeare said, that 'where ignorance is bliss, 'tis folly to be wise'. Only when the difficulties did not disappear or become painfully evident, principals made up their mind to get involved.

In the first year I got acquainted with the staff and did not make any intervention. In the second year I noticed the [teacher's] low motivation and her communication with others, which I interpreted as dishonest. For example, she could pretend: 'I didn't know I have to tell you'. I began to examine her reports more carefully. In the third year she remained a nice person but I noticed the signs of double talk. In the middle of the year one of her pupils was absent for ten days. The teacher did not report to me about it. A week later I received a telephone call from her parents. They were furious, asking how come nobody called her sick daughter, who had been hospitalized for few days. I called the teacher and revealed that the girl's absence was not registered from the start in the class's diary, but the teacher mendaciously tried to correct it (School 36).

When facing improper behavior that did not shatter vital rules, principals seemed to experience approach-avoidance conflict. They had to decide whether the presented problem called for direct intervention. Ignoring represented the choice of caution. Principals described how careful they were not to blame an innocent teacher. Such an act, they knew, could have raised restlessness and might deteriorate their relations with the staff.

Once the shortcomings were clearly noticed and found to be serious, principals became more active. In the case of perceived poor teaching, principals advised the teachers to take additional studies. It happened in about a quarter of the cases but very few of the veteran teachers actually cooperated. Offering continued education correlated negatively with more decisive acts such as reducing teaching hours ($r = -.31$). Maybe the principals felt it was too early to cut short while they still had the longer educational route. Principals also offered the problematic teacher cooperation with a senior colleague who taught the same subject and the same grade level. Such use of the professional school's resources was perceived as a legitimate channel of assistance without stigmatizing the failing teacher. Principals walked on their tiptoes not to offend their staff, but rather to encourage them to cooperate:

I initiated a meeting with both [arithmetic] teachers to examine the implementation of teaching certain subjects and to encourage them to work together. The more experienced teacher arrived after a sabbatical year. She was knowledgeable and self-confident, and somehow did not threaten the [problematic] teacher. In order not to decrease her (the weak teacher who had a severe health problem) confidence and to create a common working system, I found out-of-school courses, which I asked *both* teachers to attend. Those courses on heterogeneous teaching and on learning disabilities fitted our pupil's needs. It helped. Later, I asked the inspector, without telling the exact reasons, to observe both teachers. I also visited their classes and talked with them (School 31).

Another prevalent course of action was to ask the school counselor or the MoE instructor to get involved. That step not only enriched the professional assistance, but it

also enabled principals to take one step backward, especially when their relations with the failing teacher had already deteriorated. Interestingly, that assistance correlated with changing the teacher's position ($r .35$). It seems as if the counselor's involvement encouraged principals and teachers to take a more courageous step.

In addition, almost all the principals (87.5 percent) held feed back talks with the teachers. It enabled them to discuss in a calm atmosphere the teacher's daily experiences and to sneak in some advice and encouragement. Sometimes principals lost their temper and openly criticized the teacher ($r .38$). Once the complaints continued to flow and improvement was evidently slow, principals began to monitor more closely the teacher's performance. Walking more often along the corridors near classes, entering more often to observe a lesson, watching the teacher and her student at informal times and other methods supplied principals with further data.

About one-third of the principals rolled up their sleeves and guided the failing teacher. They talked with problematic students, conferred with parents and joined the teacher to assist with developing the curriculum and assist with its implementing. Such modeling was added to the assistance of other staff members ($r .37$)

Organizational measures

Bridges (1986) described several organizational solutions which are practiced in California in order to reduce the potential harm from the failing teachers. Those 'escape hatches' include a transfer of a teacher between schools within the district, a placement in a position of assisting individual students, or a reassignment of the incompetent teacher to non-teaching position. The Israeli system differs to some extent with regard to its personnel management. The enforced transfer of a teacher to another school is considered as a confronting measure, the last call before dismissal. Reassignment to a non-teaching position such as librarian contradicts the labor laws and the stern protection policy of the teachers unions. Even a placement in a position of assisting individual students is rare since the teacher must have a professional background of teaching to work in the special education (most of the problematic teachers did not have such experience). Meanwhile reducing teaching hours or changing a teaching position within the school are enacted more often and are met with mixed feelings. Some teachers perceived them as confronting while others felt it assisted them.

She had a 30 hours [teaching] position. Her [educational] approach to the children was terrible, as if they were her prisoners. When the 'explosion' occurred two years ago I decided to squeeze her job. She (the teacher) agreed to reduce many hours in order to concentrate on educating her class. I also turned to the inspector, to move her from my school, to use the opportunity that she left our village to reside in a nearby city. But the teacher insisted to continue working here. She is a very stubborn person and I appreciate that (School 12).

Reducing a worker's job from full-time to part-time is usually done as an alternative to layoffs when organizations need to cut their workforce (Heneman et al, 1989). In such a case, the organization negotiates with the union and reaches an agreement on the exact terms of the new labor contract. Then the company may shift to work sharing (e.g. four day workweeks, with the lost income offset to some extent by unemployment compensation), or pay cuts. Despite the emotional toll of uncertainty, it buys greater employee flexibility in adjusting to changes, since employees are not afraid of losing their jobs. Reducing the worker's position to a part time job, unlike the common measures such as oral warning, written warning, suspension and dismissal, cannot be lawfully used as a sanction in coping with incompetence and discipline problems (PPF, 1985). The few principals (17.5 percent) who reduced teaching hours were not enforced to respond to low enrollment ($r = .06$ N.S.), but rather tried to limit the harm caused by the problematic teacher. The reduction itself was minimal (otherwise it would have raised an outcry from the teachers union), and it was meant to signal the principal's upset with the teachers' performance. Needless to say that such act changed the teacher's working conditions, reduced his or her salary and sent a message to all the workers in the organization. No wonder the problematic teachers reduced their participating in staff meeting and some took a leave the next year.

When their hands are tied with regard to major personnel management practices, such as selection and dismissal, they are still left with a staff of 20 – 30 teachers to maneuver with. Changing teaching positions was used in almost half of the cases; Principals changed the teachers' grade level or transferred educators to become specialist teachers. Yet, even taking such measure entailed a cautious approach.

The first stage [when I became a principal] was to evaluate the schools' potential for growth. The school was in a [situation of] regression. When I looked for the causes, the difficulties emerged [including the 'contribution' of the problematic veteran teacher]. I asked the inspector how to reduce the salary increase she recently received [for serving a position] as a deputy. I hoped to shake her. To motivate her to work harder, but the inspector explained it was too late. I was very cautious and did not tell her my plans. Don't forget that was my first year [as a principal]. Then I asked the inspector's permission to change the grade level [the teacher was supposed to teach next year]. The inspector approved. I also consulted with an experienced colleague principal who was affiliated with the teachers union. She advised me to make the change before March 31st (last due date), so the teacher would have the option to consider leaving the school. It ran smoothly when I announced to her [the problematic teacher] about my decision. She met with the inspector who supported my decision. She also told the staff and maybe tried to lobby for her case, but I explained her that the change was meant to refresh and not to express discontent. When the parents realized the teacher would not teach next year the first grade the enrollment increased, the teacher became more active and I monitored her work more closely (School 5).

Upon her arrival, the new principal took two measures: first she collected information intensively, interviewing parents, teachers and inspectors in order to learn the school's situation. By pretending not to notice the institution's difficulties she bought an 'incubation period' to create a comfortable working climate and to establish her leadership. Only later did she begin to explore the options to make a small act to change the problematic teacher's behavior. Since she did not gain the staff's support sufficiently, she felt compelled to be cautious in confronting the teacher. In order to ensure she followed the governmental regulations and the educational system's informal norms, she asked the advice of her superiors. By that the principal managed to secure their support and was prevented from making careless mistakes. When the ground was ready she invited the teacher to inform her about her decision. Presenting her suggestion in a favorable light with no criticism on the teacher's performance proved to be a very effective move that improved the situation. Actually it was one of those unique surprising cases that were solved without any disciplinary actions.

Confronting

When the soft measures didn't bring the expected results, principals drew more aggressive weapons. Most of the principals (80 percent) criticized the teacher's actions, while only few (30 percent) expressed their discontent in a letter. According to labor regulations in Israel, once a worker receives three criticizing letters, it enables the employer to open a dismissal procedure. Employers and employees are fully aware that each letter brings closer the termination of the working contract; hence they prefer not to stain their working relations with ink. Principals used the formal channel only in extreme cases when the teachers neglected their duties

Generally, principals preferred not to signal their intention directly, but rather lead the teachers to catch the hidden signs and leave voluntarily. Yet, some staff pretended not to understand, forcing the principals to put the gun on the table and offer the teacher a move to another school. Such a move, even when transmitted in calm tones hides a serious meaning. It signaled the discontent, the personal and professional discrepancy; the principal's decision to sever the ties. If it did not help, principals turned to use direct threats. Studies on the psychodynamics of organizations indicate mixing emotion and control (Gabriel, 1998). For example, supervisors may generate fear and anxiety in order to motivate their employees. Once they become concerned about their job, esteem, or status there are better chances they would comply more willingly (Flam, 1993). The use of blatant language, which usually was added to other measures, increased the pressure on the failing teachers. Such an example occurred with the principal of the teacher who did not call her sick pupil:

I told her that I didn't believe her stories, and seriously considered her behavior as improper. I announced my intention to send a letter to the inspector. A day later, the teacher asked to meet with the inspector. After their appointment the inspector called me to explore what had happened and to defend her. At the staff room the teacher told her colleagues that I cling to her like a leech. The next week, the teacher asked to meet with me. I told her she lied to me and by that she crossed the 'red line'. When I met the inspector, I asked him to move the teacher to another school, but he refused, explaining that there were other 'more serious cases'. The teacher continued to teach properly, with high

achievements. I was lucky. Another school's principal asked the inspector to replace a failing teacher and so we did a trade in (School 36).

Most studies on control within organizations focus on the managers' behavior toward their workers (Viorst, 1998). Yet, this case supports the findings of a study on intra-organizational influence, which concluded that 'in large organizations, every one influences each other, regardless of their position' (Kipnis et al 1980, p. 450). Here, as in other organizations, despite their lower status in the power hierarchy, the workers try to control their bosses and use various tactics to improve their working conditions, their benefits and the environment, which they work in. The dishonest teacher is not a passive recipient of the principal's maneuvers. Courageously she turns to convince influential persons (e.g. inspector, staff members) whom she believes would have the power to change the course of events. The use of deception and chutzpah, with considerable success, actually voids the principal's efforts to get rid of the teacher. In terms of employer-employee relations, the teacher was more assertive and initiating, used more sophisticated tactics and actually won the game. From the principal's standpoint, this process of managing this conflict cannot be read off from legal and managerial prescriptions, and it is shaped and enabled by their ambiguities and contradictions. It also involved a complex set of assumptions about self-status, role security and professional competence – and about others (Fineman & sturdy, 1999, p. 643). .

The letters, the threats and the referral to the inspector are meant to increase the pressure on the teacher to leave the school. When none of the former methods help, principals ask the inspector to transfer the teacher to another school or to initiate dismissal procedure. Dismissal, as the last resort, was enacted when the shortcomings were profound, mainly in cases of poor teaching ($r .30$), discipline problems ($r .36$) and the teacher's irresponsible behavior ($r .31$). Dismissal, as we saw earlier, is a long process that may take up to three years, and many inspectors object to using it. In three cases, principals discontinued the contract of an untenured worker who was employed by the local municipality, while in two cases principals asked their inspector to initiate a dismissal procedure.

Measures of tolerance and confronting - some additional statistics

After examining each course of action separately and the clusters of tolerating, confronting and organizational measures, it is time to explore the principals' behavior from broader perspectives: What influence had informants and their messages had on the heads' decisions? Are there any specific patterns of teacher's behavior and principals' response? When did principals decide to tolerate and when to confront (escalate) the problematic teacher? Finally, does the principals' management style relate to a specific course of actions?

Table 9.2 Correlations between tolerating and confronting measures

	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
(1) Overlooking	.05	-.10	-.20	-.07	-.36*	-.48*	-.20	.05	.00	.02	-.23	-.20	-.05	-.07
(2) Additional studies	—	.26*	.16	.10	.02	.20	-.31*	.16	-.05	-.22	-.16	-.03	-.13	-.10
(3) Asking teachers to assist		—	.00	-.07	.16	.37**	-.06	-.15	.12	-.10	.00	-.06	.05	.37**
(4) Counselor assistance			—	.07	.05	.05	-.06	.35**	.12	.00	.23	-.06	.05	-.22
(5) Feedback discussion				—	.13	.10	-.02	.17	.38**	.25	.04	-.02	-.09	-.31*
(6) Increasing monitoring					—	.23	.19	-.04	.00	.17	.15	.19	.19	-.13
(7) Modeling and guiding						—	.24	.05	.21	.24	.22	.24	-.01	-.10
(8) Reducing teaching hours							—	.27*	.06	.13	-.11	.13	.08	.02
(9) Changing position								—	.05	-.23	-.02	.00	-.10	-.17
(10) Criticizing (orally)									—	.33*	.14	.06	.35**	.19
(11) Criticizing (written)										—	.25	.13	.25	-.25
(12) Offer to change school											—	.34*	.26*	-.04
(13) Use threats												—	.08	.02
(14) Referring to supervisor													—	.25
(15) Terminating job/ dismissal														—

N = 40

* P < .05

** P < .01

The low correlations among most of the measures mean that each case had its own solution. Principals have found their own path among the various situations and considerations. The table shows that the measures principals used did not cluster into certain groups. Yet, the first means (e.g. referring to additional studies) correlates

negatively with the last confronting measure, namely when principals had more hope and enthusiasm to assist they postponed taking more aggressive measures toward problematic teachers.

Pressures and influences

Principals would have preferred to inform the community only about their successes and leave the failures in the darkness. But the school walls, for good and for bad, are transparent. Bad news tends to reach many ears, and enraged parents, concerned inspectors, and especially the nosy local media become involved, demanding information and explanations from the principal.

When teachers' misbehavior crosses undeclared red lines, it shatters some unstated norms with regard to the relations between the school and the community. Normally, teachers have relative autonomy in choosing the materials, the teaching methods and the nature of relations developed with their pupils. The principals' prerogative to manage their staff is widely acknowledged (Ministry of Education, 1997, p.13) and usually strictly supported. Meanwhile, parents tend to remain aloof as to the intellectual food their children are being offered, or the organizational routines within the school (e.g. home assignments, amount of hours exerted to each subject matter). The teacher's misconduct violates the delicate relations fabric, leading others to feel obliged to respond. Only rarely do parents declare war, but a teacher's aggressive behavior became a cause to demand her dismissal, and so the novice principal was caught in the crossfire. This case exemplifies what educational management theorists describe as a political process (Bush, 1995). All the necessary ingredients were present: a conflict between interest groups; each group has specific goals and the will to use power tactics, bargaining and negotiation in order to achieve its targets. Neither the parents nor the teachers or the pupils wished to 'destroy' each other, but rather to ensure that the game is played properly. Violating a sacred rule, hence - 'respect your students', ignited the spark of the parents revolt. And so, in the heat of the conflict, both sides did not hesitate to call other partners (inspector, local mayor, staff members), use threats, build coalitions, use information and disinformation and other maneuvers in order to escalate the conflict and reach their goal (have the teacher remain/leave her position).

With regard to quantitative aspects: more than half of the principals (55 percent) in this study reported being pressured by parents, staff members and others. As expected, what enraged these people related mainly to insensitivity and aggressive responses toward pupils ($r .42$) and stupid behavior ($r .30$). Surprisingly, discipline problems and especially irresponsible behavior and laziness were found to have negative correlation with the amount of these complaints ($r -.20$; $-.43$; $-.42$ respectively).

What activated principals?

Everyday principals receive ample information from many sources about their school, but who among the informants influenced the principals to take specific action? Generally, as with other variables, relatively low correlations were found. It does not imply that principals ignored those who informed them, but rather attached specific responses to each case. For example, despite the fact that 85 percent of the principals received concerned messages from parents, it did not lead them to take a specific action. That was also found with regard to low students' achievements, and staff complaints. Meanwhile, pupils' complaints led principals to change the teacher's position - removing her or him from a class where many children expressed dissatisfaction ($r .29$); used threats ($r .29$) and even acted to terminate the teacher's contract ($r .31$). The principal's and the inspector's observation strengthened actions of monitoring ($r .30$) and later a change of school or act to dismiss ($r .40$).

Another aspect to examine is the connection between the difficulties and the nature of response. Three kinds of teachers' shortcomings drive principals to focus their responses: Low achievements seem much to bother principals ($r -.33$). More than in any other difficulty they tend to offer guidance, either by other staff members ($r .44$) or by themselves ($r .48$). Here their professional leadership comes to life, believing in their power to change the teachers' performance. Only when efforts bear no fruits do principals offer the teacher a change of school. Poor teaching is not perceived as a cause for dismissal, but seems to be considered by principals as a problem that might be corrected elsewhere, if the teacher works in another school with another principal.

The second shortcoming relates to dishonest behavior. When principals were faced such behavior they asked the school counselor or the MoE instructor to get involved and later, once the problem continued they did not hesitate to criticize the teacher in

writing and to offer him or her to change school. Denial of difficulties and lying were also not perceived as a reason for dismissal. Meanwhile, having discipline problems mark the problematic teacher as a danger to the school's reputation, as a hopeless case that should be removed from the list of workers. Principals surprisingly did not refer the case to the instructor or the school's counselor. They preferred to discuss about it with their inspector and asked to terminate the teacher's work.

Table 9.3 Correlations of principals' responses and teachers' difficulties

	Poor teaching	Laziness	Dishonest	Disrespect for pupils	Not responsible	Stupid	Low achievements	Poor discipline
Overlooking	-.26*	.29*	-.23	-.35**	.23	.00	-.33*	-.21
Additional studies	-.01	.25	-.26*	-.05	.22	-.05	.13	-.06
Asking teachers to assist	.26*	.09	-.23	-.05	.07	.17	.44***	.21
Counselor/instruct or assistance	-.05	-.19	.38**	-.05	-.22	.17	.11	-.32*
Feedback discussion	-.13	-.03	.14	.13	.14	.13	-.08	-.04
Increasing monitoring	.06	-.02	.02	.35**	-.14	.08	-.05	.08
Modeling/guiding	.09	-.16	.06	.27*	-.10	.30*	.48***	.16
Reducing teaching hours	-.05	.07	.02	.26*	-.17	.06	-.01	.07
Changing position	-.06	-.19	-.17	.02	-.17	.05	-.01	-.10
Criticizing (orally)	.00	.10	.19	.07	.19	-.04	.05	-.02
Criticizing (written)	-.05	.19	.41***	.01	-.08	.14	.05	.09
Offer to change school	.09	-.27	.48***	.03	-.22	.19	.38**	.18
Use threats	.08	-.18	.02	.26*	.02	.29*	.13	.07
Referring to supervisor	.22	.13	.25	.11	-.05	-.15	.14	.35**
Terminating job/initiating dismissal procedure	.30*	.18	.25	-.13	.31*	-.12	.08	.36**

N = 40

* P < .05

** P < .01

*** P < .001

As with other kinds of difficulties, heads' response to teachers' low motivation and irresponsible behavior reflects ambivalence. They prefer first to ignore and not to take any significant step. Their hesitations are portrayed in the same statistical pattern.

Principals' responses and the causes of teachers' difficulties

Do the principals' perceptions of the teacher's difficulties determine their response?

According to the *attribution theory* (Kelley, 1967) people derive causal attributions for

the behavior of other individuals. Such causal attribution can be either internal or external to the subordinate. Examples of internal causes of poor performance within the context of this study are the teacher's low motivation and lack of ability. On the other hand, if the teacher is a novice with no former experience, if she was assigned to teach a very difficult class or even if she had recently suffered personal difficulties, such as being injured in a car accident, the principals will probably make external attributions for the poor performance (Green & Mitchell, 1979).

Table 9.4 Principals' responses and the causes for teachers' difficulties

	Difficult class	Poor management	Lack of experience	Lack of ability	Laziness	Personality disorders	Personal difficulties	Other
Overlooking	-.12		-.16	-.05	.26*		-.10	.04
Additional studies	-.25	.05	.17	.05	.23	.09	.05	-.06
Asking teachers to assist		.12	.39**	.17	-.05	-.10	.00	
Counselor/instruct or assistance	.25	-.25	-.05	-.05	.05		.10	
Feedback discussion	-.19	-.19	.06	.06	-.02	-.04	.07	.28*
Increasing monitoring	.13	.13	.22	-.01	-.06	-.13	-.05	.30*
Modeling/guiding	.05	-.08	-.18	.17	-.20	.09	.05	-.06
Reducing teaching hours	-.10	-.06	-.14	.01	-.08	.15	-.06	.21
Changing position	.33*	-.18	-.19	.15	-.04	.00	-.05	.00
Criticizing (orally)	-.06	.09	-.11	.03	.26*	.05	.00	.37**
Criticizing (written)	-.19	-.05	-.40***	-.16	.17	.15	-.11	.32*
Offer to change school	.14		.03	.16	-.21	-.17	.00	-.06
Use threats	.26*	.09	.01	.16	-.22	.15	.06	-.20
Referring to supervisor	.02	.40***	.08	.09	-.01	.16	.05	.04
Terminating job/initiating dismissal procedure		.38**	.27*	.28*	.18	.04	.08	-.12

N = 40

* P < .05

** P < .01

*** P < .001

In the context of managing performance, attribution theory suggests that a manager's action regarding a poor performing worker will be based on the perceived causes of the shortcomings. A manager is likely to use more harsh means in disciplining a poor performer when that worker's behavior is based on internal causes (lack of ability or effort) than on external causes (Mitchell et al. 1981). Examining the relationships between the causes of the teachers' difficulties, as attributed to internal and external causes and the principals' responses brings very limited support to that hypothesis.

Most of the correlations are not statistically significant. Internal causes are not connected with confronting measures more often than assisting ones, and external causes (e.g. personal difficulties, poor management) are not met with soft assistance. Rather, the principals' response reflects an ad hoc approach, searching for the most reasonable solution they could find to the presented problem. For example, teachers who lack experience and knowledge (internal attribution) are given ample assistance from colleague teachers ($r .39$). The principals avoided raising criticism ($r -.40$), but in some cases, they decided to transfer the teacher to another school ($r .27$). Another example: principals' responses to low motivated teachers (internal attribution) reflected ambivalence. They walked on their tiptoes – overlooking and offering additional studies on one hand and criticizing (but no threats and suggestion of transfer to another school) on the other hand.

These findings suggest that complicated problems do not adhere to simple (not to say simplistic) theoretical schemes. The antecedent could be viewed from many perspectives, not just by its internal or external aspects. Even if principals attributed pure internal reasons to the teachers' poor performance, their responses reflected a complicated balance between contradicting demands and needs. For example, a high school principal (Pilot, school C) explained he would reprimand more softly a diligent teacher, than her low motivated colleague, when both of them arrived late to work. He would call the first one to his office, begin with praises and only later explain that her late coming harms the school's image. 'I know that the school's image is important to you. Please come on time'. To the second teacher he would say: 'I know you came late to the 8th grade lesson' (the details were collected earlier, in discussions with pupils about the teacher's habits). If that teacher searches for excuses the principal would hold a "court-martial" and threaten to deduct the missing hours from her salary. Exploring the real situation may not bring neat answers that substantiate theoretical hypotheses, as did for example researchers who asked managers and staff members as how they would respond to poor performing worker (Liden et al. 2001). Yet, the current results reflect the real situation.

Weakness or strength

According to Bridges' (1986) findings, when soft measures do not solve the problem, administrators tend to take more rigorous measures. Israeli administrators seem to

differ from their Californian counterparts. Like their general management style, the sampled principals coped softly with problematic teachers – offering their guidance, asking other staff members and other professionals to assist. Most of them did express dissatisfaction with the teachers' poor performance, a confronting measure, but only rarely escalated the situation by using threats (17.5 percent) or sending criticizing letters (30 percent). Further, even when they were fully convinced that the teachers were totally incompetent and should leave the profession, principals did not express their opinion directly, and preferred that the inspectors transmit the bad news.

Despite the fact that they were fully aware of the importance of their personal and professional status among the school-goers, only rarely did they use the teacher's shortcoming to gain managerial benefits (e.g. fortify their position; educate others about their discipline policy). Actually, more often they tried to solve the problem discreetly in order to maintain the teacher's respect and to keep a calm atmosphere among the teachers. In a few cases teachers sabotaged the principals reputation (e.g. spreading rumors and criticism among staff members), facing no proper disciplinary response. It appeared as if the principals preferred being disrespected rather than getting into open conflict. For example a veteran principal described her low profile style of handling an aggressive teacher:

Two weeks ago she terribly insulted a third grade student. I had a tough discussion with her. I told her it was inappropriate and announced to her my intention to call the inspector. That teacher sticks her nose in others' business. Her loud responses offend my staff. Last year she insulted me in a staff meeting: 'the dogs bark and the convoy continues its journey'. The teachers expected me [immediately after that session] to fire her but I explained that it was a challenge for me to help her (due to her personal hardships). My teachers blamed me that I unjustly protect her. They mock me that I only declare [my intentions] but actually do nothing (School 35).

That principal, according to Rahim's organizational conflict style (Rahim, 1985; Rahim & Bonoma, 1979), used the 'obliging style'. She was more concerned for the teacher than for her own interests. Adding the competence model (Papa & Canary, 1995; Gross & Guerrero, 2000) clearly reflects that in order to maintain good relations with the

teacher she kept relational and situational appropriateness, namely maintaining a peaceful atmosphere in the teachers' room, and appears as a victim who sacrifices herself, rather than keeping effective communication, which could have led her to achieve her goals.

Sailing against the wind

In order to grasp the drama in which principals and teachers are sometimes engaged, the case of Saul (37), a novice principal in a rural elementary school follows (school 7). The second protagonist is Sarah (34), an experienced teacher whose blatant behavior offended pupils and enraged their parents. She used to behave as the one who knows everything, with frequent moody outbursts, but also with hugging and kissing some of her favorite kids. She was known for her hot temper and brutal insults (e.g. 'you write like a monkey'). Within the small community, Sarah 'won' the reputation of a failing teacher. Through the years parents and officials in the local municipality asked several times why the previous principal assigned her as an educator. The inspector who was familiar with Sarah's difficulties did not tell Saul, but the parents and some of their offspring rushed to inform the novice principal. The staff members who silently accepted her behavior were afraid of the parents and sometimes used to grouch about her. This is the principal's point of view:

In the beginning I did not have experience and facing the teacher's [brutal behavior] was very difficult for me. My staff is like the 'class' I teach and she was one of my 'pupils'. I began to talk with her and to examine how she perceived the situation. [Unlike] the former principal [who] did not update her; I immediately brought to her attention every complaint about her [received from parents and pupils]. At first Sarah tried to move the staff against me, and they almost fell in love with her charm, so I announced to her that I intend to bring my point of view to the case to the staff. [Meanwhile] I tried to put the parents' complaints on ice, but after four months they increased their pressures, and I decided to bring the case to the staff meeting. At her presence I presented the details, and explained that I have my own 'red lines' and policy not to ban any complaint received from parents. (School 7)

As a principal who most appreciated traits of reliability and sensitivity for pupils he supported wholeheartedly his teachers but did not hesitate to discuss with them their performance and mistakes as well. Being a novice principal Saul continuously consulted with the MoE inspector and colleague principals. The inspector wanted to dismiss Sarah but Saul refused, vividly remembering what damage a principal in his former school caused when she worked to dismiss a teacher. That principal later admitted it was a terrible mistake. Accepting the advice of a communal instructor Saul refrained from clashing with Sarah. At times, feeling compassion and anger he gradually discussed his dissatisfaction with her. The growing pressure from parents, while he still had not established his leadership forced him make a hasty and risky decision - to share Sarah's difficulties with the staff (what if the teachers accepted Sarah's point of view?).

The time went by and Sarah continued with her aggressive behavior. In the middle of the year the parents tried to stop the studies [at the class]. For me it was an unbearable intervention in the professional management, so I backed up the teacher. By the end of the year the parents submitted to me a petition with a copy to the inspector. They demanded that Sarah would not continue to teach their kids. I consulted with the inspector. Sarah incited the staff to mutiny, claiming the principal 'invited' the petition. At that stage I was very distressed, so I decided to call my staff for an emergency meeting. At the end [of the session] we all reached the conclusion that when there is no confidence, people cannot work together. Meanwhile I decided Sarah would continue to teach the class, but meet first with the parents, as they requested. She knew that I supported her through the whole process.

In the beginning of the summer vacation the parents announced they would not allow us to open the class next year. Meanwhile Sarah reached a decision not to teach the class the following year. I wavered in deciding what class to offer her. Since we were limited by the amount of teaching hours I could not assign her as a specialist teacher, so I gave her an 'easy' (very disciplined) class. In the beginning of the second year I had my finger on the pulse. I also asked another teacher and our school psychologist to assist her. That year was much more relaxed and I was very pleased with that. In the first year she objected to my

leadership. In the next year I asked another MoE instructor, with whom she maintained good relations, to guide her. I also convinced her to take a course on developing pedagogic skills. Sarah was more relaxed and worked hard. I used to bring to the staff meeting the products of her work. The next year Sarah took a sabbatical year and later moved to teach in another school as a specialist teacher, a role she performed with reasonable success.

Sometimes the case of a problematic teacher may change from a small-scale interpersonal conflict into a widespread clash of interests groups. Discussing educational management theories, Bush (1995) depicts the characteristics of organizations with high political awareness that closely resembles the events in our case. The first feature is the activity of groups and each group has, as a second feature, interests that serve its own objectives. For example, the parents wished to exercise their power to secure quality teaching for their kids. On a broader perspective they learned that being active enabled them to gain influence and take part in the school's management. Unlike inner city schools, which are perceived as independent organizations within the municipal fabric, the rural school emerges as the symbol and focus of the local communal life, of the source of gratifying personal and collective needs, of a battle ground on which the interests of groups are expressed.

Bush (1995) argues that the concept of power is central to political theories, and that a decision emerges after a complex process of bargaining and negotiations. What is apparent in this case was the enormous amount of pressure from many sources with which the principal had to cope. Having surrendered to the inspector's demand to transfer the teacher would have meant for Saul a betrayal of his own values. Accepting the parents' demand might have led to demoralization among the staff members (that was low at the first place) and a serious erosion of his power. Bending to the local municipality pressures would have endangered the school's independence. Needless to say, agreeing to the teacher's norms of behavior would have emphasized the principal's weakness, in being unable to stop such unacceptable performance.

Being under cross pressures the principal wished to alleviate the growing demands, maintain his control on the course of events and solve the problems. Saul therefore adopted a strategy that might be named, somewhat metaphorically, 'sailing against the

wind'. As the sailing boat that needs to zigzag in order to move forward against the head wind, so Saul zigzagged between the groups and persons who raised pressures at the time, trying to meet their demands. Like the sailor who sees the target in front of him, so the principal had strong personal and professional values and commitment (e.g. vehemently backing his staff), to which he rowed by adopting sequential responses according to the 'changing cross winds'. Most of his responses were meant to de-escalate the pressures, but few actually confronted the teacher and the parents. Such a responsive strategy enabled him to partially satisfy all the interest groups without surrendering. Further, by adopting a pivotal in-between position, and refraining from taking a one-sided position (e.g. overlooking parents' complaints, as did the former principal), the principal brings the various groups to negotiate their aspirations directly and indirectly and finally reach a solution. Such a strategy presents the principal as a fair person who listens carefully and genuinely searches for an even-handed solution. Before proceeding with that analysis, a remark of caution is needed. One may argue that the principal's 'strategy' actually reflects a lack of decisiveness and a sheer desire to satisfy everyone.

Sailing against the wind takes longer time and much effort, but it is the only way to go from one point to another without being distracted. Zaleznik (1975) described managers as those who excel at diffusing conflicts between individuals or departments, placating all sides while ensuring that an organization's day to day business gets done. Managing a challenging teacher, like sailing in a stormy sea, needed patience and determination to lead all the participants to a safe haven.

The problematic teachers' response

The teachers' response varied tremendously with regard to the situation, the nature of shortcoming, the principals' policy, the age and experience and other factors. Before considering those means, a word of caution: the principals' description of teachers' responses cannot be considered as a full systematic account. Not only do principals probably recall their own actions better than others (teachers), but also in many cases they could not intercept teachers' hidden aggressive deeds aimed against them. Unlike Bridges (1992) who described a clear pattern of teachers' response to the specific principals actions, each of our teachers played his or her own style. Yet, veteran teachers, who were about to retire, were more often found to be less responsive, less cooperative and acting more conservatively than younger teachers. The teachers' responses can be divided into three categories – cooperation, enacted by about one third of the teachers, actions of hostility – played roughly by half of the teachers and a mixed category. There follows a concise description of those responses.

Cooperation – some teachers simply accepted the principals' advice, and did their best to improve the situation (e.g. stopped insulting pupils). Rarely, teachers admit their difficulties, but some of those who believed in the principals' good intentions volunteered to take new responsibilities, recouping for a period of setback and hoping to open with a professional renewal. In most cases it played well, clarifying that the teachers are sincere with their efforts.

Personal change – when the sources of difficulties were external, some teachers managed to solve a bothering personal problem. For example those (mostly) women, who longed to get married, finally found a spouse and got married. Others got pregnant, while some teachers took a sabbatical leave to get refreshed, to reconsider their personal and professional course of life or to assist a sick parent. In one case a teacher retired early and emigrated with his family back to his homeland. Despite their depressing conditions, the teachers who needed help (according to the principals' reports), did not seek assistance from mental health professional.

Somatization - absenteeism due to excessive sickness is a well-known phenomenon. In our sample only one teacher suffered from ailments such as frequent colds and lower back aches. That woman later got pregnant. Pregnancy, according to the labor law is a

period in which an employer cannot release a worker. Within the feminine climate in schools, pregnant women are surrounded by warm support (who would dare to mention the worker's shortcomings?), and so, together with the three months of maternity leave pregnant teachers secure their job for at least a year.

Hostile acts – were evident in many forms. Teachers pretended not to understand, overlooked head's requests, did not attend meetings, refused to get assistance, continued to behave aggressively towards pupils despite being warned not to do so. They refused to adopt the instructor's advice (or even to be instructed). Teachers, especially the veteran ones, expressed their hostility and suspiciousness directly. They were cautious not to lose their position the next year, and spoke out whenever sensing that someone tried to pull them out of their niche. Most of the principals simply ignored them, giving up the efforts to assist or transfer them to another school. Here came to life a sort of a 'balance of terror' in which both sides preferred to freeze the conflict. The more serious cases related to teachers who escalated their conflict so as to harm the principal and the school. In what were perceived as their subversive efforts to protect themselves they blamed the principal, lied about their work, spread disinformation; lobbied for their case among parents, officials at the local municipality and the teachers union, managed to get support from influential relatives and friends, in short they were seen to stage a bitter aggressive war against the person who threatened them – the principal.

Sources of assistance to the principals

Facing the teachers' response and the need to make tough decisions raised concerns and pushed principals to seek help, especially when their relations with the problematic teacher significantly eroded. Most of the principals (87.5 percent) did request assistance, usually of two sources ($M = 1.73$, $SD = 1.06$). Their close personal and professional circles enabled them to alleviate tensions and get practical advice. In many cases they consulted with close professionals whom they worked with. The most prevalent source (55 percent) was the MoE inspectors. One third consulted with their senior staff members, while some asked the advice of the MoE instructors (20 percent), school counselors and school psychologists (27.5 percent). Some principals felt more comfortable talking with colleague principals, with spouses and even with their loyal school secretary.

Personal matters are delicate issues, and the principals sought close persons to share their burden with. Examining who among the principals tended to consult with more sources revealed they were more often veteran teachers ($r = .33$), but not necessarily veteran to their new role as a school principal ($r = -.10$). They mainly consulted with regard to veteran problematic teachers ($r = .25$) who were involved in aggressive behavior toward pupils ($r = .41$). While all the sources served as confidants to contain the principal's distress, the relations with the MoE were found to be somewhat more problematic.

The role of inspectors

When they were called to help their subordinates - principals and teachers - the MoE inspectors preferred not to roll up their sleeves and get their hands dirty. Surprisingly, about half of the principals said they received no assistance from their inspectors. But before we get into more details, some clarifications should be made as to the MoE inspectors' role. Basically there are two kinds of inspectors – the general inspector and a specialist ones. The first cover all the educational and organizational aspects of the school. These inspectors used to serve as principals before they were promoted. Once they assume the new role, they represent the interests of the government and work to implement the ministry's policy. They are responsible to the personnel management, serve as consultants to the principals and whenever difficulties arise, general inspectors are supposed to be informed and involved. The specialist inspectors are responsible for

the work of specialist teachers (e.g. sports, music, arts). They have a more limited role - to assist teachers to get a job, to offer them training and develop teaching materials. When difficulties arise with a specialist teacher the principal may ask one or both inspectors to get involved.

The general inspector helped me very much. He spoke with the inspector for teaching English. She was a tough lady, who did not care about the pupils. I had a power conflict with her. I did not let her to dictate whom should I receive to teach here, and she did not cooperate to expel teachers [from my school]. Since I couldn't initiate dismissal procedure (only the inspector has the formal right to do so) I used attrition instead. As a principal I have other measures too - to announce by March 31st (last due date) that the teacher would not continue to work here. I consulted with my deputy and with the instructor and the [general] inspector. They explained to me that there is a shortage of English teachers and I should forget about getting rid of her (the aggressive teacher) (School 4).

Clearly there is a conflict of interests. The principal tries to select the best staff members while the inspector does her best to secure jobs for all her teachers. No wonder the principal is enraged about the inspector's tough approach. Both of them fight to protect their 'constituents' needs, while the dispute whether to transfer the English teacher reflects the different perspectives. But inspectors have an additional dilemma. Once they agree to transfer the weak teacher to another school, they remain with the problem and may ruin their relations with another principal. Many inspectors take one of two measures - pushing back the parents and principal's pressures, slow down their pace and postpone the transfer to the next year. A second approach, which may be the best one for everyone, was a trade in problematic teachers between schools.

Principals were selective when asking for the inspector's involvement, mainly inviting them in cases of teachers' poor performance ($r .41$), and students' low achievements ($r .22$), and much less in cases of teachers' low motivation ($r .07$). Interestingly, in small towns and rural settlements' schools principals preferred to solve the problem 'within the family' ($r -.32$). In 35 percent of the cases inspectors acceded to the heads' request and did observe the problematic teachers, but the effectiveness of monitoring was found to be doubtful. The teachers managed to cover their shortcomings with perfectly

staged lessons and cooperative pupils. Some principals admitted they had gone as far as to paint the observed teacher in rosy colors or divert the inspector's attention from the lesson. Only later did those principals realize their good intentions had come back like a boomerang, shaped as an incompetent teacher. The level of cooperation and mutual confidence played a significant role with regard to the effectiveness of the inspector's intervention. Several principals described their good relations with the inspectors, some even used to work together in the same school. Inspectors listened, offered support and advice and backed principals at their worst hours. Such acquaintance helped to alleviate tensions, improve coordination and got to solve problems faster and more effectively. In other cases, principals expressed disregard for the professional and personal level of their inspectors. The vast amount of derogatory citations were astonishing, reflecting deep feelings of despair and helplessness. What especially enraged principals was the ease with which inspectors left them to cope alone with those hardships. No wonder some experienced principals left their inspectors outside the frame.

From an organizational standpoint, inspectors report to the district's director, and are accountable to him or her only. Unless faced with extreme cases, inspectors are expected to solve personnel matters independently. Further, the MoE clearly stated that inspectors couldn't count on the ministry's resources (e.g. approving early retirement, paying extra hours). Paradoxically, once inspectors leave those cases intact, they not only secure their own peace of mind but the marginal teachers remain within the schools' domain and are not officially declared as a 'problem' (the MoE inspectors must secure a job for teachers who were taken out of their schools). Unlike school principals, inspectors are actually not accountable to interest groups (e.g. teachers, pupils, parents) and are not so easily influenced by them. They therefore have more freedom to choose in what cases to get involved. Some of them were satisfied with doing only the minimum (e.g. sending a letter, agreeing to meet with parents), just to get by.

A disturbing question remained to be answered: why did only half of the inspectors intervene in cases when they all should have been involved? The answer relates to principal –inspector mutual relations and the decision about who would confront the problematic teacher? For example, an inspector told how she used to receive invitations to observe incompetent teachers whom the principals asked to be dismissed. Being new

to the job and somewhat naive, she willingly agreed. Since most of the teachers were tenured, there could have been no viable option to initiating dismissal procedure, and her visits brought only concern and anxiety among the staff members. Gradually she realized the principals used her to threaten their lazy teachers. Adopting a colleague's advice she began to demand that the principals would try to solve directly teachers' discipline problems first before inviting her.

Summary

While coping with the challenging teacher's shortcomings, principals did not adopt a strategy, but rather responded to the course of events. When the first measure brought no change and the teacher presented no signs of improvement they used the next weapon in their arsenal. Principals did not set goals on how to cope with the problematic teachers, nor did they develop, together with the teacher, a plan for training and studies. When an improvement occurred, even temporarily, principals preferred to 'forget' the case and resumed their efforts once the difficulties reemerged. The only exception was that novice teachers who had difficulties to reach a certain benchmark enjoyed careful planning and ongoing guidance.

Handling personnel with such a shortsighted perspective halted long-term initiatives. For example, when problematic teachers decided not to attend in-house training or enroll in professional studies, principals were left empty handed. Further, when inspectors decided to initiate dismissal procedure and observed a lesson of the teacher, even a minor improvement (which could have easily been gained by a slightly more motivated teacher) led to a premature termination of the process.

Like their general good-hearted management style, principals mostly used soft assisting measures, almost twice as much as confronting or organizational means. They offered teachers various means to improve including their own personal guidance. Due to the heterogeneous nature of the cases, no cluster of responses in coping with specific problems was identified. Further, even the normal progressive passage from tolerating to confronting measures was not always evident, and sometimes both kinds of acts were done simultaneously. The most prevalent example was feedback discussions that sometimes ended with criticism and anger.

When the problematic teachers favorably perceived the principals' efforts, as happened in one third of the cases, they willingly cooperated. But in half of the cases, the teachers interpreted the principals' intentions negatively and responded aggressively. They were perceived to use dirty tricks and worked behind the principals' back to gain power and halt the efforts to change their position. In that power game, the problematic teachers were often considered to be smarter and stronger than their bosses.

Being entrapped in a complicated situation with many legal and organizational stipulations (let alone their personal hesitations) forced principals to search for any viable source of help in their immediate environment. For example, in large schools with many teachers they used to change teaching positions more often. Having a school counselor (available only in a limited number of schools), or an experienced psychologist also served their goals. But most of their efforts to gain help, though often leading to disappointing outcomes, were addressed to the MoE inspectors. Despite their mandatory role, only half of the inspectors actually got involved and tried to solve the problems. They preferred to leave the principals to handle the difficulties, especially when their mutual relationships with them were not close and warm.

Working in a highly demanding environment forced principals to save their resources and energy for the most urgent and important issues. Once they calculated their chances to succeed were limited, either due to organizational stipulations or when the teacher's personality seemed to be too rigid, they preferred to pass the burden onto the inspector's territory. When forced to cope with a stubborn veteran teacher they sometimes gave up and waited patiently until his or her retirement. The principals were torn between hope and despair. When they hoped for a change principals offered advice and guidance, but when the chances for improvement faded away they criticized and referred the case to the inspector. Evidently, when the optimism-pessimism pendulum stayed on its brighter side, it correlated negatively with more decisive acts such as reducing teaching hours.

The intervention's results

To what extent did the principal's intervention improve, or even deteriorate the situation? What measures were found to be effective, and what factors enabled them to bring about a change? Reviewing the cases reflects how relative the answers are and what little information there is; this is especially with regard to the teachers' perspective. The intervention's effectiveness is a key point to explore practical ways to help teachers and principals.

By the end of the interview, after describing their story and the measures they took to cope with the teachers' shortcomings, the principals were asked how it all ended. Some additional questions helped to clarify their answers and enabled to evaluate, for the first time in the interview, what the principal contribution to the presented difficulties was. Since the cases were so diverse, we can only estimate about the rate of success.

In half of the cases the challenging teachers remained to work in the school. One sixth left the school temporarily (e.g. took sabbatical leave, maternity leave or unpaid absence). Taking leave may be considered as mean (though not often planned in advance) to put the dilemmas on hold, and hopefully have passing time help resolve the problem. Almost a third left to work in another school, while only three teachers took early retirement. There were no cases where teachers had gone through professional change. It seems that this relatively high rate of turnover, especially when compared to the stability (not to say stagnation) in staffing those schools had relatively few downsides (Cascio, 1991; Pelled & Xin, 1999). On the positive side, it opened convenient channels for both parties to end painful working relations (Dalton & Todor, 1993), and introduced fresh perspective of replacement with other teachers, which were easily to obtain at the time. Examining in a meta-analysis the predictors to withdrawal process, such as the decision to leave (Griffeth, 2000) includes job satisfaction, organizational commitment, job search, comparison of alternatives, withdrawal cognitions, and quit intentions. It seems that many of the antecedents described in this study could have led the teachers to decide to leave, but more research is need to confirm that.

Remaining or leaving school should not be considered though as a failure or a success. In comparison, most of the teachers in Wragg's (1999) study (70 per cent) resigned or retired, many of them found another post (mainly in teaching), and very few were dismissed or made redundant. In-house support and a sensitive approach were the prominent reasons for improvement, especially with the head's desire to see the teacher succeed rather than fail. Yet, such improvement is mainly laid upon the teacher's shoulders.

Offering a high level of support, observing someone's lessons, encouraging them to watch others, giving detailed and honest feedback, all these may lead to success with a teacher who actively seeks to improve, but fail if the teacher is actually stressed, resistant, or simply appears not to have the inner resources to change existing practices. (Wragg et al. 1999, p. 7)

Some of the measures principals used correlated with those end results. In general, assisting measures ended more often with the teacher remaining in the school while confronting measures caused the teachers to leave to go to another school or take early retirement. More specifically, when principals invested in feedback discussions ($r = .39$) it was made with the intention of clearing the road to better teaching. Also, the larger the school ($r = .28$) and the option to use organizational measures, such as the use of reducing teaching hours ($r = .16$) and changing teaching positions ($r = .32$) the better the chances of teachers remaining in their schools. Meanwhile, confronting measures such as offering to move to another school ($r = .27$), referring the case to the inspector ($r = .41$) and especially initiating dismissal procedure ($r = .46$) pushed teachers outside their institution. One would expect that less provocative problems would leave a teacher inside schools while more blatant behavior would end up somewhere else, but no such correlation was found. Finally, as it was noted earlier, veteran teachers were found to be more stable ($r = .35$).

The effectiveness of the intervention

Evaluating conflict resolution should be made according to the specific goals set in advance, before initiating the process. When both parties reach their goals, at least partially, it is defined as *positive-sum outcomes*. When one wins and the other loses it is defined as *zero-sum outcomes*. A *negative-sum outcomes* occurs when neither party

reaches its goals. Different conflict styles yield outcomes of different values. Deutch (1973) proposed that a climate of competition can result in either zero- or negative-sum outcomes. At best only one party loses the competition. Often both lose. With cooperation, one party reaches its goal only if the other also does, which results in a positive-sum outcome.

Evaluating outcomes is essential to help the parties better adjust to the field realities in order to achieve their goals (formative evaluation); to provide feedback as how the conflict actually ended (summative evaluation), and to accumulate information and create a theory based knowledge as what intervention does succeed (Patton, 1997). Yet, in practice defining a 'success' is a tricky mission that faces three main obstacles (d'Estree et al, 2001p 104-5): first, which criteria to apply, who chooses the criteria for evaluation and for what reasons, especially if the conflict relates to several goals. Second, capturing the full evidence despite the fact that participants often tend not to leave written traces. Third, linking small attitudinal or behavioral changes to the broader perspective (e.g. changing organizational culture). Managing conflict is not a unilateral act. According to Balser and Stern (1999) it is both parties' willingness to engage in the conflict that determines its results. Based on interviews with 15 library supervisors about their management styles toward poor performing temporary workers they found that when supervisors were assertive, the workers' performance improved. Meanwhile, when they avoided or deferred conflict while the workers resisted, it ended with unsuccessful results and performance did not improve. Needless to say that dealing with tenured workers whom workers unions protect is a much more complicated and delicate task.

Turning back to our results, the criteria of effectiveness principals used appeared to be relative. Being transferred to another school may relieve a burden for one and be perceived as a negative outcome for another. Further, not all the cases could have ended with win-win situation. For example, once the problematic teacher remained in school, s/he continued to intrigue her principal, enrage parents and students and demoralize the atmosphere in the teachers' room. What were perceived as the teacher's 'victory' were certainly the principal's and the school's defeat. In certain cases the problem remained intact and each party could interpret that situation as positive, negative or neutral. Since life in school is very dynamic, and teachers and principals

continued to work together some of the problems got resolved by the time of the end of the study or earlier. Bad feelings may have been relieved and other perspectives taken place. Even the perceptions of the case had been changed through the months and years to follow.

In order to slightly clarify those ambiguities, the interventions' results were analyzed with reference to three groups: A. the principals, where success was determined by the strengthening of the principals status, managing to solve the problem, having others accept his/her point of view (e.g. convincing the problematic worker to move to another school), relieving tensions among staff and parents. A failure was considered when the opposite of those trends occurred (e.g. a deterioration in the principal's stature). B. The school, where success was determined when the pupils were given better instruction, they were treated more kindly, achieved higher grades, felt more satisfied. It also related to improving the staff social climate and reliving the parents concerns. A failure was considered when the opposite occurred. C. The challenging teacher, where success was determined when the teacher managed to defend his/her interests, improved his/her instruction, moved to a better position, when harsh conditions were reduced. The upcoming results should be taken cautiously since they rely on the researcher's judgment only, and not on the subjects' feelings.

The results show that eleven schools enjoyed a broad improvement, and the problems were resolved for the benefit of the principals, the teacher and the school. For example, a specialist teacher (45) who emigrated from the former Soviet Union arrived to work at the school after teaching Russian immigrants adults students for a few years. The students did not like her style (she used to shout and insult them) and poor teaching (she was not familiar with the school's tradition of teaching her subject matter) raised many discipline problems. When the new principal received complaints from pupils and their parents he increased monitoring, paid short visits to her lessons and expressed dissatisfaction. A few weeks after the beginning of the school year, the principal received a call from someone in the teachers union (who happened to be the teacher's relative), who politely 'advised' him 'not to hurry' if he wished to get tenure the next year. When the problems continued and a bitter complaint letter from a fifth grade pupil arrived at his desk he spoke to the inspector, who informed a few weeks later about an opening of a position in another school. In December the principal offered the

teacher move. She argued, but being determined to solve the problem he insisted that the new position would better fit her qualities (the carrot) and confided that after all both do not get along well (a latent message of rejection). Those arguments convinced her to leave. The principal explained to the students and later to their parents that she had personal problems, and asked to respect her leaving and to assist her replacement. That plan went well for everyone, and both the in-coming and out-going teachers adjusted easily to their new posts (School no. 8).

More specifically, half of the principals seemed to experience improvement at the time, while eight principals experienced deterioration. So was the schools' situation (21- improvement; 6 – deterioration; 13 – no change). Most of the teachers (23) presumably experienced no change (14 – improvement; 3 – deterioration). The reasons for those results should be traced in the connection with the measures principals took and other background variables

In contrast, in six schools the situation deteriorated, for at least two parties (e.g. principal and teacher; teacher and school). For example, the teacher who in a staff meeting outrageously compared her principal to a barking dog, continued to insult others and later caused a 'diplomatic incident' when she unjustly failed the son of a very important person in the final exams.

What influenced success or failure?

Computing correlations with no initial hypothesis may bring some interesting results: novice principals failed more often to solve problems than their veteran colleagues, especially within the school level (principals – $r = -.27$; teacher – $r = -.17$; school – $r = -.29$). By the same token, veteran teachers managed to improve their conditions ($r = .32$), at the expense of the school ($r = -.23$) and the principal ($r = -.10$). It seems that experience was an invaluable commodity. Female principals managed slightly better than male principals to assist their challenging teacher ($r = .19$). Also it was found that in wealthy neighborhoods the principal ($r = .27$) and the school's situation ($r = .26$) improved at the expense of the teacher ($r = -.10$). Maybe higher expectations had led to putting more pressures on the teachers to change their performance or leave the school. Meanwhile, the size of school, the demographic changes and the size of the city's population were not found to relate to the results.

Is the nature of the shortcoming related to the intervention's results? Two main findings emerged: poor teaching had better chances to get resolved and improved (principal – r .25; teacher r .27; school r .33). So also was the case with regard to low achievements (r .28; r .25; r .33 respectively) and to a lesser degree with teachers who faced serious discipline problems (r .16; r .10; r .27 respectively). On the other hand, dishonesty led to disruptive relations and ended badly (r -.25; r -.17; r -.19 respectively). Low motivation and insensitivity to children were found not to have significant connection with the intervention's results. Does it mean that as long as the teacher's skills are at stake, there are better chances they would be improved but once his or her personality traits comes into focus (e.g. low moral values, inflexibility) all who are involved are in trouble?

It was mentioned earlier that principals used on average no less than six different measures to alleviate the difficulties. Is this a hint about their effectiveness, or rather lack of usefulness? What was the connection between the specific measures principals used and the improvement (or deterioration) they brought? The answers carry practical implication. The results (see table 9.5), which had no initial hypothesis, identify several trends: first, the low correlations mean that most of the measures did not have power on their own to bring about a change. Second, as was suggested earlier, the benefit of one party (e.g. school) is not always to the advantage of the other (e.g. teachers). It is reflected in positive and negative correlation for the same measure (offering to change school). Third, the main finding is that the use of other staff members to assist the teacher caused a significant improvement in the situation, especially within the school level. Staff members are willing to assist a poor performing colleague, once that help is non-threatening, does not take an emotional toll, and can't be used against them in the future (Liden et al, 2001). Interestingly, the assistance of the school counselor, instructor or psychologist was not found to have such effect. Meanwhile principals' feedback discussions and criticizing, orally and written, achieved quite the opposite. As we saw earlier, such discussions often turned into an open conflict accompanied by expressions of anger and bitterness.

Table 9.5 Correlations of principals' responses and success rates

Mode of action	Specific measures	Principals success	Teacher success	School success
Tolerating and assisting	Overlooking	-.03	.12	-.10
	Offering additional studies	.12	.12	.30*
	Asking other teachers to assist	.35*	.21	.51***
	Counselor/instructor assistance	.09	-.04	.10
	Feedback discussion	-.32*	-.20	-.32*
	Increasing monitoring	.14	.07	.24
	Modeling/guiding	.12	-.05	.23
Organizational measures	Reducing teaching hours	-.02	-.10	-.05
	Changing teaching position	.16	.03	.04
Confronting	Criticizing (orally)	-.27*	-.19	-.08
	Criticizing (written)	-.27*	-.12	-.18
	Offer to change school	.05	-.17	.10
	Use threats	-.10	.00	-.05
	Referring to supervisor	.05	.23	.06
	Terminating job/ initiating dismissal procedure	.13	-.05	.22

N = 40

* P < .05

** P < .01

*** P < .001

Finally, most of the challenging teachers remained working at the schools. For those who left, most of the principals were not updated about their destiny, but some principals emphasized they remained in good relations and both felt mutual happiness when they occasionally met. As if they expressed the emotional burden of sending a worker out of the organization, and the relief of knowing the worker was not harmed.

I am happy about the way she was integrated in the second school, and that I didn't ruin her professionally. I [once] had two teachers who moved from here, and one of them has never spoken to me ever since. Both perform well [in their current schools]. But with the other teacher I still have friendly relations. This is my integrity, to know that from human point of view I take care of people (principal no. 38)

Before closing this section, an additional reminder of the personal and emotional toll, even when cases end successfully, would be in place. For example, two elementary school principals (Pilot A, B) who considered to dismissing teachers were much

involved with those cases. They felt very negatively toward the teachers, and their mutual relations become an emotional ordeal, which normally principals and inspectors prefer to avoid (Bridges, 1992). Both principals experienced what Levinson (1964) described as 'management by guilt'. Their responses reflected disappointment in the employee; anger at her shortcomings; failure to confront her realistically about her job behavior; procrastination in reaching a decision about the poor-performer, compliments to cover-up or ease the guilt of managerial anger, and finally discharging. We can only infer how the teachers felt, but even the principals' 'victory' was described as very painful.

Reflective thoughts

By the end of the interview the principals were asked: 'Do you have at the moment a second thought or even regret about the way the case was treated?' and 'What advice would you give to a principal who faces a similar case?' Those questions were meant to enable them to reflect upon their experience in a non-threatening setting, but almost all of them responded immediately, without giving much thought. Most of them had no regrets; they justified their actions and explained how the measures used brought about the expected results:

No, [I have no regret]. I am fully convinced that I did the right thing. I now have another teacher, a 'genuine pearl' who replaced him (an incompetent teacher whose contract was not extended). The kids love the new teacher. He defines his role as a 'teacher for adventures and experiences', and that is exactly how I envisioned that position. (School no. 20)

Working in an environment with countless cross pressures may hinder the decision making process. The principal developed clear priorities (the pupils are on the top of the list), and a precise level of expected performance from her teachers. When a conflict of interests occurs, she takes the hard decision and remains faithful to her educational leadership values. That principal was leaning toward the hard style of management. She was focused on her goals, leaving little room for those who failed. Another example brings to light the balanced style:

My experience has taught me that it is essential to manage the conflict between the teacher and the parents . . . to turn complaints into requests. It enables me to hold a discussion based on facts and not on grouches. We had seven or eight meetings with the parents through the year. I called for the last one especially for her, when we all knew she was leaving. I told them that I consider the letter they sent [to the inspector] as a serious act, which may fail her in another school. She concluded her reflection: 'if you believe the teacher has a good chance to success, do not give in too early. If you don't [believe in her strengths], count on your intuition and send her away' (principal no. 26)

The respect for the leaving teacher taught the remaining staff an important lesson: the principal is committed to their professional and personal dignity, whatever the circumstances may be. Her role model as leader, who strives to face difficulties and solve them as well as possible, enabled the principal to set very high norms of behaviour. But the quest to achieve an optimal solution (as actually happened) was justified not only on collegial values and moral grounds, but it is also served 'political' goals (Bush, 1995). The principal did not ignore interest groups and by clever negotiation managed to dissipate the growing tension and strengthen her position. Also, by cleverly reframing the parents' complaints as requests she diminished its connotation with failure, accompanied with feelings of tension and anxiety, into a challenging task oriented issue, which should be solved together.

The next example resembles the soft-leading style of management. The principal was primarily concerned not to hurt the teacher's feelings, hoping to cover for her shortcomings:

Yes, I regret that I saw the 'approaching disaster' and did not want to believe it could happen. I found for myself 'excuses' for each of her failures, which occurred in the first stages. I should have treated each case separately (for example when the posters of the Jewish new year's festival in September were still hanging on the walls in December: when she saw a child beaten and she did not intervene to stop it). That snowball should have not rolled in the first place. Today I am angry with her. [I should have] listened to somebody else, gained information and not acted by emotions. But on second thought, it is difficult to

say something conclusive. The only advice I can give now is to insist, to force the teacher (with a dependent childlike personality) and not to give up (principal no. 18).

The will to act courageously differentiates among the three principals. The first and second principals take full responsibility while the third hesitates to act decisively. She wishes to turn a win-lose situation into win-win end result, hoping that compromises will diffuse the tensions. Such common managerial practice (Zaleznik, 1975) actually leads to adverse reaction where the principal and the school suffer due to the teacher's aggressive behaviour. Her tactful behaviour and social skills 'were used not to upset others, but these very skills inhibited working through the important issues' (Argyris, 1999, p. 141).

Turning back to the stage at the interview when principals were asked to reflect upon their actions, most of them hardly tried to explore their thoughts more deeply and gain new insights. They did not empathize much with the teachers, even though they seemed to present the cases fairly objectively. The lengthy interviews helped to review the cases chronologically, and they tended to summarize their own learning in action-related terms. None of the principals made any attempt to analyze the case in a broad, systematic approach, and exert organizational measures. A similar pattern of action was manifested as how principals solved individual cases of students' discipline problems (Yariv & Coleman, 2001). Clearly the principal's rapid pace of work does not give time to reflect on specific events and processes. Also, Israeli administrators tend to set working procedures which suit their needs and avoid using external sources of information to maximize organizational learning (Klein, 2000). According to Drucker (1994), the most common mistake among decision makers is treating generic situations as if they were a sequence of random events. Zaleznik (1975) who used projective techniques to explore the differences between managers and leaders concludes that managers seek out activities with other people and aspire to maintain a low level of emotional involvement. These two themes may seem paradoxical, but their coexistence supports what managers do, including reconciling differences, seeking compromises, and establishing a balance of power. Unlike leaders who are concerned with ideas, they relate in more intuitive and empathetic ways:

Managers may lack empathy, or the capacity to sense intuitively the thoughts and feelings of others . . . empathy is not simply a matter of paying attention to other people. It is also the capacity to take in the emotional signals and make them meaningful in a relationship (Ibid, p. 72)

One principal, however, who used to work as an art teacher in special education in various settings in Israel and abroad, and who is currently leading the school for the seventh year, impressed with sincere and deep reflections.

When she first complained of how I had been teaching math at her daughter's class, I was not patient enough. I made a mistake of not listening to her (and responding bitterly to her arguments). The deterioration began then. She often criticized others and I did not understand that it was an expression of distress (due to a personal crisis) and a call for help. [The advice I would give to another principal] is always to remain and act professionally. I related to her as a human being. [In my efforts to relieve her criticism] we met at her home and spoke over many issues. I should have not taken her criticism personally. All of a sudden she turned [in my mind] from a senior colleague teacher into a nagging mother. I think that I am not professional enough as a principal (principal no. 25).

Finally, to what extent did the principals 'contribute' to worsen the teacher performance and situation? It is hard to tell since the principals did not volunteer to provide the answer. Yet, when they rushed to define the teacher's behaviour as unacceptable (e.g. she caught the teacher lying for the first time), when they responded aggressively, or simply were too weak to cope effectively with the teachers' shortcomings it certainly contributed to the manifested difficulties. Some heads reflected about mistakes they made while others boasted of success, but their minor actions clearly refuted the bombastic language. We have not mentioned yet the MoE inspectors' role, and parents' involvement, let alone the 'contribution' of the Ministry of Education within the organizational context. Maybe at this stage of the study, it would be proper to refer to the 'joint dance' instead of taking judgmental stance as to determine whom to blame.

Summary

An initial remark of caution: when the cases were so varied, when the teachers and others' perspective were hardly represented, and when the passage of time continuously changed the relations and the situations (either healing the wounds, or intensifying the pains), drawing solid conclusions became almost impossible. Even the use of quantitative measures should not mislead. However, a few trends did emerge out of the stories and should be considered

In half of the cases the challenging teachers remained in school, one third left to go to another school, one sixth took leave and very few teachers took early retirement. Applying success measures reveal that in half of the cases, improvement occurred, one fourth suffered deterioration and in one quarter the situation did not change. These figures apply more to schools and principals and to a lesser degree to the challenging teachers who experienced more status quo. Success occurred more when the problematic behaviour referred to poor teaching skills, while difficulties intensified due to problematic personality traits (dishonesty, inflexibility).

The hardships in eleven schools were resolved for the benefit of the principals, teachers and the pupils. The reasons for the comprehensive improvements can only be inferred: First the principals seemed to be determined to solve the problem. Second, they carefully planned their steps. They knew in advance what end result they wished to achieve, be it a teaching improvement and increased motivation, or finding another position in or out of the school. They used fewer measures than the rest of the sample's principals. Third, and most important, the principals managed to match perfectly the teacher's qualities and situation to their proper position. Finally, some of the principals and teachers simply enjoyed good luck.

Meanwhile, the main reason for deterioration in the situation was the inflexible approach both sides adopted. Being convinced they were right led them to involve more persons with the hope to bend the others' hand. Such escalating only strengthened their rival's position and increased the time it took to relieve the tension

Another finding: asking colleague teachers to assist significantly improved the situation within the school level, while feedback discussion, especially when followed by oral or

written criticism led to negative results. Combining these findings leads to the belief that an indirect approach, or at least using measures, which do not involve criticism and anger have a better chance to be effective. As one principal recommended: 'Join for leading. Do not confront, a confrontation deteriorates the situation. Study carefully the case, listen. Be fully aware of your actions. Be wise, patient and open' (principal no. 33).

Chapter 10. Analysis and discussion

This study relies on three main theoretical frameworks: the three-component model of attitude (Rosenberg & Hovland, 1960; Eagly & Chaiken, 1998), the leader-member exchange theory (Dansereau, Graen, & Haga, 1975), and the conflict management style (Rahim, 1985). The four chapters of the discussions and conclusion integrate these frameworks of analysis. It also combines a discussion on the impact of changes in life, as half of the challenging teachers were found to experience. Stress appeared to have an impact (Holmes & Rahe, 1967; Beehr & Newman, 1978). The structure of the analysis is presented as follows.

Table 10.1. Structure of discussion chapters

	Three component model of attitude			Management of conflict	LMX theory	Stress and burnout
	Performance appraisal (cognitive)	Management style (Behavioral)	Mutual emotions (affective)			
Chapter 10						
Chapter 11						
Chapter 12						
Chapter 13						

Poor performance – sources and stresses

Searching why certain teachers become ‘challenging’ in their principals’ eyes, has brought disappointing results in terms of definite outcomes. Poor performance was found not to correlate with any of the principal or the teacher’s background variable (e.g. gender, age, education). Neither it was connected directly with certain

professional stages of a teacher's career (Huberman et al. 1997), even though some stages, like entering the profession, and the 'conservative' stage (Huberman, 1993) appeared to be more 'vulnerable' to difficulties and stagnation. Analyzing the antecedents, which brought teachers and principals to their current unwanted situation, brings to mind two unifying themes: first, poor fit between the organization and the worker. When certain essential elements (e.g. skills, occupational tendency) of the worker do not fit the job demands it may lead to ineffective work, frustration, burn out and premature leaving. You may recall, for example, the principal who was convinced that one of her teachers' style fitted high school students rather than a third grade pupils. Second the negative influence of changes in the worker's life. Many challenging teachers faced at the time a personal or professional crisis, which intensified earlier unfavorable conditions. For example, a 50-year-old teacher had to take care of a terminally ill parent. The physical and mental load of treating a loved one, the ongoing stress and later the bereavement, seriously damaged her professional functioning. Such antecedents may feed each other and create a downward spiral.

Among various theoretical models in social sciences, those that relate to the impact of stress on work appear to explain well the influence of poor fitness and the impact of changes. The contribution of the *General Adaptation Syndrome* by Hans Selye (1982), the *Stressful Life Events Model* by Holmes & Rahe (1967), The *Facet Model of Job Stress Sequence* (Beehr & Newman, 1978) and the *Person-Environment Fit Theory* (French et al, 1982) may all apply to the current study. Taking a general perspective (Berry, 1998), according to those models (figure 10.1), a person-environment interaction determines whether or not a stressful event will occur. The environment consists of both physical and social conditions. Personal variables include perception and cognition, the learning that occurs through experience and personality. These variables account for some individual differences in how people assess situations as threatening.

Poor teacher-school fit

Following the *Person-Environment Fit Theory* (French et al. 1982), Reinhold (1996) describes the *toxic work environment*. Such an unfavorable climate appears to happen when the organization "betrays" its workers. A threat of downsizing or enforced early retirement, inner political games, jobs that intensify work-family conflict, too easy or

too difficult tasks, lack of options for promotion to higher positions and other managerial decisions may become a continuing source of anxiety and stress. The fierce competition between organizations and within them has led managers and workers not to trust each other, and to concentrate on securing their personal interests.

Figure 10.1 A general perspective on stress
Adapted from Berry, 1998 p. 427

Work becomes ‘toxic’ when its conditions cause significant mental and physical distress. It happens, for example when managers and workers feel entrapped without being able to discuss their difficulties. Being unable to change the situation may bring fatigue, headaches, insomnia, dizziness, nausea, allergies and other ailments. The physical symptoms are often accompanied by feelings of helplessness, hostility, lack of self-confidence and sometimes shutting oneself up.

It is not easy to discern poor teacher-school fit. The diagnosis is tentative and is often reached post factum, after a change had been made. For example, ‘Peter’s principle’ states that promoting a worker to higher position may lead him or her to perform in a level of incompetence due to the difficulty of the task. When some of the teachers in this study were described as ‘inflexible’ it could have meant they no longer kept track of current demands. When they were blatantly described as ‘stupid’ it could have signified poor capabilities, which were not identified earlier. Since the principals knew

little about the early stages of the teachers' professional choice, training at college, selection and induction to work we have limited information to assess the initial match between their teachers and the work demands. Studies on teachers' career entry describe this phase as a period of 'survival and discovery' (Fuller & Brown, 1975; Veenman, 1982; Huberman et al, 1997). The novice teachers lack basic pedagogic skills, rely on trial and error, are preoccupied with self, experience discrepancy between their ideals and the realities of the classroom life, face fragmentation of the work and difficulty in combining instruction and classroom management. Probably some of the challenging teachers difficulties has begun at that stage. No less important is the formal stage of granting tenure. This is the last chance of the educational system to select its best workers, but the evidence in this study raise concern whether some challenging teachers were simply passed by sleepy administrators and managed to sneak through the half-opened doors on their way for tenure. Further, there were administrators who betrayed their formal duty. One principal, for example, admitted she manipulated her inspector's impressions after observing a young teacher. That poor performing teacher, who enjoyed the mercy of her supervisor, was later granted tenure. More detailed enquiry of the teachers' stories is needed to better assess the match between teachers' skills and their work demands.

Burn out and being stuck

The result of poor fit and working in a stressful environment can lead to feelings of mental and physical exhaustion. We saw that one-third to half of the sampled challenging teachers were described as suffering burnout and other mental symptoms of stress. These figures exceed rates of burnout among Israeli teachers found earlier (Friedman & Farber, 1992). Since measures of burnout at work are based on the worker's report (Maslach & Jackson, 1981; Friedman & Lotan, 1993), the absence of the teacher's perspective does not enable us to appraise why and when those difficulties did emerge. An interesting point of view is given by Yanai-Yaffe (2000). As an occupational and clinical psychologist she assisted people who were occupationally stuck. These clients complained of having difficulties at work and losing sense of what they would like to accomplish in their lives. It reached a point where the obvious question to ask them was: If you had no limitations, what would you dream to achieve? Her personal story triggered the study of this subject.

My father was a teacher who aspired to become an educator, a pedagogue who writes his doctrine and bequeaths it to others. As a primary school teacher, Dad returned home every day frustrated. He was the only man in a group of women teachers, a pedagogue who was forced to work in a pragmatic atmosphere. He felt out of place, with no future, since he did not manage (and maybe didn't want) to achieve an academic degree that maybe would have enabled him to express himself in a more suitable channel (Ibid, p. 18).

Through lengthy psychotherapies it becomes evident that personal history and conflicting relations with parents and family members accounted for adverse occupational situations. For example, several authors emphasized the importance of the family tradition (Bowen, 1980; White, 1991), as manifested in the family geneogram (McGoldrick & Gerson, 1985), on the professional choice. Such tradition can become an obstacle for family members who share different talents or those who wish to revolt against the parents' expectations. Some of Yanai-Yaffe's clients disclosed they feel forbidden, due to such tradition to fulfill their long-held desires; others were simply reluctant to choose; some changed their professional choice due to personal trauma, while others adopted as a profession childhood experiences of coping with significant events.

Changes and Crises

Sometimes there are sharp discontinuities and enormous leaps in professional development. Choosing to enter the teaching profession; the first teaching practice, the first eighteen months of teaching, three years after taking the first job, mid-career moves and promotion and pre-retirement. These normal stages where individuals are confronted by choices and decisions were defined as *critical periods* (Sikes et al 1985, p. 58). In addition to professional occurrences, some personal events like marriage, divorce, the birth or illness of a child, can also provoke a critical phase. Sikes et al (1985) also add the concept of *critical incident*, those key events in individual life around which pivotal decisions are made. For example, when a teacher who faces serious discipline difficulties loses temper and decides to act aggressively.

The teacher's career is thus punctuated by critical incidents occurring typically within critical periods. One such period, unsurprisingly is the initiation into

teaching. Here new recruits are met with stark demands of the role in sudden and unsuspected confrontation, which challenge their existing claims to be a teacher (p. 230).

The concepts of critical periods and critical incidents closely resemble Holmes & Rahe (1967; Holmes & Masuda, 1974) *Stressful Life Events Model*, which proposes that whenever an individual experiences 'life change events' that requires adaptive response or coping behavior it is followed by stress reaction. They suggested that a stress-producing event can be positive (e.g. marriage) or negative, and the effects of these events are proposed to be additive. They listed 43 events including death of spouse, divorce, vacation, Christmas, change to different line of work and the like. By using prospective and retrospective methods of research they managed to list those events according to its stressfulness. For example, taking normal frequent events like pregnancy (rank 12, mean value 40) coupled with a beginning to teach a new class (18 and 36 respectively) may bring significant amount of stress.

Many studies used Holmes and Rahe's approach, some of them supported the connection between stressful life events and illness (e.g. Rahe, 1968; Glaser et al, 1987; Cohen et al. 1993), while others could not find such relationships (Theorell et al, 1995; Hollis et al, 1990). Despite the general agreement with the premises of the stressful life events model, its methodologies and ranking events according to their stressful impact does not always represent common experiences (Cassidy, 1999 p.40). For example, Kanner et al (1981) argued that major life events are infrequent in the life of any individual, yet most of us experience daily hassles like losing things or traffic congestion. According to a scale they developed daily hassles were found as a better predictor of psychological symptoms and health (DeLongis et al, 1982) than major life events.

The stressful life events model clearly applies to the findings in this study, where half of the problematic teachers faced marked changes in their lives. It is hard to estimate what impact these significant events (e.g. divorce, financial difficulties) had on the teacher's functioning, but given that other teachers who may have experienced similar events continued to work with no marked influence means that major life events did not create incompetence but rather intensified weaknesses and difficulties. Among these

influences, two frequent professional changes appeared to have a unique impact: the substitution of a principal and the teacher's immigration. When a new principal arrived (or when the teacher substituted school) it reopened well-balanced relations with the former principal and the staff. It became a turning point for many teachers, some who advanced while others lost their place. Novice principals, even those who preferred to conserve the school's tradition, tried to correct what seemed to them as a poor performance. No wonder that forty percent of the teachers remained less than three years in their current school before leaving to another one. The poor teacher-principals match did not work out and ended with a separation.

The second change, which combine both models - person-environment fit and the major life event is the phenomenon unique to immigrant teachers.

Immigration

Almost one quarter of the sampled challenging teachers immigrated to Israel within the last ten years, most of them from the former Soviet Union. The difficulties that accompany migration were discussed earlier (see Horowitz & Frankel, 1997).

According to the former head of department for immigrant teachers, most of the teachers who passed successfully through the obstacle race of selection, retraining, finding job and induction evidently remained to work as teachers. The adjustment rate is estimated to be equal to Israeli-born teachers, and their contribution varied according to the school's atmosphere. Teachers who taught in schools located in affluent neighborhoods appeared to contribute relatively little while teachers who settled in the periphery managed to raise their students' achievements significantly.

Even if migrants are accepted, they tend to be low in the community's power hierarchy. This is true even of professionals who migrate (Shuval, 1982). When veteran immigrant teachers faced discipline problems, the 'bad news' spread immediately in the staff and among the parents. Since principals felt more committed to their novice Israeli-born teachers, they preferred to dismiss the immigrant teachers first. In some cases such failing teachers were sent from one school to another for 4-5 years without getting a tenure position. Given the years of training and the long experience they accumulated in the Soviet Union, and then lacking other viable occupational alternatives in Israel, they preferred the hardships in teaching rather than become unemployed.

The disproportionate rate of challenging teachers in Haifa district was influenced, according to that MoE official, by the intensive activity of certain local politicians. Realizing that the hundreds of thousands immigrants may increase their power has pushed political parties and immigrants organizations to put pressures on the MoE to hire unemployed immigrant teachers.

A tentative model

Conceptually it is suggested here that the fit between the worker and the organization leads to a closed circle of responses, which influence both the individual teacher and school's characteristics (see figure 10.2). If the worker is perceived as effective, then the personal and organization's response enhance that performance (e.g. increased managerial support). Once the output is perceived as insufficient, then measures to correct and improve are taken (e.g. mentoring, tutoring, submitting negative feed back). Once these measures fail to bring the expected results, it may lead the manager to freezing additional efforts and sometimes even to expel, symbolically (becomes out-group member) and physically (dismissal) from the organization.

Figure 10.2 A tentative model for teachers' adjustment

Once a major life event occurs, it may influence the balanced worker-organization fit if the teacher was unable to cope effectively. The organization offers assistance (e.g. temporarily reduce work demands, offer emotional and financial support). Once the teacher adjusted well the event is supposed not to leave a trace. In the case of poor adjustment, it may lead the manager to reevaluate the worker's status within the organization.

Summary

Within two or three decades of a teachers' career, many changes may occur. Some are expected and planned, like getting a job or giving birth, while others are not. Since we live in a very dynamic era, with only limited control over how things develop, no one can guarantee a continual professional success and ever-happy life. Most workers, but not all of them, overcome daily hassles and cope effectively with major life events. Yet, it was found here that more than half of the challenging teachers were hurled into unfavorable personal changes. As a result of ineffective adjustment, poor fit between job demands and professional skills, and lack of adequate traits, their superior's appreciation and support significantly eroded. These changes led to the placing of the teacher as an out-group member. A tentative model was suggested to explain what measures organizations in general and managers in particular take to improve unfavorable situations and how positive or negative results affect the worker's future stature. Taking in to account the stressful toll for everyone who is involved emphasizes how important it is to assist teachers to become competent and successful.

Educational management in a situation of a conflict

Conflicts can be solved in many ways, but our principals seemed to be convinced that the 'carrot always defeats the stick' (as once stated in an advertisement by United Technologies Corporation). They preferred overlooking and taking soft measures to using organizational means and sanctions. Does such a people-oriented style characterize those who work in education? Does the considerate conflict management style reflect the socialization of the principals as women (as most of them were), parents (most of them were parents and grandparents) or teachers (as they all were trained)? What does the participants' emotions tell us about conflict solution in educational setting? The answers are certainly important within the field of education, but they may be relevant to other professions as well, since management in the public administration becomes increasingly similar in terms of organizational goals and objectives (Bottery, 1996).

Feminine aspects of educational management

The soft supporting style clearly contradicted the notion of the successful principal, (particularly at the high school level) as a tough male, who is able to maintain control and exert authority (Sherman, 2001, p. 135). It more resembled a feminine type of management. For example, surveying female secondary head teachers in England and Wales Coleman (2000) found that the majority used a collaborative and 'people-oriented' style of management. The key values promoted by the principals were related to achievement and respect for all. The head teachers generally made themselves available to staff and spent a considerable proportion of their time in school outside their office. They tended to encourage staff development, often through individual consultation.

Throughout the literature there is ample discussion of an androcentric, male-centred society. Some authors suggested that there is difference between the feminine and

masculine paradigm (Bem, 1974; Gray, 1989,1993), but other researchers (Kanter, 1993; Coleman, 1998) maintain that sex-related differences, lack empirical evidence to support popular stereotypes about male and female principals, and have been overstated in organizational literature. The organizational and cultural context that managers work in does have an important influence on their beliefs and behavior. More specifically being a principal in a primary or a secondary school in Britain (Hall, 1996; Pascal & Ribbins, 1998) and Canada (Fennell, 1999) carries significant differences. In the Netherlands, Kruger (1996) has noted the differing impacts of 'gender own' and 'gender other' cultures in schools and concluded that the dominant gender culture in a school may be a more powerful influence than the leader's own gender. Collard (2000), for example, found in Australian schools that gender, kind of school, location and other contextual background differentiated between males and females as much as they were associated with differences in the same gender.

Principals are likely to be the products of these multiple influences and any theory such as one based upon gender stereotypes can only provide a limited map of the territory. (p. 352)

Male principals impressed as sensitive to relations with teachers and pupils as much as the female heads. Very few differences were found in this study with regard to gender. For example, aspects of management style in terms of demanding and giving were similar among male and female principals and so was the case with regard to the effectiveness of their intervention. These findings support many studies (see Powell, 1988) and refute some new findings (Vroom, 2000) that female managers' efforts to discipline worker were found to be less effective and face more negative emotional response, than their male counterparts efforts (Atwater et al, 2001).

Educational management as parenting

During the interviews, several principals confided they feel like parents to their teachers, as one male head justified his tender behaviour:

Staff are like a family for me. There are teachers of all kinds. I cannot bear the idea of expelling one member out of the family. It is [emotionally] difficult for me to admit I failed with that teacher (Pilot, School D).

Management can be compared, symbolically and practically to various aspects of parenthood: taking care of others, making sure the children perform their duties, bringing them up, assisting them to solve problems and comforting them when they are in trouble. An example of such 'parental' style is portrayed by Sherman (2001) who studied the traits of female administrators in rural schools in Canada. The principals appeared to have nurturing personalities and a focus on providing staff opportunities. They also stressed a focus away from hierarchical structure and more concern for the creation of a sense of a community. Words like maternal, mothering, comforting, compassionate were a recurrent theme. One principal stressed the need she feels to be in the corridor with the children, hugging them as they walk by, touching their shoulder as she speaks to them, or as she describes, doing all the things a loving parent should do. Her loud call: 'our power is in our nurturing' was accompanied by criticism of the male-oriented style of leadership that keeps teachers and administrators 'distanced' from the children. (p. 138).

Parenthood means also bringing up – giving moral and social training during the 15-20 years of childhood and adolescence. At first glance management seems to represent a different world. Due to its ongoing, fast pace and short-lived processes managers are bothered with endless missions through their days. Mintzberg (1973) who documented the intensive, fire-fighting style maintained that managers hardly spare themselves the time and emotional resources to develop a long-range mission. Such is the case with regard to the leadership component of management, namely influencing others. The powerful dynamics between managers and workers are usually focused on the 'here and now'. But the time-dimension is extremely important (Popper, 1994), if leaders are expected to develop individuals and organizations. Then they have to lessen efforts to reach short-term goals, to empower their subordinates and let them function independently, without his or her assistance. They have also to lay the foundations of basic assumptions, thought development, and training procedures so the organization can continue to work once they are gone.

The clearest and tangible analogy is taken from the family dynamics. Parents' most important obligation and achievement is to bring up their children to become independent, being able to cope with the challenges of life; but every parent knows how easy it is to establish dependence, how tempting it is over protect, to 'do for them' (Popper, 1994, p.167).

Among leadership theories and more specifically among contingency theories, the concept of 'life cycle' suggested by Hersey & Blanchard (1977) closely resembles the idea of workers' 'bringing up'. Like children who gradually grow up, so the level of the workers' experience and motivation guides the manager as to how much support and control to exert in order to develop their professional maturity. Our principals evidently manifested certain practices of 'bringing up'. They guided novice teachers and related more patiently to their failures and difficulties, encouraged staff members to study and get promoted. They also reduced their efforts with regard to the mature staff.

Parenting styles

Dual models of management, which emphasise people vs. task-oriented approach, are similar to model of parenting. Baumrind (1971) identified three parental child-rearing styles, which mainly differ by two dimensions: the amount of nurturing and the amount of parental control over the child's activities and behaviour. *Authoritarian* parents tend to be low in nurturing and high in parental control compared with other parents. They set absolute standards of behaviour for their children that are not to be questioned or negotiated. They favour forceful discipline and demand prompt obedience.

Authoritarian parents also are less likely than others to use more gentle methods of persuasion, such as affection, praise and rewards, with their children. In sharp contrast, *permissive* parents tend to be moderate-to-high in nurturing, but low in parental control. These parents place relatively few demands on their children and are likely to be inconsistent disciplinarians. They are accepting the child's impulses, desires, and actions and are less likely than other parents to monitor their children's behaviour. Although their children tend to be friendly, sociable youngsters, compared with others their age they lack knowledge of appropriate behaviour for ordinary social situations and take too little responsibility for their own misbehaviour.

Unlike authoritarian and permissive parents, *Authoritative* parents tend to be high in nurturing and moderate in parental control when it comes to dealing with child behaviour. Authoritative parents often use praise, approval, and rewards to increase the child's compliance with behavioural standards. The success of positive social reinforcement in producing desirable behaviour is legendary. When misbehaviour does occur and discipline is deemed necessary, authoritative parents prefer "consequence-oriented discipline" in which children are expected to make up for their wrongdoing. Parents are aware that harsher forms of punishment can be effective in the short run, but they often generate resentment and hostility that carry over to the school and peer group, reducing the child's effectiveness in these settings. It is this combination of parenting strategies that Baumrind (1971) and others (Hoffman, 1975; Putallaz, 1987) find the most facilitative in the development of social competence during early childhood and beyond.

Baumrind's model resembles many 'parental' practices mentioned in this study. Assisting a temporarily unable teacher, 'nagging' to encourage lazy teachers to double their efforts, and confronting workers who rebelled against the principals' authority were all evident in our principals' behaviour. Could we not compare these practices with suitable parental behaviour with children and adolescents? Within the organizational context, management is presumably based on the same kinds of relations that prevail within the family setting.

Educational management as teaching

Several principals stated they perceive their leadership role toward their staff as being like a teacher to her 'class'. These principals used the same leadership style as they did when they taught classes. They encouraged collective processes, reinforced talented teachers and appeared to be very patient toward their weak teachers. For example the principal who counted five problematic teachers in her school preferred to become their pedagogic mentor instead of breaking the ties. This evidence introduces the question of to what extent does the personal background influence the management style?

The role of socialization

Many similarities were found here between management style and the principals' socialization as women, parents and teachers. Is such socialization required to become a school principal? The current findings follow a growing recognition that gender qualities identified with the feminine side of human nature are amongst those required in the management of effective schools (Coleman, 1994 p. 194). The feminine and the parental qualities seemed to be interwoven, and the family setting has its own contribution. Following Richard Dawkins' book 'The Selfish Gene (1989) and Beck and Cowan's (1996), who suggested the notion of a "psycho-cultural DNA", Yanai-Yaffe (2000) maintains that there are also occupational 'psycho-genes', which are transmitted through the individual and familial collective unconscious. A girl would internalize the message of success if successful parents brought her up. Meanwhile, another child would internalize the message of being a loser, if brought up by failing parents. If the father was a wholehearted businessman, the chances are that one of his children would carry on that 'professional torch', and transmit it later to the next generation. An occupational failure may happen, for example once the child who is asked to carry the business torch happens to be talented in another field, say in arts. Yanai-Yaffe (2000) believes that such lack of compatibility can hardly be corrected. The hypothesis that the family, as the first socializing agent, which leads later in life to select education and leadership as vocational choices seems tempting. Yet, it should be examined more carefully and address the criticism of being too simplistic.

It does not account for the complex interactions between personal motives and the structure of institutions. It does not account for the influences that institutions have upon the career motives and aspirations of workers (Schmuck, 1986, p. 177)

The context of this study - working with very young children, appeared to influence the nurturing and non-competitive atmosphere at the primary schools. For example, the principals' rejection of teachers who responded insensitively, and the importance they placed on commitment to the institution and the pupils

reflected the impact of the educational context. If these teachers happened to work, say in a high school, or even outside the educational settings, it would have probably generated different professional behaviour. It all leads to the conclusion that a single male who was brought up in a family of coal miners could become an exceptional primary school teacher, but the chances are he will be surrounded by female teachers who share with him the same abilities to nurture and bring up young children.

Management styles and poor performing teachers

The four proposed leadership styles were partly confirmed with regard to the principals' styles toward the staff as a whole, but were fully presented with regard to coping with individual challenging teachers. Most principals did their best to support and guide individual teachers (soft and balanced leading), while others reduced support and increased criticism (hard leading style), or simply despaired and did nothing (apathy style). Similar results were found in other studies on coping with poor performing teachers.

Most common strategies were in-house support and advice, target setting, observation of the teacher's lessons, sending the teacher on courses, giving the teacher the opportunity to observe good practice... While most heads appear to have made considerable efforts, a small number simply became exasperated or rejected the very idea of assistance. (Wragg et al. 1999, p. 5)

In a research on ineffective departments in secondary schools, Harris (1998) found they were led in a *laissez-faire* or *authoritarian* management style by heads of departments. The major problem was that the teachers taught in relative isolation from each other and did not function as a teaching team.

In several cases a soft or balanced leadership style changed into 'hard' or 'apathetic' styles due to unfavorable occurrences (e.g. parents' complaints, teacher's aggressive behaviour). Then, the tension created by the conflict may limit the principal's ability to control impulses and select proper measures to solve the problems.

Affection and dominance

Principals shared with their successful teachers mutual positive emotions like happiness and appreciation, while experiencing negative emotions (e.g. frustration, despair,

anger) toward the failing staff. Kemper (1990) traces the distinction between the emotions of love and aggression to two dimensions that provide coordinates like North – South and East – West. These poles, which he defines as ‘affection’ (originally ‘status’) and ‘power’ (or dominance) enable us to locate ourselves at any moment in interpersonal geography. These dimensions correspond to earlier works, back to the thoughts of the Greek philosopher Empedocles (Wright, 1981) who called them ‘love’ and ‘strife’. They were called ‘love’ and ‘control’ in studies on child development (Sroufe, 1978) and ‘intimacy’ and “super ordination – subordination” in anthropological studies (Triandis, 1972). Affection and anger emerge in semantic analysis as dimensions of evaluation (goodness) and potency (Osgood et al, 1975), and they are closely related, as suggested here, also to daily practices of giving (affection) and demanding (dominance). Kemper (1990) argues that these dimensions portray the nature of relationships where affection bring tranquility and reflect aspects of cooperation within relationships. Meanwhile the power corresponds to the desire to dominate, especially if it is followed by angry attacks expressed in an outburst of energy and aggression. However, once the supervisor’s power is perceived by employees as based on expertise and referent power, it leads to efforts for improvements (Fedor et al, 2001), while reward, coercive and legitimate power were found to correlate negatively to performance outcomes (Podsakoff & Schriesheim, 1985).

Tension and conflict management

In our culture anger plays a predominant role in the assertion of the self against others, in firing up people to perform deeds which they would be otherwise incapable to perform (Oatley & Jenkins, 1996, p.300). The most common reason for being angry, given in a study by almost two thirds of the subjects, was to assert authority or independence, or to improve their image (Averil, 1982). The expression of anger can be beneficial once it manifests our genuine feelings, and sometimes leads others to cooperate with us or comply with our demands. Yet, in most cases anger ignites a counter attack and leads to a hostile climate, which prevents almost any effort to solve the problem that initiated the conflict (Lazarus & Lazarus, 1994 p. 32). The results of a direct uncensored anger attack may become extremely detrimental, and sometimes irreversible. That awareness led Travis (1989) to argue that holding back our rage would cause no harm to our body but can save unnecessary damage to the relations. It

would be smarter to count from one to ten, she suggests before we utter words we later regret.

Broadening our perspective, it becomes evident that control is more subtle and dynamic than is suggested by functional roles and expectations, authority arrangements and forms of expertise and identity (Fineman & Sturdy, 1999). Power in the control encounter is a malleable and tacitly negotiated process, linked to feelings such as pride, fear, humiliation, rage or embarrassment. According to Fineman and Sturdy (1999):

It is [also] the histories of the encounter that shapes the degree to which controller and controlled expect to feel stressed, confronted, vulnerable, fearful, or positively challenged. Postures, thoughts, plans, and strategies can be well emotionalized before the face-to-face contact occurs. Forms of resistance and compliance are already affectively embedded in the individual-social scripts imported to the encounter (p. 659)

Could our principals solve the problems when they were tense and angry? The findings tentatively support the *productive conflict theory* by Walton (1969).

Figure 11.1 Level of tension and effectiveness in problem solving

According to that theory, organizational conflict with a moderate tension level is better than no conflict at all (VanYperen & Van de Vliert, 2001). Walton (1969) identified three levels of tension in conflict (low, moderate, high) with differential effects on the motivational capacity to utilize information and to produce beneficial conflict outcomes for the organization. Low-tension level conflicts lead to neglect of information, inactivity and avoidance, and low joint performance. In our study the low-tension level appeared in about one third of the cases, with mostly veteran burned out teachers with whom the principals behaved, as if it was insufficiently important to confront the issue. They preferred to leave them alone, maintain only the minimum necessary working relations and simply waited until the teacher would retire. The end result of no intervention left the situation unchanged (see Figure 11.1). Considering what management style match of this conflict management style brings to mind the apathetic and the soft leading style, to whom the desire not to harm others' feelings and the quest to maintain a peaceful, undisturbed working environment is the premier quest.

In the case of a moderate level of tension the parties consider the conflict to be relatively important and feasible to seek and integrate more information and more alternative courses of actions. In this study, about half of the cases were characterized with medium level of tension with a stronger impulse by the principals to improve the situation. The nature of cases varied tremendously but the principals were determined to solve the difficulties. The determined and reserved approach enabled the principals to use more effectively conflict management measures, which matched the teacher's situation and the school's needs. One of the methods principals used to reduce the heat was keeping other staff away from the conflict. Not only did it help them save the face of the marginal teacher, but it also limited the involvement and ensured others continue to do their job. Such strategy of managing relationships conflict was found to guarantee full effectiveness of workers (De Dreu & Van Vianen, 2001). Meanwhile, when subordinates present collaborating or contending responses (as happened in some of the extreme cases) it distracts team members and appear to be less functional. Not every intervention went smoothly. In some cases the principals put the problems blatantly on the table and escalated the conflict. Contrary to the common wisdom, an act of escalation (Vliert, 1998) can encourage both sides to take the subject more seriously. This is the lesson to emerge out of field experiments by Vliert et al (1999): a mixture of fighting and problem solving were found to be even more effective than pure problem

solving, especially if fighting preceded problem solving. Generally, the intervention results appeared to be the most successful, bringing a sense of relief to everyone. Compared to the low level and high-tension level groups, the medium level of tension established the optimal cognitive and emotional conditions in which the principals could function.

The last group, which included about one sixth of the cases, was characterized by an open bitter conflict accompanied with outbursts of aggressive personal attacks. Each side had tried to call up other parties' support. It happened mainly in small communities, where all the 'stakeholders' (e.g. parents, local municipality officials) were involved within the school's internal affairs.

According to the productive conflict theory, high tension level conflicts reduce the motivational capacity to perceive, process and evaluate information; reconciliation and settlement are deemed undesirable, impractical or both. This produces defensive interactions that result in less effective or downright destructive organizational consequences, including poor performance and health problems (VanYperen & Van de Vliert, 2001 p. 578)

Needless to say the vicious circle deteriorated the situation and left everyone with an acute sense of a failure, even after the conflict had been solved.

The medium tension level seemed to reflect the balanced leading style. The principals could offer empathy and concrete means of support coupled with prompt insisting that the teachers would perform their duties. When principals were enraged by the teacher's behavior they abandoned the considerate humane approach. Feelings of affection disappeared and emotions that reflect the needs for dominance (frustration, anger) took the center stage. The teacher became in the principal's eyes, an obstacle that should be removed in order to achieve the school's goals. Such emotionally loaded situation seems to fit the hard leading style.

The current analysis follows the productive conflict theory (Walton's, 1969). Figure 11.1 tentatively presents an inverted U curve on which the balanced leading style appeared to be the most effective approach. Ignoring, accompanied by relatively low-

tension level was found not to correlate with success or failure. The apathetic style brought no change. So was the case with a nurturing pleasing style that transmitted a message of permissiveness by the principals. That style left the situation unchanged and sometimes even deteriorated. Meanwhile an outburst of anger as expressed in oral and written criticism correlated with negative consequences and deteriorated the principal's situation. A hard leading style appeared to be the worst mode of behavior.

Finally, to what extent does the conflict management style reflects the principals' perceptions of the situations and their aims? That question was not asked directly in the study, but analyzing their actions according to the competence model of conflict (Papa & Canary, 1995) reveals that the principals were mainly interested in maintaining relational and situational appropriateness. Most of them did their best to keep a friendly and smooth conversation and handle the situation in a pro-social and constructive style. At times, they even preferred the low profile and polite manners over more assertive, goal-directed approach, which could have been more effective in solving the problems (effective communication). More often the principals used the integrating and the compromising conflict management styles (Rahim, 1985; Rahim & Bonoma, 1979; Gross & Guerrero, 2000), which represented efforts to combine the soft relational approach with medium to high efforts to use effective communication (e.g. feedback discussion, guidance by the principal sand others). They used to a lesser degree the obliging and the avoiding styles (similar to the soft-leading and the apathy styles here). Very few heads used the dominating styles, which they hoped would gain effective results, even at the expense of their relations, especially when principals decided to cut the rope and transfer the worker to another school.

How did the teachers perceive the principals' conflict management style? We can only speculate. Based on the teachers' responses to the questionnaires and the principals' accounts, it seems that in most of the cases the teachers were not fully aware to the principals attitude and intentions (after all the principals wished to maintain appropriate relations, and often avoided defining the problem as inadequate performance). When no clear definition of the problem was laid on the table, no wonder the challenging teachers perceived their superiors' behavior toward them so positively. Only when the principals decided to tackle the difficulties directly could the teachers could have sensed the principals' style. Veteran teachers who insisted on remaining in the school

despite their shortcomings probably sensed that even if the principals used harsh inappropriate relational and situational communication, it never materialized to become effective either. Meanwhile, novice teachers who received wholehearted assistance felt that the principals' style was not only effective but also relational and situational appropriate.

Summary

The principals' general management style appeared to be soft and balanced, reflecting their socialization as parents, women and teachers, and also the situation of working with young children. When it came to coping with their challenging teachers, most principals invested much effort (medium-level tension conflict) and acted assertively. They asked to keep good communication and appropriate behaviour, sometimes at the expense of effectiveness in reaching a solution. One third appeared to have a more withdrawn style, leading to no change. One sixth of the principals opened a bitter, very tense conflict, which deteriorated the situation.

Negative feedback, emotions and obstacles

This section deals with the emotional toll when principals decide to submit negative feedback to their teachers. Integrating both the cognitive and affective components reveal why managing challenging teachers is so difficult.

Submitting negative feedback

The manager's duty to provide feedback may become an unpleasant task when the appraisal is unfortunately negative. Several principals tried to avoid that threatening experience, as for example, one principal justified her indefinite messages:

I once had an inspector who told me that when you throw mud on someone you may hit but the mud would stick to your palm anyway. I am very careful to act respectfully to my teachers. I suggested to her (an aggressive teacher): 'If you leave, you would get all the support from me', but she did not catch the message. (Pilot, school D)

Clearly prefer not to transmit bad news. That is the *MUM effect*, the tendency to avoid transmitting bad news (Rosen & Tesser, 1970; Tesser & Rosen, 1975). But how could the lion's share of the principals (80 percent) express their dissatisfaction, which obviously would not be a pleasant encounter? According to Weening et al (2001) such readiness increases when the communicator and recipients are in close relations (as happened in this study), and when the message is not definitive. If the negative consequences are still indefinite (e.g. vague definition of the problem, performance can be improved) and if the news is perceived as helpful (opportunity to assist the teacher), the psychological costs of feeling unpleasantness and guilt may be reduced considerably. In addition, the teacher's negative emotional response may be alleviated,

realizing that the current negative evaluation can hopefully be changed with more efforts and assistance. Once the principal sweetened the message by adding some compliments and a promise to assist (as most of them did) it made the encounter far less extreme and much easier to deal with. The principal's strong sense of responsibility, the sense of closeness, and the desire to enrich and develop the teacher encouraged principals to transmit their negative impressions. It was probably the sense of urgency, helpfulness and importance that was involved in their actions (Batson, 1998). Returning to the Weening et al (2001) definition, there was clearly a marked difference between the formal one-sided definite announcements submitted by a letter to the less formal encounter where the principal discussed with the teacher his/her performance. Evidently twice as many of the principals preferred the indefinite message (21 cases) upon making it formal (11 cases).

Are these differences in the method of submitting feedback reflecting, as Weening et al (2001) suggest the nature of relationships between the principal and the teacher? To examine that hypothesis in a real situation (most studies on the *MUM effect* were handled as a laboratory experiment with students) the principals' emotions were compared with regard to their channel of submitting feedback. Since many principals did not mention any emotion at all or a small number of feelings there was too small a number of cases in each cell to compute correlations. Fourteen principals mentioned for example a feeling of anger, and it was a similar number with regard to compassion. Six mentioned liking the teacher and only five mentioned the affect of rejection. Other feelings were almost not mentioned at all. Each emotion is presented with regard to its proportion out of 100 percent, by the two methods of submitting feedback (oral/written).

The results (See figure 12.1) clearly support the Weening et al (2001) hypothesis. Close relations, as expressed by liking, drives the principals to hold an informal encounter and provide mainly oral feedback. Meanwhile, feelings of rejection are associated more with sending a formal definite message. The other two emotions probably reflect the principal's hesitation whether to act (anger) and what the chances are to improve the teacher's poor performance (compassion). Practically, these results mean that formative evaluation is better handled when the manager and the worker have good relations. Meanwhile, from the teacher's standpoint, receiving a letter with

negative feedback means the principal has made up their mind (summative) about the teacher's incompetence.

Finally, the small numbers and the lack of statistical significance call for a caution in analyzing these results. Additional studies are necessary to examine these findings.

Self-esteem and negative feedback

When teachers received negative feedback, some of them internalized their principal's demands and managed to keep good relations. Meanwhile others did not cooperate, challenged their principal's authority and derailed their relations with the staff. What was the reason for the difference between both groups? An interesting answer emerges out of the research on self-esteem and the response to negative feedback.

Most of the problems associated with performance feedback tend to occur when it involves criticism (Baron, 1993), where managers tend to avoid giving negative feedback (Fisher, 1979) and the recipient often responds with defensiveness and reduced efforts to improve performance (Ilgen et al, 1979; Ashford, 1989). In that respect the impact of negative feedback on self-esteem and performance appear to be

controversial. Several authors maintain that those with high self-esteem are better equipped to take in the negative message and improve their performance (McFarlin & Blascovich, 1981; Tang & Sarsfield-Baldwin, 1991), or that it plays no role (Fedor et al, 2001). Meanwhile, other studies reveal that persons with extremely positive self-appraisal have been linked to poor interpersonal outcomes and even hostile and violent acts, especially when their self-appraisal was challenged or discredited (Baumeister et al, 1996; Colvin et al, 1995). These people presented themselves much more positively when faced with negative feedback than when they were presented with positive feedback (Schneider & Turkat, 1975). No wonder they 'became more boastful as the social stakes increase' (Schlenker, Weigold & Hallam, 1990, p. 861), and were perceived as hostile and unlikable (Colvin et al, 1995). More recently, Heatherton and Vohs (2000) found that after being threatened, high self-esteem individuals were rated as more antagonistic and unlikable whereas low self-esteem individuals were rated as more likable. Although both groups 'experienced diminished positive affect, a decreased state of self-esteem, and increased hostility when threatened, their subsequent behavior led them to be evaluated quite differently' (p. 732).

Several theoretical and empirical works may account for these findings. According to *sociometer theory* (Leary et al, 1995) people have a fundamental need to belong and self-esteem plays a role as a 'relation detector'. People with high self-esteem feel more assured and less in need to continuously evaluate whether they are being liked. In contrast, people with low self-esteem feel less assured, believing that others will reject them if they fail (Baldwin & Sinclair, 1996). Once they face a threat, both groups experience hostility but those with low self-esteem double their efforts to be liked and try to minimize mistakes in order to reduce the risk of being rejected. Meanwhile those with high self-esteem are not concerned about possible social rejection, and therefore they do not engage in efforts to affirm social relationships.

Another type of behavior that contributes is that persons with high self-esteem respond to an ego threat by focusing on their strengths and downplay their weaknesses (Dodgson & Wood, 1998). Although high self-esteem compensates for negative feelings accompanying ego threats, such behavior prevents more pro-social behavior. Heatherton and Vohs (2000) argue that these people place a priority on self-reparation at the expense of impressions management. They explain that according to attachment theory, individuals with an avoidant attachment style, who also possess high self-esteem

(Collins & Read, 1990) have been found to react to threatening situations by decreasing reliance on others and reasserting their autonomy (Mikulincer, 1998). Heatherton and Vohs (2000) offer additional explanation. Maybe low self-esteem underlies the self-reports of high self-esteem for some individuals (e.g. they are actually insecure but report liking themselves for reason of social desirability or self-deception). From this perspective, it is low self-esteem and insecurity that leads defensive high self-esteem individuals to engage in antagonistic behavior.

Turning back to our data, the study clearly deals with the challenging teachers self-appraisal and the threat they experienced (most of them were criticized by their principal). In order to test the above-mentioned hypothesis two groups are compared: challenging teachers who presented behavior that appears to reflect high self-esteem. The principals perceived those mostly veteran teachers as arrogant who tended to criticize and some even refused to accept their superiors' authority. The second group faced marked discipline problems and low student achievements. Those mainly novice and inexperienced teachers appeared to be less secure and asked for assistance; here they are considered to have medium to low self-esteem. According to the high self-esteem hypothesis we expect that the first group will be less liked than the second group. Based on the principals' answers in the interviews, three groups describe their feelings toward the teachers (see table 12.1): A. other staff members. B. pupils who were taught by the teacher (for both groups: 0 – alienated and rejection; 1 – neutral or ambivalent; 2 - positive feelings). C. principals (feelings of rejection, sympathy and anger).

According to the results (see table 12.1) the principals and staff members did not like their arrogant teachers and felt sympathy toward those novice teachers who faced difficulties. Meanwhile, the pupils appreciated the experienced teachers who led orderly lessons, and helped them to progress in their studies. They seemed to like the self-assured and somewhat rebellious style but accepted less the teacher's arrogant behavior. The results support the notion that it was not the performance itself but rather the teachers' social behavior that determined whether other adults liked them or not. The pupils, on the other hand, who were not exposed to the social peer-group behavior, appraised the teachers mainly by their performance. These results support and add something else to the findings that people with high self-esteem behave in antagonistic manners (Baldwin & Sinclair, 1996; Heatherton and Vohs, 2000).

Table 12.1 Social liking of high and low self-esteem challenging teachers

		Staff	Students	Principal		
				Rejection	Liking	Anger
Low self-esteem	Low students achievements	.22	-.10	-.13	.07	.01
	Discipline problems	.14	-.38**	.13	.15	-.30*
High self-esteem	Criticizing, embittered	-.39**	.22	-.23	.02	.32*
	Don't accept authority	-.42**	.15	-.01	-.07	.35*
	Arrogant behavior	-.29*	-.10	.22	-.12	.24

* $p < .05$

** $p < .01$

Unlike the experimental procedure that controls the subjects' impressions and preferences, in real situations there are more 'players' on the social field to count on. Our high self-esteem teachers not only faced their principal's criticism but also enjoyed their student's appreciation. When people have other reference groups to which they can compare themselves, maybe they are less threatened. Revising the explanations offered by Leary et al (1995) and Heatherton and Vohs (2000), it is hypothesized here that high self-esteem persons are entrapped in a dilemma. Their need to belong is approved by one group of players and threatened by a second one (for the sake of simplicity only two 'players' are included). The positive feedback strengthens their self-esteem and reinforces their behavior toward that group, sometimes at the expense of the requirements and feedback referred to them by the second group. In line with Lewins' (1951) *field theory*, these people are caught in a need to choose which player to join. Having made their decision and due to inherent inflexibility (as many of the high self-esteem teachers appeared to be), their behavior is in a vicious circle that intensifies the positive and negative responses from both players. The current findings offer a realistic example of studies mostly handled as a laboratory experiments with students. Yet, these results and hypotheses obviously must be examined. Another explanation, the teacher's lack of sufficient social and cognitive skills is discussed later in the chapter 'obstacle on the road for improvement'.

Bitter conflicts and emotions

In one sixth of the cases the principals and the challenging teachers decided to escalate the conflict (Vliert, 1998). Within the general soft and respectful manners, such an unlikely aggressive pattern of behavior probably stemmed from a strong sense, shared by both sides, that the other person intentionally betrayed his/her obligations and moral commitment. For example, an aggressive teacher who was reprimanded in a letter sent to her by the inspector, suspected it was the principal who pulled the strings behind her back. In response she tried to lead a revolt in the teachers room against the principal. The teacher perceived the principals' negative feedback as threatening to their self-concept or social standing, generating an affective response of anger and resentment (Vecchio, 1995). Probably a feeling of being treated unfairly encouraged the teacher to seek *restorative justice* (Peachey, 1989). The construct of justice represents behaviors associated with fairness of treatment by the authorities, while restorative justice represented by four different, but not mutually exclusive, processes: retribution or revenge, forgiveness, restitution, and compensation (Peachy, 1989; Gadacz, 1986). Bradfield and Aquino (1999) argue that when a person is offended, and searches for ways to cope with his or her negative experience, revenge and forgiveness can both be viewed as 'coping'.

An act of revenge, namely 'inflicting harm in return for perceived wrong' (Stuckless & Goranson, 1992) is cited to be the primary cause of aggressiveness (Brown, 1986). Revenge is almost always accompanied by intense anger (Buss, 1961) and typically follows a period of reflection on the harm done to the victim (Bar-Elli & Heyd, 1986). Violations of interpersonal justice, such as attempts to derogate another person's status (Bies & Tripp, 1995), destructive criticism (Baron, 1993), and public ridicule (Morrill, 1992) tend to evoke the strongest emotional response, ranging from anger to moral outrage (Bies, 1987). In general, many challenging teachers did not like their principals' treatment, but having focused their efforts on 'surviving' daily hassles reduced their desire to respond. Few teachers who felt they were treated unfairly sought revenge by using hidden means to damage their principal's status; while very few were so furious as to open a direct war.

Anger clearly plays an important role here, but how does it affect the principals and teachers' response? In a series of studies Lerner and Keltner (2001) found that fear and

anger have opposite effects on risk perceptions. Whereas fearful people expressed pessimistic risk estimates, and risk-averse choices, angry people expressed optimistic risk estimates and risk-seeking choices. Interestingly, estimates of angry people more closely resembled those of happy people than those of fearful people. These findings mean that an angry teacher or principal may tend more easily to seek retaliation, not only since they become more energetic and aggressive but also because of the optimistic appraisal that they take little risk, and a fierce response would serve their goals better. Retaliatory revenge has long been discouraged as a way to resolve conflicts because it can escalate conflict, leading to a reciprocal chain of revenge and counter-revenge that may last for weeks, months and years (Kim & Smith, 1993). Lerner and Keltner (2001) findings describe the psychological mechanism, which facilitate turning a dispute into a roller coaster of attack and counter attack. When one party is angry or worse, when both parties are enraged, only an external intervention can solve the conflict.

Are there ways to minimize that detrimental effect? In a study on behavior of revenge in organizations Bradfield and Aquino (1999) found that the more the offender was likable and the less he or she were held accountable to the injustice, the better the chances the victim would select forgiveness rather than revenge. Many principals who decided to take rigorous measures, tried to cover up their tracks, asking others (parents, inspector) to dirty their hands. Meanwhile they often presented quite a friendly non-threatening posture to gain the teacher's cooperation. Using both measures even if not done intentionally did assist, despite the tense situation to minimize the eruption of those bitter conflicts. The few cases that turned a simple dispute into a 'world war' remind us of Ralph Waldo Emerson's phrase that in every minute of anger we lose sixty seconds of happiness. If only both sides would have listen to his clever advice.

Emotions and success in solving the problems

To what extent do the principal's emotions toward the challenging teachers correlate with success in solving the problem? In chapter 9 ('Intervention and results') three kinds of improvement were described with regard to the principal, the teacher and the school. According to the results (see Table 12.2) negative emotions do not support the principals to attain their goals, while positive emotions correlate with all levels of improvement. The roles of negative and positive leader-member exchanges were

discussed earlier; such is the case with regard to the influence of negative and positive emotions. Of special interest and unexpectedly, principals' feelings of compassion appeared to be detrimental to their efforts to solve the problems. Compassion represents our negative feelings toward another person who faces an unfavorable situation or events. When such a situation is beyond the person's control (e.g. the teacher's parent is terminally ill) or when we feel that the person 'does not deserve' such an ordeal (e.g. despite her heroic efforts, the students' achievements remained very poor) our feelings of compassion will become much stronger (Ben Ze'ev, 1998. 137). Anger elicits causal attributions to individuals (e.g. the poor performing teacher), whereas sadness and compassion elicits causal attributions to the situation (Keltner et al, 1993)

Table 12.2. Correlation of principals' emotions and rates of success

	Principal's success	Teacher's success	School's success
Liking	.26*	.29*	.34*
Anger	-.19	.01	-.09
Compassion	-.37**	-.23	-.34*
Rejection	-.10	-.10	-.02

*p< .05

**p< .01

We can only speculate why feelings of compassion deteriorated the situation. Probably the principals thought the teacher's situation was irreversible and hopeless and left them no viable alternative to act. Maybe the challenging teacher interpreted the principals' merciful attitude as a call for a moratorium, a license not to put more efforts to improve his or her performance. Probably other staff members, who wished to protect the suffering teacher, reinforced that sentiment. These explanations, needless to say, need to be explored.

Summary

The act of transmitting negative feedback becomes a turning point, and changes dramatically the relations between the principal and the teacher. It also influences the prospects of improvement of the teacher's performance. The hidden common denominator for these marked influences are the mutual emotions within the process of managing challenging teachers. Principals who liked the challenging teachers

transmitted their negative feedback orally, radiating a sense of importance and willingness to assist. Warm relations correlated with successful efforts to solve the problems. Meanwhile, alienation and rejection pushed principals to criticize their weak teachers in a formal, cold and definite manner (e.g. sending a letter). In a few cases negative relations ended with escalating the conflict, leading to acts of revenge and revolt. Then feelings of anger and compassion had the most detrimental impact, diminishing any sense of hope and initiating a vicious cycle of attacks and counter attacks. No wonder these emotions correlated with a failure to solve the teacher's difficulties.

The response to the negative feedback identified two kinds of teachers: inexperienced staff who appeared to have medium to low self-esteem who probably were more concerned about being rejected due to their failures. These novice teachers used pro-social behavior and appeared to be more receptive to assistance efforts. The second were a group of more arrogant teachers with possibly unrealistic high self-esteem who behaved antagonistically and rejected appeals to change their behavior. Due to their pro-social behavior, and despite their recurring failures, the first group was more liked by the staff and principals. The pupils, on the other hand, appreciated the self-assured and professional manner, though not necessarily the arrogant style of the experienced teachers.

From a methodological standpoint, this study provides an invaluable realistic evidence to examine positive and negative interpersonal processes within the workplace. The extreme situation of coping with a challenging worker enables the analysis of behavior through an emotional lens. It contributes to the few studies (Lerner & Keltner, 2001; Bodenhausen et al, 1994), which explain how specific emotions shape judgment, choices, and appraisal tendencies.

Obstacles on the road for improvement

Being in an unfavorable situation forced the principals and the challenging teachers to adopt a coping method. The question arose of whether they would try to change reality itself (e.g. improving the teacher's performance), or change their perception of the reality (e.g. pretend the problem does not exist)? The participants appeared to use both approaches. The more adaptive, but emotionally difficult means were described earlier in the chapter as 'Intervention'. The present section deals with defenses, which helped subjects to paint a calm picture within a turbulent situation.

Disengagement

Principals were found to use various means to reduce the intensity of conflict with regard to their problematic teachers, mainly by emotional and behavioral disengagement, as if they preferred to minimize the pain and the chances of escalating the conflict. Such a trend was clearly evident from the meetings with them. At the interview, the principals had already spoken for an hour about themselves, about the school and described in detail the case of the challenging teacher. Despite the long warm-up, when it came to answer an open question about what they felt toward the problematic worker they were taken by surprise and preferred to hide behind long periods of silence and irrelevant answers. Then they briefly mentioned some positive feelings like empathy and compassion. Probing about other feelings led them to also reveal negative emotions of anger and resentment.

[In the beginning] I felt toward her a lot of liking and sympathy. I am a person who loves people and I love to help. [Q.] Later I felt anger which came out of a deep frustration and a sense that maybe she was ungrateful. I wanted to ask her 'why do you do it to me?' And 'how could you manage to deceive me?' (school 18)

It was as if the respondents were socialized not to reveal 'forbidden' negative feelings and disclose only the 'legitimate' ones, mostly positive. For example, only in one case did a principal admit she was once so frustrated that she decided to take revenge.

Sometimes it was difficult to find a logical connection between the teacher's outrageous behavior and the principal's mild emotional response.

Did you express directly your dissatisfaction with her performance?

Yes, but only orally, not written. I was very cautious, did not mention any aspect of teaching, concentrating only on her conduct. She told me: "here I am hothead, and you should get by with that". When she approached the Teachers' Union, they soon understood who she was. She used ugly manoeuvres, trying to manipulate the parents' attitude. She knew how to present her case and how to hide her difficulties with me. The parents came to my office, listened to my answers, and easily identified her fingerprints. She is not that smart and some parents warned me of her. [If she would have worked] in other profession, she would have long been dismissed.

What did you feel toward her?

Sometimes I feel compassion for her. [Q.] Sometimes I feel angry, but only professionally, not personally. As far as I am concerned, she can return tomorrow to work here and I would not bear a grudge. (school 19)

If the expression of emotions reflects the seriousness of the situation, then both sides choose to disengage themselves from their most negative feelings. Teachers tended to adopt quite positive attitude toward their superiors leaving negative feelings unmentioned. The principals appeared to have neither strong sympathy nor deep resentment toward their subordinates. Experiencing little pride and little guilt reflects a sad reconciliation with the unchangeable situation. They do not invest much effort nor blame themselves for the poor results, and rather prefer to suffer the disappointment and frustration than to cope directly. Principals appeared to relate to their challenging teachers as an obstacle, which they are unable to remove.

This disengagement is also reflected in the principal's management style. In comparison to the involved and non-directive style toward the successful teachers, the principals increased demanding and reduced giving to their challenging teacher. These

findings portray, according to the Leader-Member Theory (LMX), the successful teachers as in-group members and the challenging teachers as out-group members. Graen and his colleagues who developed the theory (e.g. Graen, 1976; Dansereau, Graen and Haga, 1975; Graen et al. 1977) found in their longitudinal studies that in-group members receive attention, sensitivity and support from their leader in exchanges that are characterized by mutual trust, respect, liking and a high level of interaction (Dienesch and Liden, 1986; Liden and Graen, 1980). Out-group members, on the other hand, are confined to relatively mundane tasks, and experience more formal relationships with the leader, working largely in accordance with their job description (Liden and Graen, 1980; Zalsny and Graen, 1987). Exchanges in this case are characterized by unidirectional downward influence (e.g. more demanding) and role-defined behaviors (Graen and Schiemann, 1978).

The most fundamental factor affecting the quality of leader-member relations is the similarity between both persons in the dyad (Graen and Cashman, 1975). Holding the same attitudes and behavior, according to the classic 'similarity-attraction paradigm by Byrne (1971), raises positive feelings which increase the desire to be with someone who is similar to you. The current study has not directly examined the influence of similarity but the principals' high regard for their excellent teachers, may reflect the sharing of the same professional norms and explain the open relations and the warm mutual feelings. Other studies on leader-member exchanges have shown it relates to the leader perception of subordinates (Liden and Graen, 1980), demographic characteristics (Green, Anderson, and Shvers, 1996) and the deliberate attempt of members to ingratiate themselves with the leader (Deluga and Perry, 1994).

In the context of LMX theory, Deluga (1998) argues that interpersonal attraction fosters supervisors-subordinates compatibility, and that the resulting rapport encourages accurate perception of the supervisor performance, expectations and consequently improved worker's performance. Such an explanation is fully compatible with the strong correlation found between principals and outstanding teachers with regard to the perception of managerial practices. But how do we explain the vast gaps between the principals' and their weak teachers perceptions?

Distortion of reality

In addition to disengagement, the participants seemed in some cases to be distorting their perceptions of the situation. For example, the challenging teachers reality perception was accurate in non-threatening situations. They perceived the 'public' aspects of the principals' management style toward the staff, similarly to the other participants. However, when it came to the dyadic, discrete relations, things were different. Despite being evaluated unfavorably by their principal and their colleagues, the challenging teachers perceived their performance as equal to their successful counterparts. Further, they believed the principal had been treating them like the rest of the staff. Such distortion will be discussed from the 'sender' (principal) and the 'receiver' point of view (teacher).

The principals' defenses - based on their accounts, our principals did invest much effort to identify the problems and solve the difficulties. Yet, the results point to the fact that some of them actually stumbled into certain pitfalls. Argyris (1999, p.233) maintains that once managers are asked to examine their own behavior, or the behavior of subordinates in embarrassing or threatening situations, people in this situation are likely to fall into several traps. Those traps are exemplified by some of the current findings:

- A. Reason defensively and interact with others who are reasoning defensively. For example, many principals externalized the responsibility for the problem, citing causes, which they believed created the difficulties or prevented any effective treatment. Very few counted their contribution to the case (after all, the principal is the most significant person in the organization), and almost no one discerned self-mistakes or expressed regret about their actions, even when their share was clearly evident in creating and intensifying the problem.
- B. Get superficial, single-loop responses that led to superficial, single loop solutions. The best examples are the over-looking response and the 'more of the same' frequent discussions, which eventually did not change the teacher's situation (and sometimes even worsened it).
- C. Reinforce the organizational defensive routines that inhibit access to valid information and genuine learning. A good example is the principals' use of 'legitimate' methods (e.g. discussing students' achievements) and avoiding the use of 'sensitive' means to monitor their teachers (e.g. pupils' feed back). Further, those principals, as in Bridges (1992) findings, rarely gave their poor

performing teachers a genuine constructed feedback, orally or written. The collected material was not used to produce individual and organizational learning.

- D. Managers are not aware of their own defenses because these are so skilled and automatic. For example, the principals believed they took ‘tough’ measures (demand more and give less) than they actually did. When the transmission is weak or distorted and the ‘bad news’ does not reach the teachers’ ears, there is less chance that they would change the teachers’ self-esteem and performance.

Teachers’ defenses – the teachers’ unrealistic self-image and their professional manners recalls Heatherton & Vohs (2000) observation:

Sometimes we can be puzzled by how much people like themselves in spite of their numerous failures, obvious shortcomings, and even in the face of blatant rejection and ostracism (p. 734)

Combining the results of both teachers’ responses to the questionnaires and the principals accounts raises the impression that the challenging teachers were less attuned to information they received, processed information inaccurately, were not aware of their shortcomings and tended to respond in manners that intensified their problems. It was Charles Darwin (1871) who insightfully remarked that ‘ignorance more frequently begets confidence than does knowledge’ (p. 3). Kruger and Dunning (1999) who quote Darwin argue that this overestimation occurs, in part, because people who are unskilled in these domains suffer a dual burden: not only do they reach erroneous conclusions and make unfortunate choices, but ‘their incompetence robs them of the meta-cognitive ability to realize it’ (p. 1121). These individuals lack what cognitive psychologists variously term *meta-cognition* (Everson & Tobias, 1998), *meta-memory* (Klin, Guizman & Levine, 1997), *meta-comprehension* (Maki, Jonas, Kallod, 1994), or *self-monitoring* (Chi, Glaser, Rees, 1982). For example, Snyder and DeBono (1987) found that people high in *self-monitoring* tailor their behavior to fit situational cues and the reaction of others (Snyder, 1974). That cognitive skill serves the social adaptive function. Meanwhile, the behavior of people low in self-monitoring, mainly reflects their internal states and dispositions. Probably the lack of sensitivity to others’ cues, as many challenging teachers were portrayed here, has brought them to their current

situation in the first place and has later prevented them from using those hints to improve their performance. Kruger and Dunning (1999) found that participants scoring in the bottom quartile on aptitude tests over estimated themselves to be in the 62nd. Several analyses linked the miscalibration to deficits in meta-cognitive skill. Paradoxically, improving the skills of participants, and thus increasing their meta-cognitive competence, helped them recognize the limitation of their abilities. These findings have important practical importance, verifying Miller's (1993) observation:

It is one of the essential features of such incompetence that the person so afflicted is incapable of knowing he is incompetent. To have such knowledge would already be to remedy a good portion of the offense (p. 4)

The second filter relates to emotionally-driven misperceptions. Such distortion presumably occurs due to *defense motivation* (Stroebe and Jonas, 2001, p. 532), which protects the self-image from disturbing information. According to the *dual-process theories of persuasion* (Bohner, 2001, p.254) individuals who do not feel vulnerable are more willing to communicate threatening information, increase their motivation, to accurately and systematically process the arguments contained in the communication (Chaiken et al, 1996). Meanwhile personally vulnerable individuals prefer to hold attitudes and beliefs that are consistent with existing central attitudes and values (Jepson and Chaiken, 1990). Along that line we recall the high self-esteem teachers who probably lacked some meta-cognitive skills or wished to defend themselves from anxiety provoking information and responded aggressively to negative feedback. Another example, the challenging teachers believed they were treated the same as other staff members. Maybe such comparison assisted them to maintain high *consistency among attitude components* (Chaiken et al. 1995). Pretending to 'sail in the same boat' with the rest of the staff, probably alleviated their concerns of being marked as individuals who fail. From a different angle, Abraham (1972) found that teachers described their professional self-image as very close to the typical ideal teacher, often portrayed in stereotypical terms. Interpreting these findings from a psychodynamic perspective, she argued that the unrealistically high self-esteem reflects defensiveness due to their difficult working conditions, their low professional status, their improper basic training and the stressful environment. Abraham (1972) argues that self-awareness, the ability to differentiate between the 'true self' and the 'professional

persona” that defends the ego, and the ability to accept both sides of their personality would enable them to cope effectively with professional pressures.

Summary

Several significant obstacles appeared on the road for improvement. Analyzing these hurdles along the three-dimension scheme reveals that the participants used cognitive and emotional defensive measures. Emotional and behavioral disengagement was frequently used to alleviate the painful toll of the difficulties. Other defensive measures, mainly used by the challenging teachers, censored the information they received, led them to process information inaccurately and respond in manners that intensified their problems. The assumed poor meta-cognitive skills and the defensive attitude appeared to play significant role on the road for improvement. Yet, improving those skills were found to increase meta-cognitive competence (Kruger & Dunning, 1999), and such knowledge would already be to remedy a good portion of this offense (Miller, 1993 p. 4).

The final chapter requires the interlacing of the research questions, the major findings and both practical and theoretical conclusions into one thread. It opens with the practical implications of the research, with some advice as to what steps managers can take to improve the situation. The second section discusses the current findings in the light of the main three theoretical frameworks used here: the three-component model of attitude (Rosenberg & Hovland, 1960; Eagly & Chaiken, 1998), the leader-member exchange theory (Dansereau, Graen, & Haga, 1975), and the conflict management style (Rahim, 1985). Some suggestions are offered for additional research. The final section summarizes the main contributions of this study.

Practical implications

The main findings are shortly to be presented followed by conclusions that address the three main research questions: who are the Israeli challenging teachers? How do principals cope with them? And what is the interpersonal dynamic between the principal and the teacher. Recommendations are added how to minimize teachers' shortcomings. The author tried to avoid raising suggestions, which are obvious ('be aware of your problems' - Farber, 1984), or an impractically all-inclusive list of commands on 'how to survive' in a stressful situation (e.g. see Kyriacou, 1981). These recommendations will be discussed mainly from the principal's point of view. Researching teachers' perspective might have raised additional issues. Some insights as to how the national educational system should work, and how individual teachers can help themselves once they are accused of incompetence are added.

Teachers' quality

The first research question asked who are the problematic teachers in Israel? How many are they? What criteria do principals use to identify them as challenging? What

are their personal and professional characteristics? What are the reasons for their shortcomings?

Most teachers, but not all of them master their profession. Poor performance is a universal phenomenon. The rate of weak teachers found here (seven percent) is similar to rates in other countries. Incompetence (e.g. lack of the minimal required ability) as such accounted for about one quarter of the sampled cases. Its negative correlation with other antecedents and its strong correlation with lack of wisdom clarify the principals' criteria. Another quarter of the teachers happened to be novice workers who were posted in unfavorable positions and lacked sufficient experience and resources.

Recommendation – the Ministry of Education has to recognize first the existence of the problem and to develop, together with other organizations (e.g. colleges, teachers' unions) training programs for principals and inspectors. It should also include 'packages' of assistance to the principals and the teachers (e.g. retraining, early retirement programs).

There are many obstacles to improvement. Probably the most difficult one is the defensive attitude of the teachers, who perceived themselves to be competent, enjoyed quite positive feelings toward themselves and their superiors and believed they were treated like the rest of the staff. These results contradicted what the principals felt, thought and how they behaved, especially when compared to their outstanding colleagues. The outstanding teachers were highly appreciated and shared very positive emotions with their superiors.

Recommendation – principals should be aware that their unfavorable evaluation does not always match the challenging teacher's professional self-esteem. Once that happens, a joint planning of targets, striving to accomplish them and reviewing the results may clarify what is the situation for both parties.

Since the relationships between principals and their challenging teachers tended to deteriorate, subordinates in such case are less likely to make an effort to change their status. Managers may need to initiate the steps necessary to build such relations (Whitener et al, 1998). It is not the principal or the teacher's behavior per se that drives the relationship but rather the partner's behavior that is important (Maslyn & Uhl-Bien, 2001, p. 706).

Principals' professional development

The principals were found to motivate their teachers and encouraged an ongoing process of improvement. Yet, some principals appeared to be more capable than others. The broad distribution - some principals enjoyed a fully competent staff while others reported having three, four and even five failing teachers – was correlated with the principals experience. More experienced principals knew better how to select teachers, how to cope with the inspectors pressures and how to make faster decisions whether to give a chance or to ask the teacher to leave.

Recommendation - experience is an invaluable commodity. Some of the inexperienced principals' mistakes can be prevented with proper training and ongoing mentoring in the first five years. The nature of the 'treaty' between the principals and the staff is vital to ensure proper management. It is the principals' responsibility to clarify their expectations, and to monitor the implementation of their policy. Staff members should be made aware of the standards of performance, which they are expected to perform. Presenting these standards should be done in the initial contract of employment, in the job description, in day-to-day supervisions and in the annual appraisal.

Effective communication between the head and the teacher concerning the procedure being followed is vital if teachers are to understand the seriousness of the allegation and to understand their own rights. (Wragg et al. 1999, p. 25)

Recruitment and placement

Recruitment is currently handled by cooperation between principals and inspectors. Such practice appeared to be easy when the candidates were skilled and talented. When it came to poor performing teachers, the principals and inspectors' interests are sometimes diametrically opposed. When teachers behave aggressively, teach poorly or manifest low motivation, the principal and the MoE inspector adopt ineffective decisions due to lack of clear domains of responsibility and personal (sometimes conflicting) interests. Facing a conflict influenced their working relations. In half of the cases inspectors refrained from assisting the principals. Meanwhile, a rewarding former personal acquaintance; high level of trust and willingness to solve the problem, enabled the principals and inspectors to maintain good working relations.

Recommendation – The MoE should run in-house workshops for principals and their inspector, on how to solve such problems with less tensions and increased effectiveness.

High rates of challenging teachers correlated also with a lower socioeconomic status of the neighborhood where the school was located. That unwanted situation was probably created due to demographic processes (e.g. less affluent and politically weak immigrant populations were sent to live in the periphery), inequality of resource allocation, capable populations that leave for more prosperous cities. This and other national developments are beyond the scope of this study. Many governmental projects to boost the effectiveness of impoverished schools failed. Meanwhile, there are contradicting examples of talented principals who led their school to high levels of achievements (Kashti et al, 1997), despite their unfavorable location and situation. Recruiting skilled and devoted staff first needs recruiting of capable principals.

Placement of teachers is the principal' prerogative, and they hardly ever consulted with their staff. In large schools with over 30 teachers, principals tried to alleviate teachers' difficulties by changing their position more often. Such organizational maneuvers sometimes solved problems, and they were found to correlate positively (though statistically insignificant) with principals' effective interventions. Effective placement should take into account the teachers' aspirations and needs. Increasing the employee voice (Saunders et al, 1992) was found to change the manner in which they express conflict and their likelihood of voluntarily leaving the workplace (Farrell & Rusbult, 1992).

Teachers' appraisal

The second research question asked how Israeli principals manage their challenging teachers? What are the sources of information they use to identify the problem? What remedial programs do they offer? Do heads seek the assistance of others (e.g. inspectors)?

The principals in this study used various formal and informal methods to become updated and improve their teachers' performance. The methods most often used were unstructured observations and classroom visits. A follow up on pupils' achievements also enabled them to appraise learning and teaching. Meanwhile principals were found

to avoid using more sensitive procedures such as open discussions with pupils and parents, or passing constructed questionnaires among pupils (satisfaction) or teachers (self assessment). The principals used to give their teachers constructive feedback, most often immediately after a classroom visit or on a planned periodical basis. These encounters are typically taken in a supportive atmosphere. The principals avoid raising criticism and discussing sensitive issues. Very few give written appraisals.

Recommendations – Feedback is necessary in learning new behavior. Feedback can also be motivating, especially if coupled with setting goals for improvement. The teachers should be involved in setting the goals, and later evaluations should consider the progress towards goals (Berry, 1998, p. 228). Performance evaluation should be done more often and include a post-appraisal interview each time. Introducing additional methods of appraisal (e.g. portfolio, 360 degree evaluation, peer evaluation) would supply teachers and principals with a realistic picture and enable them to broaden the scope of the professional development.

Unlike many organizations within the private and the public sector, HRM procedure of formal workers' appraisal is not practiced in Israeli schools, except for the mandatory stage before granting tenure. Tenure is granted almost automatically after two or three years of teaching and is not based on satisfying any formal requirements (granted the teacher is licensed). The subject combines two issues, not necessarily related: first, offering the worker a stable work environment and protecting the workers' rights against arbitrary acts committed by the employer. Second, giving the employer a minimal period of time to ensure the worker meets the job demands. Since employees' tenure is considered as a basic right, anchored in legislation and labor agreements, there is very little chance that workers' unions would agree to reconsider its conditions. Bridges (1992) has stressed the importance of improving that procedure in order to minimize the population of incompetent teachers.

Recommendation - the employer should change the procedure of granting tenure by adding certain benchmark requirements such as examination on professional issues, completing studies for an MA degree, proving the achievement of certain skills, taking a certain amount of in-house training or guidance.

Management styles

The third research question asked about the principals' management styles in terms of giving and demanding, their performance evaluation, and the emotions they feel towards their above average and the weak teachers.

The emerging management style of the principals is that of unconditional support to individual teachers. Heads offer their teachers all the necessary conditions for independent work, and refrain from raising demands or remark when something goes wrong. They take care of the working conditions, enable them to call them any time, encourage teachers to study and develop their professional skills, assist them in curricular matters and fully back them when problems arise. Rarely do they refuse teacher's exceptional requests. Meanwhile, heads use more intensively balanced means when managing the staff as a group. They encourage teamwork, direct others, express expectations, meet with teachers to set targets together. Principals raise demands from their staff as a whole and raise general criticism that was directed to reach the ears of individual teachers. The supporting considerate style was found to be compatible with the context – working with very young children. However, when things went wrong, as with the incompetent teachers, the staff interpreted overlooking and soft responses as if the principal was not determined and courageous enough to treat such failures and misconduct.

Recommendation - principals should be trained how to cope with unfavourable (but rather expected) situations, like confronting a rebellious teacher or meeting with a violent parent who complains about her child's teacher. Such training may include an acquaintance with their style in problem solving, learning various methods of conflict management, participating in simulations, and having organizational counseling resources at hand.

Other organizational interventions may include (Friedman & Lotan, 1993, p. 145)

1. Adopting supporting, encouraging, rewarding and cooperating management styles.
2. Providing teachers with clear expectations, detailed job description, constructed, yet flexible daily routines and procedures.
3. Improving the communication among all the school goers (principal- teachers; teachers – teachers; teachers- pupils), and good staff relations.

4. Positive atmosphere, which include social support.
5. Professional development that includes workshops on alleviating burnout and acquiring competencies to cope with pupil's misconduct.

Principals' values and daily pressures

The sampled principals had a clear vision about the traits and skills of the 'ideal' teacher. They mostly appreciated motivated teachers who are sensitive to children. Principals also valued honesty, loyalty and the willingness to adopt new teaching methods. Surprisingly, the principals were less concerned with regard to the professional level and how clever the teachers are. In short, the principals wanted their teachers to play the role of 'mothers' much more than the role of 'professor'. Despite the clear ideas of how teachers should perform, the principals were often affected by the daily pressures and avoided assisting teachers who performed poorly. Working in a highly demanding environment forced principals to save their resources and energy for the most urgent and important issues. Once they calculated their chances to succeed were limited, either due to organizational stipulations or when the teacher's personality seemed to be too rigid, they preferred to pass the burden to the inspector's territory. When forced to cope with a stubborn veteran teacher they sometimes gave up and waited patiently until his or her retirement. Daily pressures significantly reduced principals' willingness to get involve in a long-time process of teaching improvement, once the chances for success seemed to be doubtful. They continued instead to express frustration in closed circles and radiate an ongoing mood of bitterness and dissatisfaction about the challenging teacher.

Recommendation – swimming against the stream of daily routine is not an easy mission. Principals should be trained as how to set time for long-term continuous intervention, and how to gather all the necessary resources (including those of staff members and external expertise) in order to cope effectively with unexpected challenges.

How principals receive 'bad news'?

Keeping touch and sensing the school's pulse is a necessary requirement for proper management. In no less than half of the cases principals preferred to overlook instead of rolling their sleeves up and getting to know the details. Having the tendency to avoid receiving bad news is an age-old human tendency that creates a barrier, which prevents

rapid intervention. Further, the difficulty to recognize those unfavorable aspects of reality, let alone cope with them may deteriorate the situation.

Proper individual guidance, preferably offered by a veteran principal or an organizational counselor, can give a supportive atmosphere for effective learning. Adopting additional methods to gather information (e.g. surveys, exit interviews, periodical discussions with the school's clients – pupils, parents, community leaders), will update principals.

Organizational learning

Our principals led their school quite similarly to the recommendation offered by the Ministry of Education (See Friedman, 2001). Based on their own reports and their teachers accounts, our principals invested much effort to maintain team work, to set goals, to monitor students' progress, to encourage team building activities and to present a proper role model to their staff and pupils. The principals led their school successfully until serious difficulties emerged.

Failures may serve as an excellent opportunity for learning. Detecting the failure's sources, developing organizational learning and setting targets for improvement is a vital practice. The principals invested much effort to locate the sources of problems until they had to deal with their own deeds. The principals seemed to underestimate their own contribution to the problems of the challenging teachers, mainly with regard to poor inspection and wrong decisions in human resource management. The principals did not always know about teachers' personal problems outside school. They tended to put much of the blame on the teachers' personality and shortcomings, while some of the teachers simply did not have enough experience or enough assistance while facing a personal crisis. Further, by using defense mechanisms such as emotional detachment and projection their chance to discern the real causes and treat them faded away.

Recommendation - improving organizational learning, especially with regard to emotionally loaded issues (e.g. correcting the principals own mistakes), can be accomplished with the assistance of an organizational counselor.

Teachers' professional development

The principals in this study enthusiastically encouraged their staff to get trained, study for higher degrees and improve their skills. Some principals confided they consider

their teachers' promotion as no less important than the advancement of pupils. Yet, when they had to deal with challenging teachers, our principals did not set goals, nor develop together with the teacher a plan for improvement. When the first measure brought no change and the teacher presented no signs of improvement they used the next weapon in their arsenal. When an improvement occurred, even temporarily, principals preferred to "forget" the case and resumed their efforts once the difficulties re-emerged. The only exception - novice teachers who had difficulties to reach a certain benchmark enjoyed careful planning and ongoing guidance.

Recommendation - principals should study how to identify teachers' weaknesses and develop a rehabilitation on-going plan that meets those shortcomings.

Nature of intervention

Like their general good-hearted management style, principals mostly used soft assisting measures, almost twice as much as confronting or organizational means to solve the challenging teachers' shortcomings. They were very patient and offered various means including their own personal guidance. In some cases the staff blamed the principals for overprotection. Due to the heterogeneous nature of the cases, no cluster of responses in coping with specific problems was identified. Further, even the normal progressive passage from tolerating to confronting measures (Bridges, 1992) was not always evident, and sometimes both kinds of acts were done simultaneously.

Recommendation - adopting other modes of behavior, including learning how to use negotiation, use effective public relations and information dissemination, coping with stress, and gaining insight to their teachers' situation are some of the subjects principals should learn to broaden their repertoire. Most important, acquaintance with the demanding/giving model would provide the principals an additional management style to adopt according to the development of the case.

Results of the intervention

Surveying the results of intervention reveals that the principals' actions have solved a reasonable number of cases. It also increased the challenging teachers turnover. In half of the cases, the teachers left school: one-third left to go to another school, one sixth took leave and very few teachers took early retirement. Applying success measures reveal that in half of the cases an improvement occurred, one quarter suffered deterioration and in a further quarter the situation did not change. These figures apply

more to the standpoint of the schools and principals and to lesser degree to the situation of the challenging teachers, which remained unchanged. Success occurred more when the problematic behavior referred to poor teaching skills, while difficulties intensified due to problematic personality traits (dishonesty, inflexibility).

Principals, who wish to provide vision, guidance and lead their schools, must translate these goals into a countless number of daily duties. Some heads did impress with the way they handled weak teachers. The hardships in eleven schools were resolved for the benefit of the principals, teachers and the pupils. The principals' leadership qualities seemed to matter: they were determined to solve the problem; they carefully planned their steps; they knew in advance what end result they wished to achieve, and they used fewer measures than the rest of the sample's principals. The principals managed to match perfectly the teacher's qualities and situation to the proper position, and some were simply lucky in finding the proper solution. Principals asked other 'siblings' (colleague teachers) to assist, a measure which significantly improved the situation within the school level. Meanwhile, the main reason for a deteriorating situation was the inflexible approach both sides adopted, which led to escalation and increased tension. Feedback discussion, especially when followed by oral or written criticism led to negative results.

Recommendation - an indirect intervention, or at least using clever and 'sober' measures, which do not involve criticism and anger, have a better chance to be effective. Asking other staff members appeared to be highly effective.

Use of external sources

Being entrapped in a complicated situation with many legal and organizational stipulations (let alone their personal hesitations) forced principals to search for any viable source of help. Principals asked the assistance of their deputies, school instructors and school counselor, but most often they asked the help of their MoE inspectors. Despite their mandatory role, only half of the inspectors actually got involved and tried to solve the problems. Others preferred to leave the principals to do the dirty job, especially when their mutual relationships with them were not close and warm. The effectiveness of all the available sources (except colleague teachers) was found to be statistically insignificant. In all, the use of internal and external resources

appeared to serve as a morale boost more than as an effective aid for coping with challenging teachers.

Recommendations - in addition to training the MoE inspectors and the principals how to cooperate when such difficulties arise, no less important is to establish an independent consulting body to assist principals and teachers. The counselors will consult or hold a focused intervention to alleviate tensions, to improve the communications, to consult how to improve teaching and even to serve as an arbitrator in cases of insoluble disputes. It is also recommended that the Ministry of Education and the teachers unions would develop consulting services in the form of hot lines and regional offices which would provide inexpensive psychotherapy, marital counseling and professional guidance.

Broader perspectives

The principal's management style and relations with the challenging teacher is only one segment in a complicated puzzle. Other significant antecedents that contribute to the teachers' shortcomings are the strong and militant teachers unions, which ban almost any act of dismissal; inflexible governmental policy, which does not encourage early retirement; legal and administrative HRM stipulations, which prevent using more flexible HRM practices (e.g. payment by merit), all contribute to intensify the problem. Further, coping with challenging teachers is only one aspect of broader issues, such as recruiting better candidates and improving trainings at colleges; improving the quality of the teaching force in Israel; holding more flexible HRM practices (e.g. promotions, early retirement, dismissals) and giving principals greater autonomy; improving teachers working conditions (e.g. salary, social benefits), and striving to turn teaching into an independent profession (e.g. by setting ethical codes).

Improving the current situation entails passing acts of legislation, allocating budgets, changing procedures and setting a detailed paper with specific recommendations.

It can be accomplished by small incremental changes, which gradually (and slowly) improve the situation. A second approach could be to establish a task force that will consist of representatives of the government (MoE and the Finance Ministry, Ministry of Labor), the Education Committee at the Kneset (Israeli parliament), the teachers unions, and teachers' colleges. After collecting information and holding hearings, a committee could present its recommendations to the public. The implementation could

be handled by the Ministry of Education, in cooperation with other organizations who help recruiting, training and managing the teaching force in Israel.

Recommendations for teachers

Most of the findings and recommendations presented here were directed to principals and inspectors. Before closing this section a few recommendations to teachers who face difficulties would not be out of place. All the following recommendations stem from the results of the study and for the first time they are presented from the teachers' standpoint. Instead of the 'dry' academic tone, the content is presented as a letter.

Dear teacher,

If you have been concerned about your professional situation this letter may help you. Before you proceed with reading, a word of caution: it is not easy to admit shortcomings, let alone to change teaching style and even personality traits. You may feel tempted to resent the forthcoming recommendations. Please remember they are based on solid evidence. Two steps are offered: first, be aware of the warning signs.

- A. Physically – do you feel chronic fatigue, headaches, insomnia, dizziness, nausea, allergies, high blood pressure and other ailments? Did you suffer a serious health problem within the last year? Do you take medicine that influences your daily functioning? On the positive side – do you actively keep physically fit (daily exercises, proper nutrition and rest)?
- B. Mentally –at work do you feel helplessness; boredom; hostility, lack of self-confidence, shutting yourself up, feel exhausted and 'empty'? Do you suffer high levels of anxiety or depression? Within the last year were you faced with a major life event (e.g. serious financial problems, marriage, divorce, sickness or death of close relative, serious difficulties at work)? On the positive side – do you maintain good social and family relations? Do you have out-of-work hobbies and domains of interest? Do you consult with professionals, friends or colleagues about your difficulties?
- C. Socially - Do you feel alone or lonely at work? Are you sometimes being 'skipped', forgotten, not being invited to participate? Do you sometimes feel rejected by your principal and staff members? Do you feel entrapped without

being able to discuss your difficulties? On the positive side – do you actively seek to get socially involved?

- D. Professionally – Do you feel a considerable gap between your efforts and the actual results (e.g. discipline problems, students' low achievements) or the external feedback you receive? Are you often praised? Do you suffer burnout? Were you promoted (e.g. offered new jobs or position) within the last three years? Do you lag behind in terms of adopting new teaching methods? Are you looking to teach other grade levels, other subjects? Is your career 'stuck'? Do you feel you have stumbled into the wrong profession? On the positive side – have you recently taken a course or training? Do you develop new areas of expertise? Do you frequently consult with your principal, senior teacher, MoE instructor?

If the answers to these questions identify certain areas of difficulties in your work, you may prefer to consider them to be short-lived and unimportant. Most of the challenging teachers in this study were blind to their shortcomings and had unrealistic high professional self-esteem. My recommendation is to take personal and professional problems seriously. The tendency to put the blame on others' shoulders (projection) or to provide many explanations and excuses (rationalization) helps to protect your ego from unpleasant truths, but it becomes a significant obstacle between you and reality. Bear in mind that the teacher's defense mechanisms are strengthened by the principals' tendency to ignore, and hesitation to directly express their impressions, concerns and criticism. Yet, they see and know about your performance much more than you realize (they gain much information from other sources).

You may also look to your relations with your superiors. There are good chances that your feelings closely match the principal's feelings toward you. It was found here that mutual negative feelings not only represent dissatisfaction, but they are more immediate and accurate sensors than other overt behaviors such as oral feedback. Please also look at how your principal treats you. Instead of expressing their opinion, principals prefer to 'behave' it. When your principal is dissatisfied with your work, he or she would avoid your company, decrease support and slightly increase his/her demands (e.g. visit more often your class, criticize more often). If, on the other hand the feelings are positive but the principal considers your performance as insufficient,

good chances he or she will devote much time and effort to assist you. Do your best to show progress.

The second step: prompt response, initiating open discussion, requesting more information from your principal would encourage him or her to seek solutions and assist you. Further, your principal will appreciate your initiative. After all it saves him/her the unpleasant task of transmitting 'bad news'. Some teachers feel uncomfortable discussing their personal problems with the principal. In such a case you may choose to consult with another professional in the staff, but please make sure the principal approves it.

The best approach to improve and solve difficulties is to identify areas of weakness and strengths and to set together with your principal/instructor a concrete plan for improvement. Once you set the goals, select another person who can be called to assist you. Then, set the criteria to appraise the results, and set a timetable, to focus your attention to the task ahead. For example, you may realize with your principal that your soft teaching style encourages the flamboyant boys in your class to misbehave. It often happens that a poor fit between the teacher and the class leads to unexpected difficulties. One of the targets may become therefore to learn how to adopt more 'tough' sentiment and leadership qualities. You may choose to be guided by the MoE instructor, with whom you have pleasant and trustworthy relations. She may visit your class several times and discuss with you after each observation her impressions.

My best wishes to you.

Summary

The principal's performance appeared to be good with regard to their daily duties, but when they faced serious difficulties they were caught unprepared with no plans how to advance, and how to alleviate the problems. They preferred an ad-hoc response upon developing plans and setting goals together with the teachers. The unfavorable situation exposed some of the discrepancies between their management styles and personality traits and the demands of the specific situations. The lack of effective organizational learning clearly reduced the chances for successful implementing of remedial plans. Several ways of granting the principals and the teacher more tools were offered. Some

additional suggestions were made as how the government, the parliament and the teachers unions can address the issue of the challenging teachers.

Theoretical implications

Concluding a thesis cannot be complete without addressing its theoretical importance and relevance. The theoretical contribution is probably the unique essence of a Doctorate. The subject of this thesis – ‘managing challenging teachers’ appeared to be so complicated, that it was decided to use three main theoretical frameworks to account to all its manifestations (Rosenberg & Hovland, 1960; Eagly & Chaiken, 1998), the leader-member exchange theory (Dansereau, Graen, & Haga, 1975), and the conflict management style (Rahim, 1985). In addition, several specific theoretical schemes were added in relation to some research questions and findings. For example, the dual process model of management, such as Blake and Mouton’s (1978) managerial grid, and the new model of management styles in term of demanding and giving (Yariv, 1999) were presented and do relate to the behavioral aspect. In addition, the influence of stress on workers’ adjustment (Holmes and Rahe, 1967) and the fitness between them and the organization (French et al, 1982) were related to workers’ failure.

The next section integrates the findings, and point to the current contribution to existing theories and raises several new research questions.

Managing challenging teachers revisited

From a theoretical perspective, this study incorporated several new elements – using the *three-component model of attitude* (Rosenberg & Hovland, 1960; Eagly & Chaiken, 1998), which enabled the examination of the cognitive, affective and behavioral components of management. Observing management from three different angles enriched our understanding of the subject, and substantiated this model’s usefulness and validity. It followed, for example, a study by Breckler (1984) who assessed affective, behavioral and cognitive aspects of students’ attitudes. Breckler used confirmatory factor analysis, and found that the three-factor model accounted better than a one-factor solution for the co-variation among measures.

This model also identified principals’ behavior along the dimensions of giving and demanding. The combinations of these elements within that dual process model created a ‘soft’ style, a ‘hard’ style, and a ‘balanced’ style. The cognitive component identified the informal, value-based teachers’ performance appraisal (compared to a constructed

formal tool), while the affective component related to the measurement of mutual prolonged emotions.

This study identified the challenging teachers, described how principals cope with their difficulties and elaborated on the mutual relations within that dyad. It added to the studies of Bridges (1986) who described the incompetent teachers and how administrators treat them (Bridges, 1992), and also to Wragg et al (1999) who recorded the perspectives of everyone who was involved with the poor performing teachers. Several central perspectives remained to be addressed. First, it is essential to discern exactly when and why teachers' performance deteriorates. Probably documentation by diaries (Huberman et al, 1997) can shed more light on the teachers' adjustment on each stage of their career. Second, in order to follow the 'mutual dance', the principals and the teachers' perspectives should be recorded simultaneously. It would enable the evaluating of the contribution of each partner in the dyad to the working relations. Third, based on the *Facet Model of Job Stress Sequence* (Beehr & Newman, 1978) this collected material would enable the identification more specifically of the contributing factors and probably enable the prediction of who are the vulnerable teachers.

Following the three components of the model, the cognitive, affective and behavioral aspects of the work are now considered.

Teachers' appraisal – the cognitive component

The teachers' performance was assessed here from three perspectives one of them used intensively in workers' appraisal, while the others are rarely discussed. First, evaluating the teachers' skills with a constructed tool (see Darling-Hammond, 1990; Middlewood & Cardno, 2001). Second, a value-based measurement of the most important qualities teachers should have, and what principals consider as the least desirable ones. In addition to the more general sentiment of principals who appreciated motivated and sensitive teachers, many of them appeared to hold different views, which in some cases influenced their appraisal and responses. Therefore asking a principal to appraise a teacher cannot rely on constructed measures solely. Their personal values on teaching and other issues are no less important. Third, like Fiedler's (1978) concept of the Least Preferred Coworker, principals here were asked to define who are the challenging teachers, and according to what criteria they were selected. Here, the teacher's performance and situation, other than general values, played significant idiosyncratic

importance. Each of these three perspectives adds a different angle, but it remains to elaborate on the exact contribution of the 'objective' criteria-based appraisal to the intuitive appraisal. What makes a teacher 'problematic', and when does a teacher gain back a status of well-performing teacher?

Prolonged mutual emotions – the affective component

Adding an affective component to the behavior and cognitive aspects of educational management substantiated the current research of emotions (Scherer, 2001) and opens additional avenues. Take for example, the notion of 'hot cognition' (Frijda, 1986; Lazarus, 1991), namely emotional responses that help us to sort relevant and important cognitions from the not so important and relevant. It was found here that negative emotions 'colored' the negative appraisal of the teachers' performance ($r .42 p < .01$), and similarly positive affect accompanied the appraisal of the outstanding teachers ($r .24$ statistically insignificant).

The construct of *prolonged emotions* (Ben Ze'ev, 1998) was meant to achieve two goals: first, enriching our understanding about feelings as reflections of the interrelations in the principal-teacher dyad. In addition to validating that construct and describing its manifestations within the principal-teacher relationships, the comparison between the two groups of teachers has helped to identify certain interpersonal dynamics, such as relations of dependence or independence, and supposedly the defense mechanism by which principals and teachers minimize the pains stemmed by the conflict. The current study contributed the emotional aspects to other aspects reported in recent studies on leader-member exchange (LMX) (see Rousseau, 1998; Maslyn & Uhl-Bein, 2001). The current findings fully support the LMX premises and invite more explorations along that direction.

The second goal of exploring the use of emotions as information to guide the principal on how to act was found to be less promising. The respondents easily filled questionnaires about their emotions, but experienced difficulties to express these feelings in an open verbal discussion. It seems as if the emotional awareness, or at least the readiness to share it openly were minimal. In addition, being interviewed on the subject appeared to strengthen (and sometimes even change) their feelings and attitudes about the challenging teachers. Another, more general criticism relates to influences of irrelevant factor, such as mood or negative or positive emotionality (Watson &

Telegan, 1985) on cognitive judgment. If people are unaware of the true cause of their affect, they may erroneously attribute it to attitude object currently in their focus of attention (Schwarz, 1990). In a test of this *mood-as-information* hypothesis, Schwarz and Clore (1983) found that people who were interviewed on sunny days were in a better mood, which in turn caused them to evaluate their lives more positively, than others interviewed on rainy days. Exploring what role the emotional awareness plays in the principal's decision-making process and whether managers can be trained to use their emotions as a managerial tool remains to be fully addressed.

Educational management – the behavioral component

The idea of behavior of giving and demanding was taken from the family setting and parental practices. It was extended to the organizational setting, namely to schools and behavior of principals. The tools developed in this study identified different management styles among different principals. As much as these style follow dual model schemes of management, such as the managerial grid (Blake & Mouton, 1978), the current model adds a new dimensions in describing leadership. It describes managerial relations in terms of the 'give and take' bytes, looking for aspects of balance between the effort invested by each party. These dimensions point out that managerial behavior is not necessarily 'people oriented' or 'task oriented', as suggested by all dual process model theories. It may rather represent acts needed to manage workers and keep proper relations with them. Yet, additional studies are needed on management styles of high school and colleges administrators; leadership styles of managers in the public and the privates sector, as well as 'managing' practices in the family and the classroom.

Identifying a challenging worker is not an easy task, concluding thoughts on the subject are now presented from the point of view of the prime subjects of this research: the principals.

When does a teacher become 'challenging'?

The definition of the challenging teacher as 'the worker who poses difficulties to the principal' has brought, as expected, various profiles. Some related to teachers' performance, while others were concerned with their traits and personality. With so

many kinds of presented shortcomings, one may ask what is the point in exploring a phenomenon along such broad lines? This question is not trivial. The worker-organization fit appears to depend on many factors. Some are more general, for example the *Facet Model of Job Stress Sequence* (Beehr & Newman, 1978), while others are more idiosyncratic. Identifying the criteria managers use to evaluate the successful and failing workers has theoretical and practical importance.

What are the criteria that cause principals to evaluate a teacher as 'challenging'? The tentative answer combines two elements: A) the principal's subjective perception as to how serious the teacher's shortcomings are; to what extent these behavior/traits are disturbing daily routines or seriously damaging norms of behavior? The principals in this study seemed to perceive realistically the teachers' advantages and shortcomings. They could easily identify the difficulties and explain their damage to the school. Yet, they differed significantly with regard to their 'red lines' and sensitiveness to various aspects of the teacher's performance.

B) The principal's subjective perception about the chances to 'bring-up' and improve the teachers' shortcomings. Very few cases of teachers in their initial professional stages were mentioned here and many principals expressed confidence in their ability to enhance novice teachers' performance. The ability to develop a worker is a combination of an evaluation of the teacher's capabilities to get changed as much as the skills, former experience and willingness of the principal to help others. Principals were found to differ as to the amount of efforts they are willing to make in 'bringing up' their workers. One principal confided she enjoyed 'rehabilitating' teachers who seriously failed in other schools. Others, mostly in competitive schools located in affluent neighborhoods expressed high expectations with lower readiness to assist those teachers who fail.

The questions to test this hypothesis operationally are: "to what extent are the teacher's shortcomings acceptable?" and "to what extent can the teachers' shortcomings be improved by yours and others assistance?" The answers are supposed to be continuous rather than dichotomous (yes/no). It is assumed that the skills and performance once the teacher became professionally mature are relatively stable. Meanwhile the ability to change is relatively short-lived. Once the teacher has acquired the new skill he or she is expected to perform in a stable manner.

The seriousness of problems and the ability to change

It is hypothesized that principal's level of acceptance of the teachers' shortcomings and the perceived chances to improve the teachers weaknesses determine whether the teacher would be defined as challenging. When teachers perform well they would never be defined as problematic. A teacher's behavior may be defined as totally intolerable. That was the case, for example with a high school teacher who recently undressed herself in the middle of a lesson. She was dismissed immediately. The seriousness of the difficulties should be considered therefore as a necessary (and in extreme cases sufficient) condition, while the chances for improvement are a contributing factor. Earlier studies found that poor performers are virtually doomed to remain in low quality relations with their superiors (Vecchio, 1997). Despite their potential to perform better, weak workers did not make the effort until their managers demonstrated effort toward their mutual relations. Only then did improvement occur (Scandura & Graen, 1984). It is hypothesized that the ability to change may compensate for a poor performance, and the two elements of shortcomings and guidance are interrelated and dynamic. As in bringing up children, the first year of teaching is expected to be difficult, accompanied with many obstacles (Huberman et al, 1997). The failures, which may be considered down the road as intolerable, are currently perceived as an inevitable phase of professional development. Yet, when the presented problems are perceived to be very difficult to change, principals may give up even at this initial stage. For example, it was found that young teachers were defined as challenging due to their negative personality traits, and not due to their performance. Principals perceived traits of dishonesty and insensitiveness unacceptable and difficult, if not impossible to change.

Mature teachers improve their skills and are expected to perform with less principal's guidance. When experienced teachers suffered a temporary crisis, which affected their performance, principals did their best to assist, hoping for fast recovery. When intensive efforts to assist a teacher prove to be ineffective, principals may reduce their involvements and consider to what extent the teacher's performance still contributes to the school. The hypothesis can be elaborated. For example, teachers who performed well and were perceived to easily adopt new methods and steadily improve their functioning were highly regarded by their supervisors. The readiness to change was so

important that in one case a principal explained he considered a teacher to be excellent just because she managed to significantly improve her former shortcomings.

Significance of findings

The whole area of performance management is one which is vital to the management of an effective school and is also an area which is perceived as difficult and therefore tends to be ignored or side-lined by those who manage and those who research educational management. The current study advances the knowledge and theory in several areas:

1. Empirical findings on the subject of challenging teachers and their management are extremely rare. As a very complicated phenomenon, the current findings identified the characteristics of these teachers and the causes for their shortcomings.
2. It is the first investigation into the subject in Israel.
3. The investigation allows the testing of models developed in the USA and comparison with findings from the UK.
4. New theory is developed relating emotion to the management of teachers. Emotion appeared to be the major hidden obstacle, in both parties, for a change. The model assist to select the conditions in which emotions can play positive role.
5. New theory of demanding and giving, previously applied to classroom management is incorporated into consideration of the management styles of principals in handling challenging teachers.
6. The outcomes of the findings provide indications of some of the ways that principals may successfully manage poorly performing teachers.
7. The development of a new model indicates the conditions that lead to perceived poor performance. Poor worker-organization fit and facing major life events account for unexpected high rates of challenging teachers. The new model assists in identifying the causes and offering some remedies.

Endnote

It is always difficult to come to an end of any long piece of work like this. The message should emerge out of this thesis is the awareness how the 'mutual dance' is complicated and painful, how both partners in the dyad need support, not criticism, how leaders in the educational system need evidences and explanations, such as those brought in this study, in helping them to assist those who have chosen to work in one of the most challenging professions - education.

Bibliography

- Abelson, R.P., Aronson, E., McGuire, W. J., Newcomb, T. M., Rosenberg, M. J., & Tannenbaum, P. H. (1968) *Theories of Cognitive Consistency: A Sourcebook*, Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Abraham, A. (1972) The teacher's self-image, *Megamot*, 18, pp. 431-471. (Hebrew)
- Adams, J. S. (1965) Inequity in social exchange. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology* (Vol. 2, pp. 267-299), New York: Academic Press.
- Anastasi, A. (1976) *Psychological Testing* (4th edition), London: Collier Macmillan Publishers.
- Anderson, J. (1997) Content and text analysis, In J. P. Keeses (Ed.). *Educational Research, Methodology and Measurement* (2nd ed.) (pp. 340-344), Oxford: Pergamon.
- Applebaum, E., & Batt, R. (1994) *The New American Workplace*, Ithaca, NY: ILR Press.
- Argyris, C. (1999) *On Organizational Learning* (2nd ed.), Oxford: Blackwell.
- Argyris, C. (1976) *Increasing Leadership Effectiveness*, New York: Wiley.
- Aronson, E., & Carlsmith, J. M. (1969) Experimentation in social psychology, In G. Lindzey and E. Aronson (Eds.) *The Handbook of Social Psychology* (Vol. 2), Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Arvey, R. D., & Jones, A. P. (1985) The use of discipline in organizational settings: A framework for future research, *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 7, pp. 367-408.
- Ashford, S. J. (1989) Self-assessment in organizations; A literature review and integrative model, *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 11, pp. 133-174.
- Aspy, D. N. (1974) *Toward a Technology of Humanizing Education*, Champaign, IL: University of Michigan.
- Atkinson, R. L., Atkinson, R. C., Smith, E. E., & Bem, D. J. (1993) *Introduction to Psychology*, 11th ed. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- Atwater, L. E., Carey, J. A., & Waldman, D. A. (2001) Gender and discipline: Wait until your father gets home, *Journal of Management*, 27, pp. 537-561.
- Averill, J. R. (1982) *Anger and Aggression: An Essay on Emotion*, New York: Springer.
- Bailey, G. D (1981) *Teacher Self-Assessment: A Means for Improving Classroom Instruction*. Washington, DC: National Education Association.
- Bailey, K. D. (1978) *Research Methods in Social Science*. London: Collier-Macmillan.
- Baldrige, J. V. (1971) *Power and Conflict in the University*, New York: John Wiley.
- Baldwin, M. W., & Sinclair, L. (1996) Self-esteem and "if.....then" contingencies of interpersonal acceptance, *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 71, pp. 1130-1141.
- Balgor, R. (1968) *List of basic Hebrew words for school*, Tel Aviv: Otzar Ha'more. (Hebrew)
- Balser, D. B., & Stern, R. N. (1999) Resistance and cooperation: A response to conflict over job performance, *Human Relations*, 52, pp. 1029-1053.

- Barber, L. W. (1990) Self-assessment, In J. Millman & L. Darling-Hammond (Eds.) *The New Handbook of Teacher Evaluation*, London: Sage Publications.
- Barber, M., Evans, A., & Johnson, M. (1995) *An Evaluation of the National Scheme of School Teacher Appraisal*, London: DfEE.
- Bar-Elli, G., & Heyd, D. (1986) Can revenge be just or otherwise be justified? *Theoria*, 52, pp. 68-86.
- Baron, R. A. (1993) Criticism (informal negative feedback) as a source of perceived unfairness in organizations: Effects, mechanisms, and countermeasures, In R. Cropanzano (Ed.) *Justice in the Workplace: Approaching Fairness in Human Resource Management* (pp. 155-170), Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
- Barrett, G. V., & Kernan, M. C. (1987) Performance appraisal and terminations: A review of court decisions since *Brito vs. Zia* with implications for personnel practices, *Personnel Psychology*, 40, pp. 489-503.
- Bass, B. M. (1985) *Leadership and Performance Beyond Expectations*, New York, NY: The Free Press.
- Bass, B. M., & Sogdill, R. M. (1990) *Bass and Stodgill's Handbook of Leadership*, New York, NY: Free Press.
- Batson, C. D. (1998) Altruism and pro-social behavior, In D. T. Gilbert, S. T. Fiske, & G. Lindzey (Eds.), *Handbook of Social Psychology* (Vol. 2, 4th ed.), (pp. 28-316). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Baumeister, R. F., Smart, L., & Boden, J. M. (1996) Relations of threatened egotism to violence and aggression: The dark side of high self-esteem, *Psychological Review*, 103, pp. 5-33.
- Baumrind, D. (1971) Current patterns of parental authority, *Developmental Psychology Monographs*, 4, pp. 1-103.
- Beaman, A. L., Cole, C. M., Preston, M., Klentz, B., & Steblay, N. M. (1983) Fifteen years of foot-in-the-door research: A meta-analysis, *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 9, pp. 181-186.
- Beck, E. D., & Cowen, C. C. (1996) *Spiral Dynamics: Exploring the New Science of Memetics*, Cambridge: Blackwell.
- Beehr, T. A., & Newman, J. E. (1978) Job stress, employee health, and organizational effectiveness: A facet analysis, model, and literature review, *Personnel Psychology*, 31, pp. 665-699.
- Bell, L. (1988) *Appraising Teachers in Schools, A Practical Guide*, London: Routledge.
- Bem, S. L. (1974) The measurement of psychological androgyny, *Journal of Counseling and Clinical Psychology*, 42(2), pp. 155-162.
- Ben Ze'ev, A. (1998) *The Subtlety of Emotions*, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Bennett, N. (1995) *Managing Professional Teachers: Middle management in Primary and Secondary Schools*, London: Paul Chapman.
- Bennis, B., & Nanus, B. (1985) *Leaders: The Strategies for Taking Charge*, New York: Harper & Row.
- Berger, E., (2001) *Absorption Problems in a Multicultural Society: Selected Issues of Professional Integration of Immigrant teachers From the Former Soviet Union into the Israeli Education System in Northern Israel*, Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Anglia Polytechnic University.
- Berry, L. M. (1998) *Psychology at work* (2nd ed.), Boston, MA: McGraw Hill.

- Bies, R. J. (1987) The predicament of injustice: The management of moral outrage, In L. L. Cummings & B. M. Staw (Eds.) *Research in Organizational Behavior*, Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Bies, R. J., Tripp, T. M. (1995) Beyond distrust: "Getting even" and the need for revenge, In R. M. Kramer & T. R. Tyler (Eds.) *Trust in Organizations* (pp. 246-260), Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Blake, R. R. and Adams McCanse, A. (1991) *Leadership Dilemmas – Grid Solutions*, Houston, TX: Gulf Publishing Co.
- Blake, R. R. and Mouton, J. S. (1978) *The New Managerial Grid*, Houston, TX: Gulf Publishing Co.
- Blake, R. R. and Mouton, J. S. (1985) *The New Managerial Grid III: The Key to Leadership Excellence* (3rd ed.), Houston, TX: Gulf Publishing Co.
- Blake, R. R. and Mouton, J. S. (1981) *The Academic Administrator Grid*, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Blake, R. R., Shepard, H. A., & Mutton, J. S. (1964) *Managing Inter-Group Conflict in Industry*, Houston, TX: Gulf.
- Blanz, F., & Ghiselli, E. E. (1972) The mixed standard scale: A new rating system, *Personnel Psychology*, 25, pp. 185-199.
- Blau, P. M., (1964) *Exchange and Power in Social Life*, New York: Wiley.
- Bless, H. (2000) Moods and general knowledge structures: Happy moods and their impact on information processing, In J. P. Forgas (Ed.) *Feeling and Thinking: The role of Affect in Social Cognition* (pp. 201-222), Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bodenhausen, G., Sheppard, L., & Kramer, G. (1994) Negative affect and social judgment: The different impact of anger and sadness, *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 24, pp. 45-62.
- Bohner, G. (2001) Attitudes, In M. Hewstone and W. Stoerbe (Eds.) *Introduction to Social Psychology* (3rd ed.), Oxford: Blackwell.
- Bottery, M. (1996) The challenge to professionals from the new public management: Implications for the teaching profession, *Oxford Review of Education*, 22(2), pp. 179-197.
- Bowen, M. (1980) *Key to the Geneogram*, Washington DC: Georgetown University Hospital.
- Bower, G. H., & Forgas, J. P. (2001) Mood and social memory, In J. P. Forgas (Ed.) *The Handbook of Affect and Social Cognition* (pp. 95-120), Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Bowman, J. S. (1999) Performance appraisal: verisimilitude trumps veracity, *Public Personnel Management*, 28(4), pp. 557-575.
- Boyd, N., & Taylor, R. (1998) A developmental approach to the examination of friendship in leader and follower relationships, *Leadership Quarterly*, 9(1), pp. 1-25.
- Bracey, G. W. (2002) Test scores, creativity, and global competitiveness, *Phi Delta Kappan*, 83, 10, pp. 738-739.
- Bradfield, M., & Aquino, K. (1999) The effects of blame attributions and offender likableness on forgiving and revenge in the workplace, *Journal of Management*, 25, pp. 607-631.
- Breckler, S. J. (1984) Empirical validation of affect, behavior and cognition as distinct components of attitude, *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 47, pp. 1191-1205.
- Brehm, S. S., & Brehm, J. W. (1981) *Psychological Reactance: A Theory of Freedom and Control*, New York: Academic Press.

- Brehm, S. B., & Kassin, S. M. (1990) *Social Psychology*, Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Bridges, E. M. (1992) *The Incompetent Teacher: Managerial Response* (rev.), London: The Falmer Press.
- Bridges, E. M. (1990) Evaluation for tenure and dismissal, In J. Millman & L. Darling-Hammond (Eds.) *The New Handbook of Teacher Evaluation*, London: Sage Publications.
- Bridges, E. M. (1986) *The Incompetent Teacher: The Challenge and the Response*, (rev.), London: The Falmer Press.
- Bridges, E. M. (1985) Managing the incompetent teacher – what can principals do? *NASSP Bulletin*, 69, pp. 57-69.
- Bridges, E. M. & Groves, B. R. (1999) The macro and micropolitics of personnel evaluation: a framework, *Journal of Personnel Evaluation*, 13(4), pp. 321-337.
- Bridges, E. M., & Groves, B. (1990) Managing the incompetent teacher, *Eugene, Oregon: ERIC clearinghouse*.
- Brief, A. P., Burke, M. J., George, J. M., Robinson, B. S., and Webster, J. (1988) Should negative affectivity remain an unmeasured variable in the study of job stress? *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 73, 2, pp. 193-198.
- Brown, R. (1986) *Social Psychology*, New York: Free Press.
- Bullock, A. (1988) *Meeting Teachers Management Needs*, Ely: Peter Francis.
- Burgess, R. (1993) *Research Methods*, Walton: Nelson.
- Burns, R. B. (2000) *Introduction to Research Methods*, London: Sage.
- Bush, T. (2002) Authenticity – reliability, validity, and triangulation, In M. Coleman, & A. R. J. Briggs (Eds.) *Research Methods in Educational Leadership and Management*, London: Paul Chapman.
- Bush, T. (1995) *Theories of Educational Management* (2nd ed.), London: Harper and Row.
- Bush, T. (1994a) Accountability in education, In T. Bush and J. West-Burnham (Eds.) *The Principals of Educational Management* (pp. 309-326), London: Pitman Publishing.
- Bush, T. (1994b) Theory and practice in educational management, In T. Bush and J. West-Burnham, *The principles of Educational Management* (pp. 33-54), London: Pitman Publishing.
- Buss, A. (1961) *The psychology of Aggression*, New York: Wiley.
- Buunk, B. P., Jan Doosje, B., Jans, L. G., & Hopstaken, L. E. (1993) Perceived reciprocity, social support, and stress at work: The role of exchange and communal orientation, *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 65, pp. 801-811.
- Byrne, D (1971) *The Attraction Paradigm*, New York: Academic Press.
- Cacioppo, J. T., Gardner, W. I., & Bernston, G. G (1997) Beyond bipolar conceptualizations and measures: The case of attitudes and evaluative space, *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 1, pp. 3-25.
- Cardno, C. (2001) Managing dilemmas in appraising performance: an approach for school leaders, In D. Middlewood and C. Cardno (Eds.) *Managing Teacher Appraisal and Performance* (pp. 143-159), London: Routledge Falmer.

Cardno, C., & Piggot-Irvine, E. (1997) *Effective Performance Appraisal: Integrating Accountability and Development in Staff Appraisal*, Auckland: Longman.

Carducci, B. J., & Zimbardo, P. G. (1995) Are you shy? *Psychology Today*, 28(6), pp. 34-42.

Carkhuff, R. R. (1971) *The Development of Human Resources*, New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Carrington, L. (September, 1994) Competent to manage? *International Management*, p. 17. Also see "Management Charter Initiative issues competence standards", *Personnel Management*, October 1990, p. 17; "MCI Launches standards for first two levels", *Personnel Management*, November 1990, p. 13.

Carroll, J. G. (1981) Faculty self-assessment, In J. Millman (Ed.) *Handbook of teacher evaluation* (pp. 180-200), Beverly-Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

Cascio, W. F. (1991) *Costing Human Resources: The financial Impact of Behaviour in Organizations* (3rd ed.), Boston: PWS-Kent Publishing Company.

Cassidy, T. (1999) *Stress, Cognition and Health*, London: Routledge.

Cassirer, E. (1944) *An Essay on Man*, New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, pp. 208-209.

Central Bureau of Statistics (CBS) (2001) *Annual Report 2000*, Jerusalem.

Chaiken, S., Giner-Sorrola, R., & Chen, S. (1996) Beyond accuracy: Defense and impression motives in heuristic and systematic information processing, In P. M. Gollwitzer & J. A. Bargh (Eds.), *The Psychology of Action: Linking Motivation and Cognition to Behavior* (pp. 553-578), New York: Guilford Press.

Chaiken, S., Pomeranz, E. M., & Giner-Sorrola, R. (1995) Structural consistency and attitude strength, In R. E. Petty & J. A. Krosnick (Eds.), *Attitude Strength: Antecedents and Consequences* (pp. 387-412), Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Cheng, Y. C., & Tsui, K. T. (1999) Multimodels of teacher effectiveness: implications for research, *The Journal of Educational Research*, 92, pp. 141-150.

Chi, M. T. H., Glaser, R., & Rees, E. (1982) Expertise in problem solving, In R. Sternberg (Ed.) *Advances in the Psychology of Human Intelligence* (Vol. 1, pp. 17-76), Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Cialdini, R. B. (1985) *Influence: Science and Practice*, Glenview, IL: Scott Foresman.

Clark, K. E., Clark, M. B., & Campbell, D. P. (1993) *Impact of Leadership*, Greensboro, NC: Center for Creative Leadership.

Clemmett, A. J. & Pearce, J. S. (1986) *The Evaluation of Pastoral Care*, Oxford: Blackwell.

Cogliser, C., Schriesheim, C., Scandura, T., & Neider, L. (1999) Balanced and unbalanced leadership relationships: A three-sample investigation into the outcomes associated with four different types of leader-member exchanges, Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Academy of Management, Chicago, IL.

Cohen, J. (1965) Some statistical issues in psychological research. In B. B. Wolman (ed.), *Handbook of Clinical Psychology*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Cohen, L. and Manion, L. (1994) *Research Methods in Education* (4th edition), London: Routledge.

Cohen, S., Tyrell, D. A. J., & Smith, A. P. (1993) Negative life events, perceived stress, negative affect, and susceptibility to the common cold, *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 64, pp. 131-140.

- Coleman, M. (2000) The female secondary head teacher in England and Wales: leadership and management styles. *Educational Research*, 42(1), pp. 13-27.
- Coleman, M (1998) The management style of female head teachers, *Educational Management & Administration*, 24, pp. 163-174.
- Coleman, M. (1994) Women in educational management, In T. Bush and J. West-Burnham, *The Principles of Educational Management*, London: Pitman Publishing.
- Collard, J. L. (2000) Leadership and gender, An Australian perspective, *Educational Management & Administration*, 29(3), pp. 343-355.
- Collins, N. L., Read, S. J. (1990) Adult attachment, working models, and relationship quality in dating couples, *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 58, pp. 644-663.
- Colvin, C. R., Block, J., & Funder, D. C. (1995) Overly positive self-evaluations and personality: Negative implications for mental health, *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 68, pp. 1152-1162.
- Coombs, C. H. (1987) The structure of conflict, *American Psychologist*, 42, pp. 355-363.
- Cooper, R. K. & Sawaf, A. (1997) *Executive EQ, Emotional Intelligence in Leadership and Organizations*, Advanced Intelligence Technologies, LLC.
- Cresswell, J. & Fisher, D. (1999) Assessing principal's interpersonal behaviour with their teachers, *International Studies in Educational Administration*, 27(1), pp. 29-44.
- Cronbach, L. J. (1990) *Essentials of Psychological Testing* (5th ed.), New York: Harper Collins.
- Cronbach, L. J. (1951) Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests, *Psychometrika*, 16, pp. 297-334.
- Cruickshank, D. R., & Haefele, D. (February, 2001) Good teachers, plural, *Educational Leadership*, pp. 26-30.
- D'Estree, T. P., Fast, L. A., Weiss, J. N., & Jakobsen, M. S. (2001) Changing the debate about 'success' in conflict resolution efforts, *Negotiation Journal*, 21, pp. 101-113.
- Dalton, D. R., & Todor, W. D. (1993) Turnover, transfer, absenteeism: An independent perspective, *Journal of Management*, 19, pp. 193-219.
- Danielson, C. (February, 2001) New trends in teacher evaluation, *Educational Leadership*, pp. 12-15.
- Dansereau, F., Graen, G., & Haga, W. (1975) A vertical dyad linkage approach to leadership within formal organizations, *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 13, 46-78.
- Darling-Hammond, L (1990) Teacher evaluation in transition: emerging roles and evolving methods, In J. Millman & L. Darling-Hammond (Eds.) *The New Handbook of Teacher Evaluation*, London: Sage Publications.
- Darling_Hammond, L. (1986) A proposal for evaluation in the teaching profession, *Elementary School Journal*, 86, pp. 531-551.
- Darwin, C. (1871) *The descent of Man*, London: John Murray.
- Dawkins, R. (1989) *The selfish Gene*, (new edition). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Day, D. D., & Crain, E. C. (1992) The role of affect and ability in initial exchange quality perceptions, *Group and Organizational Management*, 17, pp. 380-397.

- Dayan, A. (2001) 140 files a year, *Hed Hachinuch*, 75 (7-8), p. 7. (Hebrew)
- De Dreu, C. K. W., & Van Vianen, A. E. M. (2001) Managing relationship conflict and the effectiveness of organizational teams, *Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, 22, pp. 309-328.
- Dean, C. (13.7.2001) Damning verdict on performance pay, *Times Educational Supplement*, 4437.
- DeLongis, A., Coyne, J. C., & Dakof, G. (1982) Relationship of daily hassles, uplifts, and major life events to health status, *Health Psychology*, 1, pp. 119-136.
- Deluga, R. J. (1998) Leader-member exchange quality and effectiveness ratings, *Group and Organizational Management*, 23, pp. 189-216.
- Deluga, R. J., & Perry, J. T. (1994) The role of subordinate performance and ingratiation leader-member exchanges, *Group and Organizational Management*, 19, 67-86.
- Dessler, G. (2000) *People and Organizations in the 21st Century*, Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Deutch, M. (1980) Over fifty years of conflict research, In L. Festinger (Ed.) *Four Decades of Social Psychology*, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Deutch, M. (1973) *The Resolution of conflict: Constructive and Destructive Process*, New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Deutch, M. (1971) Conflict and its resolution, In C. G. Smith (Ed.). *Conflict Resolution: Contributions of the behavioral Sciences*, Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press.
- DfEE (2002) Criteria of teachers' performance evaluation, www.dfes.gov.uk/management/performance.
- Diener, E. & Crandall, R. (1978) *Ethics in Social and Behavioral Research*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Dienesch, R. M., & Liden, R. C. (1986) Leader-member exchange model of leadership: A critique and further development, *Academy of Management Review*, 11, pp. 618-634.
- Dillard, J. P. Hunter, J. E., Burgoon, M. (1984) Sequential-requested persuasive strategies: Meta-analysis of foot-in-the-door and door-in-the-face, *Human Communication Research*, 19, pp. 461-488.
- Dixon, N. F. (1987) *Our Own Worst Enemy*, London: Cape.
- Dockery T. M. & Steiner, D. D. (1990) The role of the initial interaction in leader-member exchange, *Group and Organizational Studies*, 15, pp. 395-413.
- Dodgson, P. G., & Wood, J. V. (1998) Self-esteem and the cognitive accessibility of strengths and weaknesses after failure, *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 75, pp. 178-197.
- Drucker, P. (1994) *Peter Drucker on the Profession of Management*, Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- Drucker, P. F. (1992) The new society of organizations, *Harvard Business Review*, 68(5), pp. 234-263.
- Drucker, P. F. (1974) *Management: Tasks, Responsibilities, Practices*, New York: Harper & Row.
- Duarte, N. T., Goodson, J. R., & Klich, N. R. (1993) How do I like thee? Let me appraise the ways, *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 14, 239-249.

- Duke, D. L., & Stiggins, R. J. (1990) Beyond minimum competence: Evaluation for professional development, In J. Millman & L. Darling-Hammond (Eds.) *The New Handbook of Teacher Evaluation*, London: Sage Publications.
- Dwyer, C. A. (1995) Criteria for performance-based teacher assessment: validity, standards, and issues, In A. J. Shinkfield and D. Stufflebeam (Eds.) *Teacher Evaluation: Guide to Effective Practice*, Boston: KAP.
- Dyer, K. M. (February, 2001) The power of 360-degree feedback, *Educational Leadership*, pp. 35-38.
- Dyer, K. M., & Carothers, J. (2000) *The Initiative Principal: A Guide to Leadership*, Thousands Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Eagly, A. H., & Chaiken, S. (1998) Attitude structure and function, In D. T. Gilbert., S. T. Fiske, & G. Lindzey (Eds.). *The Handbook of Social Psychology* (4th ed.), (pp. 269-322), New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Easterby-Smith, M., Thorpe, R. and Lowe, A. (1994) The philosophy of research design, In N. Bennett, R. Glatter. & R. Levacic (Eds.), *Improving Educational Management through Research and Consultancy*, London: Paul Chapman.
- Eden, D. (1998) Who supervise the teachers' work? Hidden inspection in school. *Iunim Bachinuch*, 24, pp. 34-52. (Hebrew).
- Educational Research Service (ERS), (1988) *Teacher Evaluation: Practices and Procedures*, Arlington, VA: Author.
- Eid, M., & Diener, E. (2001) Norms for experiencing emotions in different cultures: Inter- and intra-national differences, *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 81, pp. 869-885.
- Eisenstadt, S. N. (1968) *On Charisma and Institution Building*, Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Ekman, P., & Davidson, R. J. (Eds.) (1994) *The Nature of Emotions: Fundamental Questions*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ekman, P., & Friesen, W. V. (1969) The repertoire of nonverbal behavior: Categories, origins, usage, and coding, *Semiotica*, 1, pp. 49-98.
- Endler, N. S., & Magnusson, D. (Eds.) (1976) *Interactional Psychology and Personality*. Washington: Hemisphere Publication.
- Everson, H. T., & Tobias, S. (1998) The ability to estimate knowledge and performance in college: A meta-cognitive analysis, *Instructional Science*, 26, pp. 65-79.
- Fantasia, R., Clawson, D., & Graham, G. A. (1988) A critical review of worker participation in American industry, *Work and Occupations*, 15, pp. 468-488.
- Farber, B. A. (1984) Stress and burn out in suburban teachers, *Journal of Educational Research*, 77, pp. 325-331.
- Farrell, D., & Rusbult, C. E. (1992) Exploring exit, voice, loyalty and neglect typology: The influence of job satisfaction, quality of alternatives, and investment size, *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal*, 5, pp. 201-217.
- Fedor, D. B., Davis, W. D., Masly, J. M., & Mathieson, K. (2001) Performance improvement efforts to negative feedback: The roles of source power and recipient self-esteem, *Journal of Management*, 27, pp. 79-97.

- Fennell, A (1999) Power in the principalship: four women's experience, *Journal of Educational Administration*, 37(1), pp. 23-49.
- Fessler, R., & Christensen, J. (1992) *The Teacher Career Cycle: Understanding and Guiding the Professional Development of Teachers*, Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Festinger, L., & Katz, D. (1966) *Research Methods in Behavioral Sciences*, New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Fidler, B., & Atton, T. (1999) *Poorly Performing Staff in Schools and How to Manage Them*, London: Routledge.
- Fiedler, F. (1978) The contingency model and the dynamics of the leadership process. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology* (Vol. 11). New York: Academic Press.
- Fiedler, F. E. (1967) *A Theory of Leadership Effectiveness*, New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Fiedler, F., & Garcia, J. E. (1987) *New Approaches to Effective Leadership: Cognitive Resources and Organizational Performance*, New York: John Wiley.
- Fiedler, K. (2000) Towards an integrative account of affect and cognition phenomena, In J. P. Forgas, (Ed.) *Feeling and Thinking: The Role of Affect in Social Cognitions* (pp. 223-252), Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Filley, A. C., (1975) *Interpersonal Conflict Resolution*, Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman.
- Fineman, S. (1996) Emotion and organizing, In S. Clegg, C. Hardy., and W. R. Nord (Eds.) *Handbook of Organization Studies*, London: Sage.
- Fineman, S. (1995) Emotions in organizations' In N. Nicholson. R. S. Schuler & A. H. Van de Ven (Eds.). *The Blackwell Encyclopedic Dictionary of Organizational Behavior*, (pp. 51-57) Cambridge, MA: Blackwell Publishers.
- Fineman, S., & Sturdy, A. (1999) The emotions of control: A qualitative exploration of environmental regulation, *Human Relations*, 52, pp. 631-663.
- Fink, C. F. (1968) Some conceptual difficulties in the theory of social conflict, *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 12, pp. 412-460.
- Fischer, A. H. (1991) *Emotions Scripts: A Study of the Social and Cognitive Facets of Emotions*, Leiden; DSWO Press.
- Fisher, C. D. (1979) Transmission of positive and negative feedback to subordinates: A Laboratory investigation, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 64, pp. 533-540.
- Flam, H. (1993) Fear, loyalty and greedy organizations, In S. Fineman (Ed.), *Emotion in Organizations*, London: Sage.
- Flanagan, J. C. (1954) The critical incident technique, *Psychological Bulletin*, 31(4), pp. 123-154.
- Foreman, K. (1997) Managing individual performance, In T. Bush and D. Middlewood (Eds.) *Managing People in Education*, London: Paul Chapman.
- Forgas, J. P. (Ed.) (2001) *The Handbook of Affect and Social Cognition*, Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Forgas, J. P. (1992) Affect in social judgments and decisions: A multi process model, *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 25, pp. 227-275.

- Forgas, J. P., & George, J. M. (2001) Affective influences on judgments and behavior in organizations: An information processing perspective, *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 86(1), pp. 3-34.
- Fox, S. (1998) *The Psychology of Resistance to Change*, Ramat-Gan: Bar-Ilan University Press. (Hebrew)
- Frankfort-Nachmias, C., & Nachmias, D. (1992) *Research Methods in the Social Sciences*, London: Edward Arnold.
- Freedman, J. L., & Fraser, S. C. (1966) Compliance without pressure: The foot-in-the-door technique, *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 4, pp. 195-202.
- French, J. R. P., Caplan, R. D., & Van Harrison, R. (1982) *The Mechanisms of Job Stress and Strain*, New York: Wiley.
- Friedman, I. (2001) Standards for training school principals, *Forum*, 18, pp. 7-10.
- Friedman, I. (1992) Teacher's burnout: the concept and its unique components, *Megamot*, 34(2), 261-248. (Hebrew)
- Friedman, I. (1990) Normative behavior of the teacher and the principal, In, I. Friedman (ed.) *Autonomy in Education*, Jerusalem: Szald Institute. (Hebrew)
- Friedman, I. & Benades-Yaakov, O. (1998) *The Struggle for Freedom of Management in a Constrains-Saturated Environment, Friction and Conflict in the Secondary Education*, Jerusalem: Szald Institute. (Hebrew)
- Friedman, I., & Farber, B. A. (1992) *Teacher's Professional Image and Burnout*, Jerusalem: Szold Institute. (Hebrew)
- Friedman, I., & Lotan, I. (1993) *Teacher Stress and Burnout, Causes and Coping Strategies*, Jerusalem: Szold Institute. (Hebrew)
- Frijda, N. H. (1994) Varieties of affect: Emotions and episodes, mood, and sentiments, In P. Ekman., & R. Davidson (Eds.) *The Nature Emotions: Fundamental questions*, (pp. 59-67), Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Frijda, N. H. (1986) *The Emotions*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Fuhr, D. L. (1993) Managing mediocrity in the classroom, *School Administrator*, 50(4), pp. 26-29.
- Fulk, J., & Wendler, E. R. (1982) Dimensionality of leader-subordinate interactions: A path-goal investigation, *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, vol. 30, pp. 241-264.
- Fuller, F., & Brown, O. (1975) Becoming a teacher, In K. Ryan (Ed.), *Teacher Education: 74th Yearbook of NSSE* (Vol. II), (pp. 25-52), Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Furnham, A., & Springfield, P. (1994) Congruence of self and subordinate ratings of managerial practices as a correlate of supervisor evaluation, *Journal of Occupational & Organizational Behavior*, 67, pp. 57-67.
- Gabriel, Y. (1998) Psychoanalytic contribution to the study of the emotional life of organizations, *Administration and Society*, 30, pp. 291-314.
- Gadacz, R. R. (1986) Power and Justice, *Alberta Law Review*, 24, pp. 296-304.
- Gali, J. (1983) The administrative behavior of high school principals, *Studies in Educational Administration and Organization*, 37/38, pp. 283-305. (Hebrew)

- Gaziel, H.H. (1994) Implementing reforms in a centralized education system: The case of Israeli education, *Oxford Review of Education*, 20, pp. 237-249.
- George, J. (1995) 'Emotion' In N. Nicholson. R. S. Schuler & A. H. Van de Ven (Eds.). *The Blackwell Encyclopedic Dictionary of Organizational Behavior*, Cambridge, MA: Blackwell Publishers.
- George, J., Jones, G. R. (1997) Experiencing work: Values, attitudes, and moods, *Human Relations*, 50, pp. 393-416.
- Gerstner, C. R., Day, D. V. (1997) Meta-analytic review of leader-member exchange theory: Correlates and construct issues, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82, pp. 827-844.
- Gibson, J. L., Ivancevich, J. M., & Donnelly, J. H. (1988) *Organizations: Behavior, Structure and Process* (6th ed.), Homewood, IL: BPI.
- Glaser, R., Rice, J., & Sheridan, J. (1987) Stress-related immune suppression: Health implications, *Brain, Behavior and Immunology*, 1, pp. 7-20.
- Glomb, T. M., & Hulin, C. L. (1997) Anger and gender effects in observed superior-subordinate in dyadic interactions, *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 71, pp. 281-307.
- Goldberg-Weil, N. (1999) Leadership in cultural context, In I. Gonen and E. Zakay *Leadership and Leadership Development*, Tel Aviv: The Ministry of Defense Publishing. (Hebrew)
- Goleman, D. (March-April 2000) Leadership that gets results, *Harvard Business Review*, pp. 78-90.
- Goleman, D. (1995) *Emotional Intelligence*, New York, NY: Bantam Books.
- Grace, G. (1985) Judging teachers: the social and political contexts of teacher evaluation, *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 6 (1), pp. 3-16.
- Graen, G. (1976) Role-making processes within complex organizations, In M. D. Dunnette (Ed.). *Handbook of industrial and Organizational Psychology* (pp. 1201 – 1245). Chicago, IL: Rand McNally.
- Graen G., & Cashman, J. F. (1975) A role making model of leadership in formal organizations: A developmental approach, In J. G. Hunt & L. L. Larson (Eds.). *Leadership Frontiers*. Kent, OH: Kent State University Press.
- Graen, G., & Cashman, J., Ginsburgh, S., & Schiemann (1977) Effects of linking-pin quality upon the quality of working life of lower participants: A longitudinal investigation of the managerial understructure, *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 22, pp. 491-504.
- Graen, G., & Schiemann (1978) Leader-member agreement: A vertical dyad linkage approach, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 63, pp. 206-212.
- Gray, H. L. (1993) Gender issues in management training, In Ozga, J. (ed.) *Women in Educational Management*, Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Gray, H. L. (1989) Gender considerations in school management: masculine and feminine leadership styles, In C. Riches and C. Morgan (Eds.). *Human Resource Management in Education*, Milton Keynes: Open University Press.
- Green, S. G., & Mitchell, T. R. (1979) Attributional processes of leader in leader-member interactions, *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 23, pp. 429-4568.

Green, S. G., Anderson, S. E., & Shivers, S. L. (1996) Demographic and organizational influences on leader-member exchange and related work attitudes, *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 66, pp. 203-214.

Greenberg, J. (1996) *Managing Behavior in Organizations*, Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Griffeth, R. W., Hom, P. W., & Gaertner, S. (2000) A meta-analysis of antecedents and correlates of employee turnover: Update, moderator tests, and research implications for the next millennium, *Journal of Management*, 26, pp. 463-488.

Griffin, R. S. (1993) How to stay in a rut as a teacher, *Clearing-House*, 66(5), pp. 293-4.

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

Gross, M. A., & Guerrero, L. K. (2000) Managing conflict appropriately and effectively: Application of the competence model to Rahim's organizational conflict styles, *The International Journal of Conflict Management*, 11(3), pp. 200-236.

Haertel, E. H. (1991) New forms of teacher assessment , *Review of Research in Education*, 17, pp. 3-29.

Hales, C, L. (1995) 'Managerial behavior' In N, Nicholson. R. S. Schuler & A. H. Van de Ven (Eds.). *The Blackwell Encyclopedic Dictionary of Organizational Behavior*, Cambridge, MA: Blackwell Publishers.

Hall, V (1996) *Dancing on the Ceiling*, London: Paul Chapman.

Halpin, A, W. (1966) *Theory and Research in Administration*, New York: MacMillan.

Halpin, A. W., & Winer, b. J. (1952) A factorial study of the leader behavior descriptions, In R. M. Stogdill & A. E. Coons (Eds.). *Leader Behavior: Its Description and Measurement*, Columbus, OH: Ohio State University Bureau of Business Research.

Hamilton, D. (1976) *Curriculum Evaluation*. London: Open Books.

Handy, C., & Aitken, R. (1986) *Understanding Schools as Organizations*, Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Harris, A. (1998) Improving ineffective departments in secondary school, *Educational Management & Administration*, 26(3), pp. 269-278.

Harris, M. M., & Schaubroeck, J. (1988) A meta-analysis of self-supervisor, self-peer, and peer-supervisor ratings, *Personnel Psychology*, 41, pp. 43-62.

Hatfield, E., Cacioppo, J., & Rapson, R. L. (1994) *Emotional Contagion*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hay/McBer (2002) *The lessons of Leadership*, www.transforminglearning.co.uk

Hay/McBer (2002) Research into Teacher Effectiveness, www.teachernet.gov.uk/haymcber=20

Heatherton, T. F., & Vohs, K. D. (2000) Interpersonal evaluations following threats to self: Role of self-esteem, *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 78, pp. 725-736.

Hed-Hachinuch (Education's Echo), 2001, 75, 11-12.

Hed-Hachinuch (Education's Echo), 1999, Annual Labor Rights Supplement, p. 22.

Hed-Hachinuch (Education's Echo), 18, 6.5.1981, Special Supplement.

- Heneman, H. G., Schwab, D. P., Fossum, J. A., & Dyer, L. D. (1989) *Personnel/Human Resource Management* (4th ed.), Boston: BPI.
- Herold, D. M., Liden, R. C., & Leatherwood, M. L. (1987) Using multiple attributes to assess sources of performance feed back, *Academy of Management journal*, 30, pp. 826-835.
- Hersey, P., & Blanchard, K. H. (1977) *Management of Organizational Resources Utilizing Human Resources*, Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Herzberg, F. (1966) *Work and the Nature of Man*, Cleveland: World Publishing.
- Hoffman, M.L. (1975) Moral Internalisation, parental power, and the nature of Parent-child interaction, *Developmental Psychology*, 11, pp. 228-239.
- Hofstede, G. (1980) *Culture's Consequences: International Differences in Work-Related Values*, Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Hollander, E. P. (1985) Leadership and power, In G. Lindzey & E. Aronson (Eds.), *Handbook of Social Psychology* (3rd ed.), New York: Random House.
- Hollis, J. F., Connett, J. E., Stevens, V. J., & Greenlick, M. R. (1990) Stressful life events, Type A behavior, and the prediction of cardio-vascular and total mortality over six year, *Journal of Behavioral Medicine*, 13, pp. 263-281.
- Holmes, T. H., & Masuda, M. (1974) Life change and illness susceptibility, In B. s. Dohrenwned & B. P. Dohrenwned (Eds.). *Stressful Life Events: Their Nature and Effects*, New York: Wiley.
- Holmes, T. H., & Rahe, R. (1967) The Social Readjustment Rating Scale, *Journal of Psychosomatic Research*, 14, pp. 213-218.
- Homans, G. C. (1961) *Social Behavior*, New York: Harcourt, Brace & World.
- Hopkins, D., & West, M. (1994) *Evaluation of Teacher and Head Teacher Appraisal*, Maidstone, Kent County Council.
- Horowitz, T., & Frankel, H. (1997) *Adjustment of Immigrant Teachers to the Israeli Education System*, Jerusalem: Szold Institute. (Hebrew)
- House, E. R. (1997) Ethics of evaluation studies, In J. P. Keeres (ed.) *Educational Research Methodology and Measurement: An International Handbook* (2nd ed.) (pp. 257-261), Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- House, E. R. (1981) Three perspectives on innovation, In R. Lehming, and M. Kane (Eds.). *Improving Schools: Using What We Know*, Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- House, R. J., & Howell, J. M. (1992) Personality and charismatic leadership, *Leadership Quarterly*, 3(2), pp. 81-108.
- Howard, B. B., & McColskey, W. H. (February 2001) Evaluating experienced teachers, *Educational Leadership*, pp. 48-51.
- Howell, D. C. (1997) *Statistical Methods fo Psychology* (4th ed.), Belmont, CA: Duxbury Press.
- Howell, J. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1993) Transformational leadership, transactional leadership, locus of control and support for innovation: Key predictors of consolidated-business unit performance, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78, 891-902.
- Hoy, W. K., & Miskel, C. G. (1996) *Educational Administration: Theory, Research, Practice* (5th ed.) New York: McGraw-Hill.

- Huberman, M. (1993) *The Lives of Teachers*, New York: Teachers College Press.
- Huberman, M. (1989) The professional life cycle of teachers, *Teachers College Record*, 91(1), pp. 31-57.
- Huberman, M., & Thompson, C. C., & Weiland, S. (1997) Perspectives on the teaching career, In B. J. Biddle, T. Good, I. F. Goodson (Eds.). *International Handbook of Teachers and Teaching*, London: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Hunter, M. (1982) *Mastery Teaching*, El Segundo, CA: PIP Publications.
- Hutchinson, B. (1997) Appraising appraisal: some tensions and some possibilities, In L. Kydd, M. Crawford and C. Riches (Eds.) *Professional Development for Educational Management*, pp. 157-168, Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Ilgen, D. R., Fisher, C. D., & Taylor, M. S. (1979) Consequences of individual feedback on behavior in organizations, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 64, pp. 349-371.
- Ingvarson, L. (2001) The limited value of appraisal performance. What might we do instead? In D. Middlewood & C. Cardno (Eds.) *Managing Teacher Appraisal and Performance*, London: Routledge.
- Jackobson, L. (1986) *Workers Appraisal*, Tel Aviv: Open University Press. (Hebrew)
- Jackobson, S. L., & Battaglia, C. F. (2001) Authentic forms of teacher assessment and staff development in the US, In D. Middlewood and C. Cardno (Eds.) *Managing Teacher Appraisal and Performance*, London: Routledge Falmer.
- Jehn, K. (1995) A multimethod examination of the benefits and determinants of intra-group conflict, *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 40, pp. 256-282.
- Jepson, C., & Chaiken, S. (1990) Chronic issue-specific fear inhibits systematic processing of persuasive communications, *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality*, 5, pp. 61-84.
- Jermier, J & Kerr, S (1997) Substitutes for leadership: The meaning and measurement – Contextual, recollections and current observations, *Leadership Quarterly*, 8(1), pp. 95-101.
- Johnson, D (1994) *Research Methods in Educational Research*, London: Pitman.
- Jones, A. R. (1986) *Research Methods in the Social and Behavioral Sciences*. Sunderland, MA: Sinauer.
- Jones, R. (1997) Showing bad teachers the door, *American School Board Journal*, 184 (11), pp. 20-24.
- Kane, J. S., & Lawler, E. E. (1978) Methods of peer assessment, *Psychological Bulletin*, 85, pp. 555-586.
- Kanner, A. D., Coyne, J. C., Schaefer, C., & Lazarus, R. S. (1981) Comparison of two modes of stress measurement: daily hassles and uplifts versus major life events, *Journal of Behavioral Medicine*, 4, pp. 1-39.
- Kanter, R. M. (1993) *Men and Women on the Corporation*, New York: Basic Books (1st published 1977).
- Katz, D., & Kahn, R. L. (1978) *The Social Psychology of Organizations* (2nd ed.), New York: Wiley.
- Kashti, Y., Alpert, B., Yosifon, M., & Manor, E. (1997) *School Heterogeneity: Unity and Variety*, Tel Aviv: Tel Aviv University Press, Ramot. (Hebrew)

- Kedney, B., & Saunders, B. (1993) *Coping with Incapability, Mendip Paper 51*, Bristol, The Staff College.
- Kelley, H. H. (1967) Attribution theory in social psychology, In D. Levine (Ed.). *Nebraska Symposium on Motivation* (Vol. 15), pp. 192-238.
- Kelly, J. R., & Barsade, S. (2001) Mood and emotions in small groups and work teams, *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 86(1), pp. 99-130.
- Keltner, D., Ellsworth, P. C., & Edwards, K. (1993) Beyond simple pessimism: Effects of sadness and anger on social perception, *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 64, pp. 740-752.
- Kemper, T. D. (1990) Social relations and emotions: A structural approach, In T. D. Kemper (Ed.). *Research Agendas In the Sociology of Emotions* (pp. 207-237), Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Kerr, S., & Jermier, J. (1978) Substitutes for leadership: The meaning and measurement, *Organization and Human Performance*, 22, pp. 374-403.
- Kim, S. H., & Smith, R. H. (1993) Revenge and conflict escalation, *Negotiation Journal*, 9, pp. 37-43.
- Kipnis, D., Schmidt, S. M., & Wilkinson, I. (1980) Intraorganizational influence tactics: Explorations in getting one's way, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 65, pp. 440-452.
- Klein, J. (2000) Factors promoting organizational learning in schools, *Studies in Educational Administration & Organization*, 24, pp. 57-72. (Hebrew)
- Klein, K. J. and House, R. J. (1995) On fire: Charismatic leadership and levels of analysis, *Leadership Quarterly*, 6(2), pp. 183-198.
- Klin, C. M., Guizman, A. E., & Levine, W. H. (1997) Knowing that you don't know: Meta-memory and discourse processing, *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition*, 23, pp. 1378-1393.
- Kmetz, J. T., Willower, D. J. (1982) Elementary school principals' work behavior, *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 18, pp. 62-78.
- Kotter, J. (1990) What leaders really do? *Harvard Business Review*, 66(3), pp. 103-111.
- Kotter, P. (1982) *The General Manager*. New York: Free Press.
- Krallwhol, D. R. (1998) *Methods of Educational and Social Science Research*, New York: Longman
- Krashen, S. (2002) Whole language and the Great Plummet of 1987-92: An urban legend from California, *Phi Delta Kappan*, 83, 10, pp. 748-753.
- Krau, E. (1981) Immigrants preparing for their second career: The behavioral strategies adopted, *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 18, pp. 289-303.
- Krause, S., Louis, K. S., & Bryke, A. (1994) Building professional community in schools, *Issue Report No. 6* (pp. 3-6) Madison, WI: Center of Organization and Restructuring of Schools.
- Kremer-Hayon, L. (1993) Teacher self-evaluation: a tool for professional development. In L. Kremer-Hayon, H. C. Vonk & R. Fessler (Eds.), *Teacher Professional Development: A Multiple Perspective Approach* (pp. 217-240).
- Kristof, A. I. (1996) Person-organization fit: An integrative review of its conceptualization, measurement, and implication, *Personnel Psychology*, 49, pp. 1-49.

- Kruger, J., & Dunning, D. (1999) Unskilled and unaware of it: How difficulties in recognizing one's own incompetence lead to inflated self-assessment, *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 77, pp. 1121-1134.
- Kruger, M. L. (1996) Gender issues in school headship: quality versus power, *European Journal of Education*, 31(4), 447-461.
- Kuder, G. F., & Richardson, M. F. (1937) The theory of estimation of test reliability, *Psychometrika*, 2, pp. 151-160.
- Kyriacou, C. (1987) Teacher stress and burnout: An international review. *Educational Research (NER)*, 29(2), 146-152.
- Kyriacou, C. (1981) Social support and occupational stress among school teachers, *Educational Studies*, 7, pp. 55-60.
- Lance, C. E., LaPointe, J. A., & Stewart, A. M. (1994) A test of the context dependency of three casual models of halo rater error, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 79, pp. 332-340.
- Larsen, J. T., McGraw, A. P., & Cacioppo, J. T. (2001) Can people feel happy and sad at the same time? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 81(4), pp. 684-696.
- Latane, B. (1981) The psychology of social impact, *American Psychologist*, 36, pp. 343-356.
- Latham, G. P., & Wexley, K. N. (1977) Behavioral observation scales for performance appraisal purposes, *Personnel Psychology*, 30, pp. 255-268.
- Lauer-Schachter, H. (1988) Performance and teacher lay-offs, *International Review of Education*, 34, pp. 109-115.
- Lavelly, C. et al. (1992) Actual incidence of incompetent teachers, *Educational Research Quarterly*, 15(2), pp. 4-11.
- Lawrence, E. C. (1993) *The Marginal Teacher: A Step-by-Step Guide to Fair Procedures for Identification and Dismissal*, Newbury Park, CA: Corwin Press.
- Lazarus, R. S. (1991) *Emotion and Adaptation*, Oxford University Press.
- Lazarus, R. S., Lazarus, B. N. (1994) *Passion and Reason: Making Sense of Our Emotions*, Oxford University Press.
- Leary, M. R., Tambor, E. S., Terdal, S. K., & Downs, D. L. (1995) Self-esteem as an interpersonal monitor: The sociometer hypothesis, *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 68, pp. 518-530.
- Leary, T. (1957) *Interpersonal Diagnosis of Personality*. New York, NY: Ronald Press.
- Lee, J. (1997) Leader member exchange: The "Pelz Effect" and cooperative communication between group members, *Management Communication Quarterly*, pp. 266-287.
- Lee, R. M. (1993) *Doing Research on Sensitive Topics*, London: Sage.
- Lerner, J. S., & Keltner, D. (2000) Beyond valence: Toward a model of emotion-specific influences on judgment and choice, *Cognition and Emotion*, 14, pp. 473-493.
- LeRoy, M. H., & Schultz, J. M. (1995) The legal context of HRM: conflict, confusion, cost, and role-conversion, In G. R. Ferris, S. D. Rosen & D. T. Barnum (Eds.) *Handbook of Human Resource Management*, Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.

- Lev, S. (1996) *Teacher Commitment to School, Teaching and Students as Related to Performance and Turnover*, Master's dissertation, Ramat-Gan: Bar-Ilan University (Hebrew).
- Levinson, H. (1964) *Emotional Health in the World of Work*, New York: Harper & Row.
- Lewicki, R. J. Weiss, S. E., & Lewin, D. (1992) Models of conflict, negotiation and third party intervention: A review and synthesis, *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 13, pp. 209-252.
- Lewin, A. Y. & Minton, J. W. (1986) Determining organizational effectiveness: another look and an agenda for research, *Management Science*, 24, pp. 514-522.
- Lewin, K. (1951) *Field Theory in Social Science*, New York: Harper & Row.
- Lewin, K., Lippit, R., & White, R. K. (1939) Patterns of aggressive behavior in experimentally created social climates, *Journal of Social Psychology*, 10, pp. 271-301.
- Lewis, M. (1993) Self-conscious emotions: Embarrassment, pride, shame, and guilt, In M. Lewis & J. Haviland (Eds.) *Handbook of Emotions* (pp. 563-575), New York: Guilford Press.
- Lewis, M., & Haviland-Jones, J.M. (Eds.) (2000) *Handbook of Emotions* (2nd ed.) New York: Guilford Press.
- Liden, R. C., & Graen, G. (1980) Generalizability of the vertical dyad linkage model of leadership. *Academy of Management Journal*, 23, pp. 451-465.
- Liden, R. C., & Maslyn, J. M. (1998) Multidimensionality of leader-member exchange: An empirical assessment through scale development, *Journal of Management*, 24, pp. 43-72.
- Liden, R. C., Sparrowe, R. T., & Wayne, S. J. (1997) Leader-member exchange theory: The past and potential for the future, In G. R. Ferris (Ed.) *Research in Personnel and Human Resource Management* (Vol. 15) (pp. 47-119), Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Liden, R. C., Wayne, S. J., & Kraimer, M. L. (2001) Managing individual performance in work groups, *Human Resource Management*, 40(1), pp. 63-72.
- Likert, R. (1967) *The Human Organization*, New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Likert, R. (1961) *New Patterns of Management*, New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Little, J. W. (1993) Teachers' professional development in a climate of educational reform, *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 15, 2, 129-152.
- Lord, F. M. (1953) On the statistical treatment of football numbers, *American Psychologist*, 8, pp. 750-751
- Lowenthal, M., & Thurnher, M., & Chirikoga, D. (1975) *Four Stages of Life*, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Lunenburg, F. C., & Ornstein, A. C. (1996) *Educational Administration, Concepts and Practices* (2nd ed.), London: ITP.
- Machin, J. I. (1982) *The Expectation Approach*. Maidenhead, UK: McGraw-Hill.
- Maki, R. H., Jonas, D., & Kallod, M. (1994) The relationship between comprehension and meta-comprehension ability, *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*, 1, pp. 126-129.
- Martin, L. L., Abend, T., Sedikides, C., & Green, J. D. (1997) How would I feel if...? Mood as input to a role fulfillment evaluation process, *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 73, pp. 242-253.

- Maslach, C., & Jackson, S. (1981) The measurement of experienced burnout, *Journal of Occupational Behavior*, 2, pp. 99-113.
- Maslyn, J. M., & Uhl-Bien, M. (2001) Leader-Member Exchange and its dimensions: Effects of self-effort and other effort on relationship quality, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(4), pp. 697-708.
- Mastenboek, W. F. G. (1987) *Conflict Management and Organization Development*, Chichester: Wiley.
- Mayer, J. D., Caruso, D., & Salovey, P. (1999) Emotional intelligence meets traditional standards for an intelligence, *Intelligence*, 27, 267-298.
- Mayer, J. D., & Salovey, P. (1997) What is emotional intelligence? In P. Salovey & D. Sluyter (Eds.) *Emotional Development and Emotional Intelligence: Implications for Educators* (pp. 30-31), New York: Basic Books.
- McFarlin, D. B., & Blascovich, J. (1981) Effects of self-esteem and performance feedback on future affective preferences and cognitive expectations, *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 40, pp. 521-531.
- McGoldrick, M., & Gerson, R. (1985) *Geneograms in Family Assessment*, New York: W.W. Norton & Co.
- McGreal, T. L. (1999) The use of rating scales in teacher evaluation: concerns and recommendations, *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education*, 4, pp. 41-58.
- McGreal, T. L. (1990) The use of rating scales in teacher evaluation: concerns and recommendations, *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education*, 4, pp. 41-58.
- McLeod, J. (1998) *An Introduction to Counseling* (2nd ed.), Buckingham: Open University Press.
- McQuillan, J. (1998) *The Literacy Crisis: False Claims and Real Solutions*, Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Meeus, W. H. J., & Raaijmakers, Q. A. W. (1987) Administrative obedience as a social phenomenon. In W. Doise & S. Moscovici (Eds.). *Current Issues in European Social Psychology* (Vol. 2) (pp. 183-230). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Mesquita, B. (2001) Emotions in collectivist and individualist contexts, *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 80, pp. 68-74.
- Messick, D. M., & Cock, K. S. (Eds.). (1983) *Equity Theory: Psychological and Sociological Perspectives*, New York: Praeger.
- Meyer, H. H. (1980) Self-appraisal of job performance, *Personnel Psychology*, 33, pp. 291-295.
- Michael, S. (10.9.1999) You scratch my heart, *Ma'ariv* (a daily newspaper), New-year's supplement (p. 9). (Hebrew)
- Middlewood, D. (2001) Managing teacher appraisal and performance in the United Kingdom: pendulum swings, In D. Middlewood and C. Cardno (Eds.) *Managing Teacher Appraisal and Performance* (pp. 125-140), London: Routledge Falmer.
- Middlewood, D. (1997) Managing appraisal, In T. Bush and D. Middlewood (Eds.) *Managing People in Education*, London: Paul Chapman.
- Middlewood, D., Blount, J., Sherman, M. & Fay, C. (1995) *Evaluation of Teacher Appraisal in Northamptonshire*, Northampton, Northants County Council.

- Middlewood, D. & Cardno, C. (2001) The significance of teacher performance and its appraisal, In D. Middlewood and C. Cardno (Eds.) *Managing Teacher Appraisal and Performance* (pp. 1-16), London: Rutledge Flamer.
- Mikulincer, M. (1998) Adult attachment style and affect regulation: Strategic variations in self-appraisal, *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 75, pp. 420-435.
- Milgram, S. (1974) *Obedience to Authority*, New York: Harper and Row.
- Miller, W. I. (1993) *Humiliation*, Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Millman, J., & Darling-Hammond, L. (Eds.) *The New Handbook of Teacher Evaluation*, London: Sage Publications.
- Ministry of Education: the general director circular, 2.12.2001, 64/4 (2). (Hebrew)
- Ministry of Education (1997) *The Educational System Evaluated 1992-1997*. Jerusalem. (Hebrew)
- Mintzberg, H. (1973) *The Nature of Managerial Work*, New York: Harper Collins.
- Mitchell, T. R., & O'Reilly, C. A. (1983) Managing poor performance productivity in organizations, *Research in Personnel and Human Resources Management*, 1, pp. 201-234.
- Mitchell, T. R., Green, S. G., & Wood, R. E. (1981) An attributional model of leadership and the poor performing subordinate: Development and validation. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 3, pp. 197-234.
- Morand, D. A. (2001) Language and power: an empirical analysis of linguistic strategies used in superior-subordinate communication, *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 21, pp. 235-248.
- Morrill, C. (1992) Vengeance among executives, *Virginia Review of Sociology*, 1, pp. 51-76.
- Mowday, R. T., & Sutton, R. I. (1993) Organizational behavior: Linking individuals and groups to organizational context, *Annual Review of Psychology*, 44, pp. 95-229.
- Munton, A. G. (1990) Job relocation, stress and the family, *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 11, 401-406.
- Neugarten, B., & Datan, N. (1973) Sociological Perspectives on the life cycle, In P. Baltes & K. Schaie (Eds.), *Life-span Development Psychology: Adult Socialization* (pp. 53-69), New York: Academic Press.
- Nevo, D. (1987) Various aspects in clarification the meaning of evaluative action – the case of the matriculation examinations, *Megamot*, 30, pp. 93-101. (Hebrew)
- Nevo, D. (1997) School-based evaluation: advantages and shortcomings of internal evaluation, In E. Paldi (ed.) *Education and the Challenges of Time* (pp. 274 - 283), Tel Aviv University Press – Ramot.
- Nicholson, R. S. Schuler & A. H. Van de Ven (Eds.). *The Blackwell Encyclopedic Dictionary of Organizational Behavior*, Cambridge, MA: Blackwell Publishers.
- Nixon, J. (1995) Appraisal at the crossroads, *Management in Education*, 5(3), pp. 41-45.
- Oakley, K. (1998) The performance assessment system: a portfolio assessment model for evaluating beginning teachers, *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education*, 11, pp. 323-341.
- Oatley, K., & Jenkins, J. M. (1996) *Understanding Emotions*, Oxford: Blackwell.

OFSTED/TTA (1996) *Joint Review of Head Teacher and Teacher Appraisal : Summary of Evidence*, London: TTA.

Oser, F. K., Dick, A., & Patry, J. L. (Eds.) (1992) *Effective and Responsible Teaching*, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Osgood, C. E., May, W. H., & Miron. M. S. (1975) *Cross-Cultural Universals of Affective Meaning*, Urbana, IL: Illinois University Press.

Ostell, A. and Oakland, S. (1995) *Head Teacher Stress, Coping and Health*, Hants, UK: Avebury.

Oxford Student's Dictionary for Hebrew Speakers, 2nd ed. (1993) Tel Aviv: Kernerman Publishing Ltd.

Painter, B. (February 2001) Using teaching portfolios, *Educational Leadership*, pp. 31-34.

Palker, P. (1980) How to deal with incompetent teacher, *Teacher*, 97(4), pp. 42-45.

Papa, M. J. & Canary, D. J. (1995) Conflict in organizations: A competence based approach, In A. M. Nicotera (Ed.), *Conflict and Organizations: Communicative Process* (pp.153-179). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Parkes, K. R. (1990) Coping, negative affectivity and the work environment: Additive and interactive predictors of mental health, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 75(4), pp. 399-409.

Parry, G. (1991) Teacher incompetence and the courts: the American experience, *Education and the Law*, 3(2), 71-78.

Pascal, C., & Ribbins, P. (1998) Regarding heads: primary lives and careers, In C. Pascal and P. Ribbins (Eds.), *Understanding Primary Head Teachers* (pp. 1-30), London: Cassell.

Patton, M. Q. (1997) *Utilization focused evaluation: The New Century Text*, Thousands Oaks, CA: Sage.

Patton, M. Q. (1987) *How to Use Qualitative Methods in Evaluation*, London: Sage Publications.

Payne, R. L. and Hartley, J. (1987) A test of a model for explaining the affective experience of unemployed men, *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 60, pp. 31-47.

Peace, W. H. (1991) The hard work of being a soft manager, *Harvard Business Review*, (reprinted in December 2001, pp. 99-104.)

Peachey, D. E. (1989) What people want from mediation. In K. Kressel., D. G. Pruitt & Associates (Eds.), *Mediation Research: The Process and Effectiveness of Third-Party Intervention* (pp. 300-321), San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Pelled, L. H., & Xin, K. R. (1999) Down and out: An investigation of the relationships between mood and employee withdrawal behavior, *Journal of Management*, 25, pp. 875-895.

Pennington, M. (1996) *Norfolk Appraisal 1991 – 1995*, Norwich, Norfolk County Council.

Peters, T., & Waterman, R. H. (1984) *In Search of Excellence*, New York: Warner Books.

Peterson, W. (1964) Age, teachers' role and the institutional setting, In D. Biddle & W. Ellena (Eds.), *Contemporary Research on Teacher effectiveness* (pp. 268-315), New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Phillips, A. S. & Bedeian, A. G. (1994) Leader-follower exchange quality: The role of personal and interpersonal attributes, *Academy of Management Journal*, 37, pp. 990-1001.

- Phillips, W., & Young, B. (1997) Just caring? Supervisors talk about working with incompetent teachers, *Journal of Educational Thought/Revue de la Pensee Educative*, 31 (2), pp. 105-21.
- Pines, A.M., & Aronson, E. (1988) *Career Burnout*, New York: Free Press.
- Pinkley, R. L. (1990) Dimensions of conflict frame: Disputant interpretations of conflict, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 75, pp. 117-126.
- Podsakoff, P. M., & Schriesheim, C. A. (1985) Field studies of French and Raven's bases of power: Critique, reanalysis, reanalysis, and suggestions for future research, *Psychological Bulletin*, 97, pp. 387-411.
- Pondy, L. R. (1969) Varieties of organizational conflict, *Science Quarterly*, 14, pp. 499-505.
- Popper, M (1999). Leadership: The wood and its pathways. In I. Gonen and E. Zakay *Leadership and Leadership Development* (pp. 19-34), Tel Aviv: The Ministry of Defense Publishing. (Hebrew)
- Popper, M. (1994) *On Managers as Leaders*, Tel Aviv: Ramot, Tel Aviv University Press.
- Powell, G. (1988) *Women and Men in Management*, California: Sage.
- PPF Survey No. 139 (1985) *Employee Discipline and Discharges*, Washington, D.C.: Bureau of National Affairs, pp. 17-18.
- Prein, H. (1987) Strategies for third party intervention, *Human Relations*, 40, 706-719.
- Prick, L. (1986) *Career Development and Satisfaction among Secondary High School Teachers*. Amsterdam: Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam.
- Pruitt, D. J., & Carnevale, P. J. (1993) *Negotiation in Social Conflict*, Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole.
- Putallaz, M (1987) Maternal behaviour and children's sociometric status, *Child Development*, 58, 324-340.
- Rafaeli, A. and Sutton, R. I. (1989) The expression of emotion in organizational life, In B. M. Staw & L. L. Cummings (Eds.), *Research in Organizational Behavior* (Vol. 11), Greenwich, CT: JAI Press, pp. 1-42.
- Rahe, R. H. (1968) Life changes measurement as a predictor of illness, *Proceedings of the Royal Society of Medicine*, 11, 91-93.
- Rahim, M.A. (1992) *Managing Conflict in Organizations* (2nd ed), Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Rahim, M. A. (1985) A strategy for managing conflict in complex organizations. *Human Relations*, 38, 81-89.
- Rahim, M.A. & Bonoma, T. V. (1979) Managing organizational conflict: A model for diagnosis and intervention, *Psychological Reports*, 44, 36-48.
- Reinhold, B. B (1996) *Toxic Work*, New York: Penguin.
- Ribore, R. W. (1991) *Personnel Administration in Education*, Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Rich, J. M. (1988) Reducing teacher incompetence, *Planning and Changing*, 19 (2), pp. 118-123.
- Robbins, S. P. (1998) *Organizational Behavior* (8th edition), Upper Saddle River, NJ: Simon and Schuster.

- Robbins, T. L., & DeNisi, A. S. (1998) Mood vs. interpersonal affect: Identifying process and rating distortions in performance appraisal, *Journal of Business Psychology*, 12, pp. 313-325.
- Robertson, I. (1987) *Sociology* (3rd ed.) New York: Worth Publishers.
- Robinson, V. M. J. (2001) Embedding leadership in task performance, In k. C. Wong & C. Evers (Eds.). *Leadership for Quality Schooling*, London: Falmer.
- Roseman, I. J., Wiest, C., & Swartz, T. S. (1994) Phenomenology, behaviors, and goals differentiate discrete emotions, *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 67, pp. 206-211.
- Rosen, S., & Tesser, A. (1970) On reluctance to communicate undesirable information: The MUM-effect, *Sociometry*, 33, pp. 253-263.
- Rosenberg, M. J., & Hovland, C. I. (1960) Cognitive, affective, and behavioral components of attitudes, In M. J. Rosenberg, C. I., W. J. McGuire, R. P. Abelson, & J. W. Brehm (Eds.), *Attitude organization and Change* (pp.1-14). New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Rosenblatt, Z., & Somech, A. (1998) The work behavior of Israeli elementary school principals: Expectations versus reality, *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 34, 505-532.
- Rosseau, D. M. (1998) LMX meets the psychological contract: Looking inside the black box of leader-member exchange, In F. Dansereau & F. J. Yammarino (Eds.), *Leadership: The Multiple Level Approaches, Contemporary and Alternative* (pp. 149-154), Stamford, CT: JAI Press.
- Rubin, J.Z., Pruitt, G. G., & Kim, S. H. (1994) *Social Conflict: Escalation, Stalemate, and Settlement* (2nd ed.), New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Russell, J. A., & Carroll, J. M. (1999) On the bipolarity of positive and negative affect, *Psychological Bulletin*, 125, pp. 3-30.
- Ryff, C., & Baltes, B. (1976) Value transition and adult development of women, *Developmental Psychology*, 12, 567- 578.
- Sa'ar, R. The discrimination of Arabs is expressed in school grades, *Ha'aretz*, 5.12.2001. (Hebrew)
- Sagy, S., Orr, E., & Bar-On, D. (1999) Individualism and collectivism in Israeli society: Comparing religious and secular high-school students, *Human Relations*, 52, pp. 327-340.
- Sahin, E. (1998) Practices used by Arizona school districts dealing with incompetent teachers, *Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association*. San Diego: CA.
- Saunders, D. M., Sheppard, B. H., Knight, V., & Roth, J. (1992) Employee voice to supervisors, *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal*, 5, pp. 241-259.
- Sawyer, L. (February, 2001) Revamping a teacher evaluation system, *Educational Leadership*, pp. 44-47.
- Scandura, T. A., & Graen, G. B. (1984) Moderating effects of initial leader-member exchange status on the effects of a leadership intervention, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 69, pp. 428-436.
- Schein, E. (1978) *Career Dynamics*, Reading, MA: Addison Wesley.
- Scherer, K. R. (2001) Emotion, In M. Hewstone & W. Stroebe (Eds.) *Introduction to Social Psychology* (3rd ed) (pp. 151-197), Oxford: Blackwell.
- Scherer, K. R. (1986) Studying emotion empirically: issues and a paradigm for research, In R. S. Scherer., H. G. Wallbott., & A. B. Summerfield (Eds.) *Experiencing Emotion: A Cross-Cultural Study*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Scherer, K. R., Wallbott, H. G., & Summerfield, A. B. (Eds.) (1986) *Experiencing Emotion: A Cross-Cultural Study*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schlenker, B. R., Weigold, M. F., Hallam, J. R. (1990) Self-serving attributions in social context: Effects of self-esteem and social pressure, *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 58, pp. 855-863.

Schmuck, P. A. (1986) School management and administration: an analysis by gender, In E. Hoyle and A. McMahon (Eds.) *The Management of Schools, World Yearbook of Education 1986*, London: Kogan Page.

Schneider, D. J., Turkat, D. (1975) Self-presentation following success or failure: Defensive self-esteem models, *Journal of Personality*, 43, pp. 127-135.

Schwartz, N. (1990) Feelings as information, Informational and motivational functions of affective states, In E. T. Higgins & R. M. Sorrentino (Eds.) *Handbook of Motivation and Cognition: Foundations of Social Behavior* (Vol. 2) (pp. 527-561). New York: Guilford Press.

Schwartz, N., & Clore G. L. (1983) Mood, misattribution and judgment of well-being: Informative and directive functions of affective states, *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 45, 513-523.

Scriven, M. (1994) Duties of the teacher, *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education*, 8, pp. 151-184.

Selye, H. (1982) History and present status of the stress concept, In L. Goldberger & S. Breznitz (Eds.), *Handbook of Stress: Theoretical and Clinical Aspects*, New York: Free Press.

Sergiovani, T. (1994) Organization or communities? Changing the metaphor changes the theory, *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 30(2), pp. 214-226.

Shaver, P.R., & Schwartz, J. (1992) Cross cultural similarities and differences in emotions and representations; A prototypes approach, In M. s. Clark (Ed.) *Emotion: Review of Personality and Social Psychology*, Newbury Park, CA: Sage (pp. 175-213).

Shaver, P.R., Schwartz, J., Kirson, D., & O'Connor, C. (1987) Emotions knowledge: Further exploration of prototype approach, *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 52, pp. 1061-1081.

Sherif, M. (1966) *In Common Predicament: Social Psychology of Inter-group conflict and Cooperation*, Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Sherman, A. (2001) Women managing/managing women, *Educational Management and Administration*, 28(2), 133-143.

Shinkfield, A. J. & Stufflebeam, D. (1995) *Teacher Evaluation: Guide to Effective Practice*, Boston: KAP.

Shuval, J. T. (1982) Migration and stress, In L. Goldberger & S. Breznitz (Eds.), *Handbook of Stress: Theoretical and Clinical Aspects*, New York: Free Press.

Sikes, P. J., Measor, L., & Woods, P. (1985) *Teacher career, crises and continuities*, London: Falmer.

Singleton, R. A., Straits, B. C., & Straits, M. M (1993) *Approaches to Social Research* (2nd ed.), Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Smith, P. C., & Kendall, L. M. (1963) Retranslation of expectations: An approach to the construction of unambiguous anchors for rating scales, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 47, pp. 149-155.

Smith, W. J., Harrington, K. V., & Houghton, J. D. (2000) Predictors of performance appraisal discomfort: a preliminary examination, *Public Personnel Management*, 29(1), pp. 21-31.

- Snyder, M. (1974) Self-monitoring of expressive behavior, *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 30, 526-537.
- Snyder, M., & DeBono, K. G. (1987) A functional approach to attitudes and persuasion, In M. P. Zanna., J. M. Olson, & C. P. Herman (Eds.), *Social Influence: The Ontario Symposium* (Vol. 55) (pp. 107-125). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Sorolla, R. G. (2001) Guilty pleasures and grim necessities: Affective attitudes in dilemmas of self-control, *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 80(2), pp. 206-221.
- Sparks, R., & Lipka, R. P. (1992) Characteristics of master teachers: personality factors, self-concept, locus of control, and pupil ideology, *Journal of Personal Evaluation in Education*, 5, 303-311.
- Sparks, R., & Lipka, R. P. (1991) Selecting master teachers: A preliminary study, *Journal of Personal Evaluation in Education*, 4(4), 367-373.
- Spence, J. T., and Helmreich, R. L. (1978) *Masculinity and Femininity: Their Psychological Dimensions, Correlates, and Antecedents*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Spitzberg, B. H., Canary, D. J., & Cupach, W. R. (1994) A competence-based approach to the study of interpersonal conflict, In D. Chan (Ed.). *Conflict in Personal Relationships* (pp. 183-202). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Sroufe, A. (1978) The ontogenesis of emotion, In J. Osofsky (Ed.), *Handbook of infancy* (pp. 462-516), New York: Wiley.
- State of Israel, civil service court 88/14, June 1988. (Hebrew)
- Staner, R. (1966) *Educational laws, legislation, interpretation and court decisions*, Jerusalem: Igra Publishers. (Hebrew)
- Staples, S. R. (1991) A study of tenured teacher dismissals in Virginia, 1987-1990, Doctoral dissertation, Virginia State University. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 52, 49.
- State of Israel, Ministry of Education (1998), *Facts and Figures About the Education and Culture in Israel 1998*, Jerusalem.
- State of Israel, Ministry of Education (15.4.1996) Director of department for teaching personnel's circular. (Hebrew)
- State of Israel, Supreme Court (1989), 89/3-123. Benjamin Fuchs vs. Iskar Ltd. Nahariya, verdict 21, 343. (Hebrew)
- State of Israel, Civil Service Court 87/2, February 1987.
- State if Israel, civil service court 86/20, January 1986.
- State of Israel, Ministry of Education (1985), director of department for teaching personnel's circular 85/7.
- State if Israel, civil service court 85/2, January 1985.
- State of Israel Government (1982), Civil service regulation [teachers], section 82.233
- State if Israel, civil service court 81/3, April 1981.
- State of Israel. Law of civil service [discipline] 1963, section 4.
- State of Israel, Education Order (1933) (Hebrew)

- Steinmetz, L. (1969) *Managing the Marginal and Unsatisfactory performer*, Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Sternberg, R. J., & Dobson, D. M. (1987) Resolving interpersonal conflicts: An analysis of stylistic consistency, *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 52, 794-812.
- Stewart, R. (1991) *Managing Today and Tomorrow*, Basingstoke, UK: Macmillan.
- Stewart, R. (1982) *Choices for the Manager*, Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Stoerbe, W., & Jonas, K. (2001) Health psychology, In M. Hewstone and W. Stoerbe (Eds.) *Introduction to Social Psychology* (3rd ed.), Oxford: Blackwell.
- Stokes, C. (2000) *Appraisal in West Northshire: Primary Head's Practice, Working Papers in Education*, No. 1, pp. 51-87, Leicester: University of Leicester Press.
- Stuckless, N., & Goranson, R. (1992) The vengeance scale: Development of a measure of attitude toward revenge, *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality*, 7, pp. 25-42.
- Suh, E., Diener, E., Oishi, S., & Triandis, H. C. (1998) The shifting basis of life satisfaction judgments across cultures: Emotions versus norms, *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 74, pp. 482-493.
- Sulsky, L. M., & Balzer, W. K. (1988) Meaning and measurement of performance rating accuracy: Some methodological and theoretical concerns, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 73, pp. 497-506.
- Sweeney, J., and Manatt, D. (April, 1984) A team approach to supervising the marginal teacher, *Educational Leadership*, 25-27.
- Tang, T., & Sarsfield-Baldwin, L. (1991) The effect of self-esteem, task label, and performance feedback on goals setting, certainty and attribution, *Journal of Psychology*, 125, pp. 413-418.
- Tannenbaum, R., & Schmidt, W. H. (1973) How to choose a leadership pattern, *Harvard Business Review*, May-June, 162-180.
- Taub, D. (1993) The legal aspect of teachers' appointment, *Iyunim BeMinhal u'Beirgun Hachinuch* (Studies in Educational Administration and Organization), 19, pp. 93-110. (Hebrew)
- Taub, D. (1997) The legal aspect of teachers' dismissals in the educational system, *Iyunim BeMinhal u'Beirgun Hachinuch* (Studies in Educational Administration and Organization), 23, pp. 127-147. (Hebrew)
- Taylor, J. A. (1953) A personality scale of manifest anxiety, *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 48, 285-290.
- Taylor, P. J., & Pierce, J. L. (1999) Effects of introducing a performance management system on employees' subsequent attitudes and effort, *Public Personnel Management*, 28(3), pp. 423-452.
- Tellegen, A. (1982) *Brief Manual of the Differential Personality Questionnaire*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Tesser, A. & Rosen, S. (1975) The reluctance to transmit bad news, In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, (Vol. 8) (pp. 193-232). New York: Academic Press.
- Thayer, R. E. (1996) *The Origin of Everyday Mood*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Theorell, T., Blomkvist, V., Jonsson, H., Schulman, S., Brentorp, E., & Stigendale, L. (1995) Social support and the development of immune functions in human immunodeficiency virus infection, *Psychosomatic Medicine*, 57, 32-36.

- Thibaut, J. W., & Kelley, H. H. (1959) *The Social Psychology of Groups*, New York: Wiley.
- Thomas, K. W. (1992) Conflict and negotiation process in organizations, In M. D. Dunnette & L. M. Hough (Eds.), *Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology* (Vol.3, 2nd ed) (pp. 651-717).
- Thrupp, M. (1999) *Schools Making a Difference. Let's be Realistic!*, Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Tinsley, C. H., & Brett, J. M. (2001) Managing workplace conflict in the United States and Hong Kong, *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 85(2), pp. 360-381.
- Tjosvold, D. (1984) Cooperation theory and organizations, *Human Relations*, 37, 743-767.
- Tjosvold, D. (1981) Unequal power relationships within a cooperative or competitive context, *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 11, 137-150.
- Travers, C. J., & Cooper, C. L. (1996) *Teachers Under Pressure: Stress in the Teaching Profession*, London: Routledge.
- Travis, C. (1989) *Anger: The Misunderstood Emotion* (2nd ed), New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Triandis, H. C. (1995) *Individualism and Collectivism*, Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Triandis, H. (1972) *The Analysis of Subjective Culture*, New York: Wiley.
- Tucker, P. (February, 2001) Helping struggling teachers, *Educational Leadership*, 52-55.
- Tucker, P. (1997) Lake Wobegon: Where all teachers are competent (or have we come to terms with the problem of incompetent teachers?), *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education*, 11, 103-126.
- Turner, G., & Clift, P. (1988) *Studies in Teacher Appraisal*, London: The Falmer Press.
- Uhl-Bien, M., Graen, G., & Scandura, T. (2000) Implications of leader-member exchange (LMX) for strategic human resource management systems: Relationships & social capital for competitive advantage, In G. R. Ferris (Ed.) *Research in Personnel and Human Resource Management* (Vol. 18) (pp. 137-185), Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Ury, W. L., Brett, J. M., & Goldberg, S. B. (1988) *Getting Disputes Resolved: Designing systems to cut the costs of conflict*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Usher, R. (1996) A critique of the neglected epistemological assumptions of educational research, In D. Scott and R. Usher (Eds.) *Understanding Educational Research*, London: Routledge.
- VanYperen, N. W., & Vliert, E. van de (2001) Social psychology in organizations, In M. Hewstone & W. Stroebe (Eds.) *Introduction to Social Psychology* 3rd ed. (pp. 559-585), Oxford: Blackwell.
- Vecchio, R. P. (1997) Are you in or out with your boss? In R. P. Vecchio (Ed.), *Leadership: Understanding the Dynamics of Power and Influence in Organizations* (pp. 274-277), Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press.
- Vecchio, R. P. (1995) It is not easy being green: Jealousy and envy in the workplace, In G. R. Ferris (Ed.), *Research in Personnel and Human Resources Management*, Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Vecchio, R. P., & Godbel, B. C. (1984) The vertical dyad linkage model of leadership: Problems and prospects, *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 34, 5-20.
- Veenman, S. (1982) Perceived problems of beginning teachers, *Review of Educational Research*, 54, 143-178.

- Viorst, J. (1998) *Imperfect Control*, New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Vliert, E. van de (1998) Conflict and conflict management, In J. D. Drenth., H. Thierry & Wolff, C. J. de (Eds.) *Personnel Psychology* (2nd ed.), Hove, UK: Psychology Press. pp 351-376.
- Vliert, E. van de (1997) *Complex Interpersonal Conflict behavior: Theoretical frontier*, Hove, UK: Psychology Press.
- Vliert, E. van de. Nauta, A., Vermunt, R., & Wike, H. A. M. (1999) Constructive conflict at work, *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 20, pp. 475-491.
- Vroom, V. H. (2000) Leadership and the decision-making process, *Organizational Dynamics*, 28(4), pp. 82-94.
- Walker, A., & Stott, K. (2000) Performance improvement in schools: a case of overdose? *Educational Management and Administration*, 28(1), pp. 63-76.
- Wall, V. D., & Nolan, L. L. (1986) Perceptions of inequity, satisfaction and conflict in task-oriented groups. *Human Relations*, 39, pp. 1033-1051.
- Walster, E., Walster, G. W., Berscheid, E. (1978) *Equity: Theory and Research*, Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Walton, R. E. (1987) *Managing Conflict: Interpersonal Dialogue and Third Party Roles* (2nd ed.), Reading, MA: Addison Wesley.
- Walton, R. E. (1969) *Interpersonal Peacemaking: Confrontations and Third Party Consultation*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Walton, R. E., Dutton, J. M., & Cafferty, T. P. (1969) Organizational context and intradepartmental conflict, *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 14, pp. 522-542.
- Wargeft. N. (1.10.2001) The end of tenure, *Yediot Aharonot*, The business supplement (p. 10). (Hebrew)
- Watson, D. & Clark, L. A. (1984) Negative affectivity: The disposition to experience aversive emotional states. *Psychological Bulletin*, 96, pp. 465-490.
- Watson, D. & Tellegen, A. (1985) Toward a consensual structure of mood. *Psychological Bulletin*, 98, pp. 219-235.
- Watson, D., Clark, L. A., & Tellegen, A. (1988) Development and validation of brief measures of positive and negative affect: The PANAS Scales. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 54, pp. 1063-1070.
- Weening, M. W. H., Groenenboom, A. W. J., & Wilke, H. A. M. (2001) Bad news transmission as a function of the definitiveness of consequences and the relationships between communicator and recipient, *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 80 (3), pp. 449-461,
- Weiss, H. M., Suckow, K., & Cropanzano, R. (1999) Effects of justice conditions on discrete emotions, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 84, pp. 786-794.
- West-Burnham, J. (1993) *Appraisal Training Resource Manual: Implementing Teacher Appraisal in Schools*, Harlow; Longman.
- White, M. (1995) *Re-Authoring Lives: Interviews and Essays*, Adelaide, South Australia: Dulwich Centre Publications.

- Whitener, E. M., Brodt, S. E., Krosgaard, M. A., & Werner, J. M. (1998) Managers as initiators of trust: An exchange relationship framework for understanding managerial trustworthy behavior, *Academy of Management Review*, 23, pp. 513-530.
- Williams, P. (1994) The disciplining of government school teachers: An antipodean approach, *Education and the Law*, 6(4), pp. 221-233.
- Wise, C. (2000) Monitoring role of academic managers in schools, *Educational Management & Administration*, 29(3), pp. 333-341.
- Wragg, E. C. (1993) *Primary Teaching Skills*, London: Routledge.
- Wragg, E. C., Haynes, G. S., Wragg, C. M. & Chamberlin, R. P. (1999) Managing Incompetent Teachers, leeds.ac.uk/educol/documents/00001235.htm
- Wragg, E. C., Haynes, G. S., Wragg, C. M. & Chamberlin, R. P. (2000) *Failing Teachers?* London: Routledge.
- Wragg, E. C., Wikeley, F. J. Wragg, C. M., & Haynes, G. G. (1996) *Teacher Appraisal Observed*, London: Routledge.
- Wright, M. R. (1981) *Empedocles, the Extant Fragments*, New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Yanai-Yaffe, O (2000) *Career Healing*, Tel Aviv: Modan. (Hebrew)
- Yariv, E. (1999) *Silence in class!* Even-Yehuda: Reches Publishing House. (Hebrew).
- Yariv, E. (2000) Emotions as a managerial tool: A preliminary study, in H. Busher., M. Coleman., & M. Morrison (Eds.) *Addressing Conflict Between Teachers' Professional Needs and Organizational Demands*, University of Leicester, School of Education, Working Papers No. 3. (pp 41-66).
- Yariv, E., & Coleman, M. (2001) An application of educational management theories on the basis of solving discipline problems by heads, Unpublished paper, University of Leicester.
- Yukl, G. (1999) An evaluation of conceptual weaknesses in transformational and charismatic leadership theories, *Leadership Quarterly*, 10(2), pp. 285-305.
- Yukl, G. (1998) *Leadership in Organizations* (4th ed.), Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Zalesny, M. D., & Graen, G. (1978) Exchange theory in leadership research, In A. Kieser. G. Reber & R. Wanderer (Eds.). *Handbook of Leadership* (pp. 714-727), Stuttgart: Paeschel, Veriag.
- Zaleznik, A. (June, 1975) Managers as leaders: Are they different? *Harvard Business Review*, 235-248.
- Zaleznik, A., & Kets De Vries, M. F. R. (1975) *Power and the Corporate Mind*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co.
- Zimbardo, P. G. (1977) *Skyness*, New York: Addison Wesley.
- Zuckerman, M., DePaulo, B., & Rosenthal, R. (1986). Humans as deceivers and lie detectors, In: P. Blanck, R. Buck, R. Rosenthal (Eds.) *Nonverbal Communication in the Clinical Context*. University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Zuckerman, M., DePaulo, B., & Rosenthal, R. (1981). Verbal and non-verbal communication of deception, In: L. Berkowitz (Ed.) *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 14). New York: Academic Press.

Activities and management styles

Principal questionnaire - Appendix 1

Enclosed several statements, which refer to your activities and management style as a principal toward _____ (name of teacher). Please indicate on the left sideline the number which represents most accurately to your opinion the frequency of the below mentioned behaviors.

Many times - 5

Several times - 4

Few times - 3

1-2 times - 2

Never - 1

_____ I expressed my expectations from him/her (e.g. I would like your class achievements get improved next semester)

_____ I asked him/her to take care for an urgent matter.

_____ I demanded forcefully from him/her to perform a task, even if it was against his/her will

_____ We discussed his/her students' achievements.

_____ I insisted s/he would follow my directions.

_____ I visited his/her class to observe a lesson (follow-up on implementing teaching methods, examining the source for certain disorder etc.)

_____ We decided together what targets s/he is expected to perform.

_____ I asked the teacher to submit a detailed report of implementing the curriculum, field trip and other activities s/he performed.

_____ I reprimanded him/her when s/he did not follow the rules (e.g. late coming).

_____ I devoted much time and resources to solve problems s/he raised.

_____ I expressed my trust in him/her.

_____ I consulted with him/her.

_____ I praised his/her successes.

_____ I generously offered him/her to use all the facilities and equipment (Xeroxing, telephones, secretary etc.) to accomplish his/her duties.

_____ I made sure s/he would get assistance to help with a student's difficulties.

_____ I listened carefully to him/her.

_____ I guided how to overcome difficulties s/he faced while doing a task I gave him/her.

_____ I refused to his/her request.

Management style toward the staff

Principal questionnaire - Appendix 2

Enclosed several statements, which refer to your activities and management style as a principal toward the staff. Please indicate on the left sideline the number which represents most accurately to your opinion the frequency of the below mentioned behaviors.

Many times – 5

Several times – 4

Few times – 3

1-2 times – 2

Never – 1

- _____ I express expectation from the staff with regard to my plans.
- _____ I tend to ask teachers to take care for urgent matters.
- _____ When teachers object my requests, I insist they should perform it.
- _____ I meet with the various teams and teachers to monitor advancement and difficulties.
- _____ I remark in staff meeting to teachers (without mentioning names) that misbehaved.
- _____ I provide teachers with duties they have to perform in upcoming events.
- _____ When problems arise, I try to find out the what were the reasons.
- _____ I direct teachers by asking questions (e.g. should we meet with the parents?)
- _____ I meet with teachers to decide together what are the targets they are expected to perform in the near future.
- _____ I reprimand teachers who did not fulfill their duties

- _____ I take care for the working conditions of the teachers (e.g. decorate and. purchase equipment for the teacher's room and the classrooms etc.)
- _____ I encourage team-building activities (e.g. take the staff to a restaurant, day trip etc)
- _____ I publicize orally and in written material the activities and achievements of my teachers.
- _____ I disseminate detailed information to the teachers.
- _____ I enable teachers to call me at home whenever it is necessary.
- _____ When teachers object my requests, I tend to accept their point of view.
- _____ I encourage my teachers to study and get professionally developed.
- _____ When teachers object my requests, I consider the arguments, do not bend by the pressures, and decide for the benefit of the subject itself.
- _____ I assist teachers with the curricular and educational programs they initiate.
- _____ When problems arise, I fully back my teachers against anyone who complains (parents, local media, Ministry of Education, local authority etc)
- _____ I refuse to teachers' exceptional requests if they disturb daily routines.

Teacher's appraisal

Principal questionnaire - Appendix 3

Enclosed several statements that appraise _____ (name) the teacher's work. Each pair of statements describes a dimension of behavior (or the class condition as influenced by the teacher's acts). Please mark a circle on the line (I) between each pair of statements, which mostly fit your opinion on the teacher's behavior.

1	The teacher shows genuine interest in pupils	1 1 1 1 1 1	The teacher is not interested in his/her pupils
2	The teacher use varied didactic methods in his/her lessons	1 1 1 1 1 1	The teacher doesn't use varied didactic methods
3	Many pupils appreciate the teacher	1 1 1 1 1 1	Many pupils do not appreciate the teacher
4	Many discipline problems occur at the teacher's lessons	1 1 1 1 1 1	No discipline problems occur at the teacher's lessons
5	The teacher encourages students for an independent learning.	1 1 1 1 1 1	The teacher does not encourage students for an independent learning.
6	The teacher invests only minimal efforts at work	1 1 1 1 1 1	The teacher invests efforts at work beyond the required.
7	The teacher adjust teaching methods to the students needs	1 1 1 1 1 1	The teacher does not adjust teaching methods to the students needs
8	Pupils do not show interest in the teacher's lessons.	1 1 1 1 1 1	Pupils show interest in the teacher's lessons.
9	Almost all the students reach excellent mastery of the thought material	1 1 1 1 1 1	Only few students reach excellent mastery of the thought material
10	The teacher does not manage to advance his/her weak students.	1 1 1 1 1 1	The teacher manages to advance also the weak students in his/her class.
11	The teacher often refer to the principal problem students	1 1 1 1 1 1	The teacher rarely refers to the principal problem students.
12	Parents have no complaints toward the teacher	1 1 1 1 1 1	Parents frequently complain about the teacher
13	The teacher activates a lot the students in his/her lessons	1 1 1 1 1 1	The teacher almost does not activate the students in his/her lessons
14	The teacher behaves respectfully to his/ her students	1 1 1 1 1 1	The teacher disregard his/ her students
15	The teacher does not manage to carry into effect his/her students' potential.	1 1 1 1 1 1	The teacher manages to carry into effect his/her students' potential.
16	The teacher invests extra efforts to advance weak students.	1 1 1 1 1 1	The teacher does not invests much efforts to advance weak students.

17	The teacher raises high motivation to learn among his/her students.	1 1 1 1 1 1	The teacher doesn't manage to raise high motivation to learn among his/her students.
18	The teacher knows his/her students only superficially.	1 1 1 1 1 1	The teacher deeply knows his/her students.
19	The teacher is open for inventions.	1 1 1 1 1 1	The teacher is not open for inventions.
20	Many students love the teacher.	1 1 1 1 1 1	Many students do not love the teacher.
21	The teacher manages to tie good relations with parents.	1 1 1 1 1 1	The teacher does not manage to tie good relations with parents.
22	Overall, the teacher well performs his/her duties.	1 1 1 1 1 1	Overall, the teacher does not function well.

Principal – teacher relationships

Principal questionnaire - Appendix 4

As a principal you have close relationships with your staff members. These relations are accompanied with emotions, some positive and some negative. Some feelings are short lived while others stay with us for long time.

When you think about relationships you have with _____ please indicate to what extent have you felt the below mentioned emotions in the last month.

Very often – 4

Quite often – 3

Sometimes – 2

Rarely – 1

Never – 0

When I think about our relationships, I feel pride _____

When I think about our relationships, I feel guilt _____

When I think about our relationships, I feel anger (hostility) _____

When I think about our relationships, I feel gratitude _____

When I think about our relationships, I feel happiness _____

When I think about our relationships, I feel ashamed of him/her _____

When I think about our relationships, I feel fear _____

When I think about our relationships, I feel appreciation _____

When I think about our relationships, I feel envy _____

When I think about our relationships, I feel hope _____

When I think about our relationships, I feel rejection _____

When I think about our relationships, I feel sadness _____

When I think about our relationships, I feel indifference _____

When I think about our relationships, I feel superiority _____

When I think about our relationships, I feel frustration _____

When I think about our relationships, I feel compassion _____

An interview with a principal

Appendix 5

Principals do their best to help teachers who have difficulties. Along with the competent and devoted teachers, there are also staff members who do not teach well, have discipline difficulties at their lessons, whose students complain about them. In some cases, parents, colleague-teachers and students draw your attention to the problems they have. The treatment for such problems is a sensitive and sometimes painful. Could you please help me understand this issue?

In order to protect the anonymity of your school, your teachers and yourself, I ask you not to mention any name and other identifying details. I am committed to secure any part of our discussion, and not transmit it to anyone. I will send you a full transcript of the content of this interview for your approval. Also, if I decide to quote things you said, it would be without any identifying details. Please answer sincerely.

School code _____

1. Personal information

- (a) How long have you served in this position?
- (b) Briefly, what is your professional background?
- (c) How many teachers do you have in your staff? How many part time-teachers?
- (d) What is the students' enrolment to the school within the last three years?
- (e) How many teachers stopped working in the school within the last two years?
- (f) What were the reasons

Currently on a sabbatical leave _____

Currently on a birth vacation _____

Moved to another school _____

Promoted to higher position in another school _____

A teacher without tenure who finished to work _____

Stopped working as a teacher _____

Retired _____

Dismissed _____

2. What two traits you most appreciate in teachers who work here?

3. What two traits teachers in your staff would better not have?

4. What formal and informal tools do you use for teachers' evaluation? (Details)

As you know, in each organization there are about one-third of employees who perform below the average. It is estimated that 5% are poor-performing workers who do not bring the expected results and cause some difficulties. Managers would have been happy not to have them in the organization. Within the field of education I define these teachers as 'challenging', those who pose a challenge to the principal how to work with them.

5. How many “challenging teachers” had enrolled your staff within the last two years?

6. How many of whom had no tenure?

And now, can you recall a case of a challenging teacher whom you worked with?
(if the answer is no stop here, express appreciation)

Without revealing unnecessary:

- a. What subject did this teacher teach?
- b. What grade levels?
- c. Was this teacher male.....or female.....?
- d. How old was this teacher?
- e. How long had this person taught in your school?

What was the nature of the teacher’s difficulties in the school and classroom?

Which of these difficulties were the most serious?

To your knowledge did the other teachers generally like this teacher?

To your knowledge, what did students feel toward the teacher?

What type of information indicated that this teacher was having difficulties in the classroom?

- a. Inspector observation. _____
- b. Students’ complaints. _____
- c. Colleague teachers’ complaints. _____
- d. Rumours in staff room and elsewhere _____
- e. Student test results. _____
- f. Parents complaints _____
- g. Observation you made. _____
- h. Other (please specify) _____

What were the reasons, to your opinion, for the teacher’s difficulties? Which of the following reasons seems to be applicable.

- a. Difficult teaching assignments (for example, too many preparations, too many difficult students, too few resources). _____
- b. Shortcomings of the supervisor/principal _____
- c. Lack of professional knowledge and experience _____
- d. Lack of ability by the teacher. _____
- e. Lack of effort or motivation by the teacher _____
- f. Personal disorder of the teacher (for example, burned out, severe emotional distress, mental illness, alcoholism etc.) _____
- g. Outside influences (for example, marital problems, financial difficulties, conflicts, problem with children) _____
- h. Other (please specify) _____

Can you describe in a chronological order what were the efforts you made to solve the problem?

Was there any “peak” event?

Where other persons who assisted you?

Where other persons (e.g. school counsellor) or organizational frameworks that assisted the challenging teacher?

Did you express directly your dissatisfaction with his/her performance?

Orally_____ written_____

What pressures where put on you?

What did you feel toward that person?

Was there any moment or event, which changed your mind about the teacher?

Who else was involved in assisting helping that teacher?

What was the inspector’s role?

How was it ended? Why?

Do you have any additional thought, or may be regret about the nature of the treatment for that case?

What advice would you give a colleague principal who faces such case of a problematic teacher?

Factor analysis - demanding and giving questionnaires

Teachers' responses – Appendix 6

	Components										
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
TG2	.80	-.30	-.01	.08	.08	.21	.12	-.07	.20	.06	.00
TG7	.80	-.26	.18	.10	.11	.22	-.08	.15	.11	.07	.05
TG3	.79	-.10	.11	.07	-.06	-.02	.30	.07	-.04	-.02	-.08
TG4	.78	-.08	.25	.06	.07	-.02	.02	.28	.04	-.04	-.05
TG1	.70	-.23	.12	.21	.06	.20	.08	.30	.09	.02	.09
TG5	.69	-.09	.17	-.09	-.08	-.15	.02	-.01	.17	.17	.23
TG8	.68	-.19	.23	.24	.27	.18	.02	.21	-.05	.17	.07
TSG10	.66	-.09	.12	.07	.07	.34	-.09	-.19	.20	.19	.06
TG6	.61	.03	.43	.16	.12	-.05	-.07	-.02	-.06	.20	.01
TSG9	.58	-.26	.40	.03	.03	.32	.17	.13	.11	.08	-.07
TSD10	-.06	.82	.12	-.02	.07	.01	.03	.00	-.03	-.10	-.02
TD9	-.20	.79	-.04	.11	-.10	.00	.02	.10	-.09	.00	-.13
TD3	-.24	.78	-.09	.12	-.14	.03	.17	-.04	-.09	.02	-.09
TD5	-.28	.72	.00	.19	.03	-.12	.05	-.14	.04	-.01	.02
TSD5	.05	.68	-.14	-.11	.31	.13	.04	-.07	-.03	-.07	-.05
TSD3	-.13	.62	-.20	-.09	.22	-.23	.18	.01	.01	-.33	.29
TSG3	.18	-.02	.79	.04	-.05	.04	-.08	.09	.16	-.07	.02
TSG1	.44	.10	.57	-.05	-.08	.31	.15	.03	.25	.10	.00
TSG4	.27	-.14	.57	.09	-.11	.13	.11	.45	.01	-.05	-.02
TSD9	.32	-.08	.55	.03	.34	-.09	.03	.16	-.02	.32	.12
TSG8	.47	-.08	.49	.04	.10	.19	.00	.24	.21	-.13	.21
TSD8	.36	-.09	.45	.31	.25	.18	.16	-.14	-.28	-.30	-.08
TD8	.27	.03	.07	.76	.14	.03	.01	-.10	-.14	-.18	-.13
TD1	-.02	.17	.00	.70	-.12	-.09	.26	.00	.15	-.01	.20
TD7	.34	.00	.06	.64	.32	.12	.18	.11	-.02	.03	.08
TD6	-.09	.02	.03	.60	-.01	.20	-.24	.24	.06	.20	.05
TSD6	.06	.23	-.15	.04	.78	-.09	.12	.01	.08	-.06	-.10
TSD7	.16	-.04	.27	.16	.59	.28	.17	.27	.01	-.02	.12
TSG5	.28	.08	.10	.09	.04	.75	-.01	.18	-.10	-.02	.14
TSG6	.19	-.23	.21	.02	.02	.47	.04	-.03	.26	.33	-.30
TD2	.31	.13	-.08	.15	.00	-.10	.77	.20	.03	.08	-.14
TSD2	-.03	.28	.13	.01	.24	.14	.73	-.18	-.01	.00	.14
TSD4	.23	-.07	.31	.06	.22	.22	.00	.69	-.01	-.06	.02
TD4	.33	.05	.07	.49	.16	-.16	-.06	.51	.10	.27	.02
TSG2	.24	-.09	.34	.02	.14	-.11	-.09	.00	.77	.07	-.16
TSG7	.43	-.18	.01	.10	-.10	.18	.21	.07	.60	-.22	.14
TSG11	.27	-.25	-.05	.01	-.10	.07	.08	-.01	-.05	.73	.06
TG7	.27	-.39	.04	.10	-.09	.14	.08	-.03	-.02	.17	.60
TSD1	.03	-.01	.15	.22	.52	.02	-.18	.10	-.09	-.08	.53

Rotation method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization

Teacher – giving (TG)

Teacher – staff giving (TSG)