A COMPARISON OF MANAGEMENT AND LEADERSHIP SKILLS CRITICAL TO THE PRINCIPALSHIP AS PERCEIVED BY SUPERINTENDENTS IN SELECTED INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICTS IN TEXAS

A Dissertation

by

KATHERINE ALIA WHITE

Submitted to the Office of Graduate Studies of
Texas A&M University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

December 2005

Major Subject: Educational Administration

A COMPARISON OF MANAGEMENT AND LEADERSHIP SKILLS CRITICAL TO THE PRINCIPALSHIP AS PERCEIVED BY SUPERINTENDENTS IN SELECTED INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICTS IN TEXAS

A Dissertation

by

KATHERINE ALIA WHITE

Submitted to the Office of Graduate Studies of
Texas A&M University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Approved by:

Chair of Committee,	Stephen L. Stark
Committee Members,	John R. Hoyle
	Tim O. Peterson
	Virginia S. Collier
Head of Department,	Jim Scheurich

December 2005

Major Subject: Educational Administration

ABSTRACT

A Comparison of Management and Leadership Skills Critical to the Principalship as Perceived by Superintendents in Selected Independent School Districts in Texas. (December 2005)

Katherine Alia White, B.A., Our Lady of the Lake;

M.Ed., Our Lady of the Lake

Chair of Advisory Committee: Dr. Stephen L. Stark

The purpose of this study was to determine which management and leadership behaviors selected superintendents perceived as critical to the position of principal. Differences were examined by gender as well as size of district. A secondary goal of this research was to raise awareness regarding gender inequity that exists in educational administration.

The population of the study was all female superintendents in Texas (N=135) and randomly selected male superintendents (N=301). Data were disaggregated by gender and size of district. An e-mail was sent to each superintendent with a web address and an access code. A response rate of 66% was obtained for a sample size of 290 superintendents.

The survey contained items on management and leadership skills from the Peterson Managerial Leadership Instrument (PMI) and the Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI) developed by Kouzes and Posner. Superintendents were asked to respond to the behaviors based on their envisioned best principal. Descriptive

and inferential statistical analyses were performed for the total group and subgroups.

Major research findings included:

1. An independent samples t-test on the PMI determined two behaviors that were significantly different ($p < .05$) and six behaviors that were significantly different ($p < .01$) between the means of female and male superintendents.
2. An independent samples t-test on the LPI determined four behaviors that were significantly different ($p < .05$) and one behavior that was significantly different ($p < .01$) between the means of female and male superintendents.
3. A post hoc Scheffe analysis on the PMI indicated four levels of perceived use on the managerial statements and six levels of perceived use on the leadership statements at the $p < .05$ level.

Based on the findings of this study, researcher recommendations include:

1. The process of identifying the pool of applicants for the principalship needs to be examined for screening processes that block women and minorities from educational administration.
2. Principal appraisal instruments should be reviewed and weighted to correctly reflect management tasks against other administrative duties.
3. School districts need to investigate the use of personality and leadership instruments while developing a cohort of potential principals.

DEDICATION

This study is dedicated posthumously to my dear friends, surrogate grandmothers, and fairy godmothers: Sister M. Boniface O'Neill, SHSp. and Sister Isidore McGann, SHSp.

During our time together, you offered me your love and your faith. You made my education a priority. I was able to pursue a degree for you, because of your belief in me, when I could not pursue one for myself. You taught me that persistence and determination alone are omnipotent. It is my prayer that I may continue your legacy of working with at-risk youth with the same faith, zeal, and presence you exemplified. You will forever be in my heart.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

> At times our own light goes out and is rekindled by a spark from another person. Each of us has cause to think with deep gratitude of those who have lighted the flame within us.
>
> – Albert Schweitzer

I am blessed to have so many generous individuals in my life who have encouraged, supported, and assisted me in my studies and throughout my life. I will be eternally grateful to my family and friends who have continually rekindled the flame within me during the last six years. Specifically, I would like to acknowledge the following individuals:

To my parents, I thank you for your continued support. Mom, you always said I had a book in me. This is as close as you are going to get! Both of you have been very patient and understanding throughout this process, always interested and always encouraging. The doors at Belvidere are now open.

To my sister, Vicki, I offer you my sincerest thanks for always listening during my most insane moments, especially this last year. To my sister Gina, thank you for your never-ending humor. To my niece, “The Kid,” I say a special thank you for all of your interest in this project and for waiting patiently until KK finished this degree.

To my dearest friend and wisest counsel, Helen Hargis. Twenty-seven years ago, you gave a young woman a chance. As my first principal, you gave me the foundation upon which I practice today. Your support during my bachelor’s and master’s degrees was critical to my arrival at this point. Thank you for your friendship. Through it all, your belief in me has never wavered.

Dr. Dottye Williams, my friend and mentor, you taught me that careers do not just happen, they are crafted. It was you who assisted me in the transition from private to public education, ushered me through a master's degree and encouraged me to perfect the Aggie within. It was through our conversations that this study evolved and that I have grown as a person and an educator. I thank you especially for all of your proofreading and valued input.

To Tony, I thank you for your friendship, support, interest, and concern during this endeavor. Your "Hey darlin'" on the other end of the phone always made me smile.

I am blessed in that I go to work every day with people who are not only my colleagues, but also my friends and extended family. This study would never have been completed without their help and support. Specifically:

To my principal and friend, Joseph Zatarain, thank you for allowing me to take off the last week of May to attend summer school for two years and for generously giving me all the time I needed to complete this study. You were always there for me when I needed help.

To my friend, Waynette Dolan, who has served as my coach since August: "A winner can't afford a negative thought." For every negative thought I had, you came up with a positive one. I will always be deeply grateful to you for pulling me through Chapters IV, V, and the defense. You kept me on track and focused. I value your friendship and support more than I can say.

To my velcro sister, Margie "P" Mendoza, I am grateful for all of the binding you did for me throughout this degree, the database management, and

the millions of times we have crossed-referenced lists. You have celebrated with me and worried with me. In the ups and downs, you remained steady. I thank you.

To my friend, Dixie Andersen, you are the best librarian in the world. If you cannot find it, it has not been published! I am grateful for all of the library work that you did for me especially during Chapters I, II, and in finalizing the references.

To my Aggie friend, Kathy Flinn, without your encouragement to go to summer school, this study might never have come about. Your phone skills are dazzling! At the darkest hour, you reminded me that I am not just an Aggie, but rather a Fightin' Texas Aggie! Thank you for all of your encouragement. Here is to the summer of '00!

To Geri and Monte Barnes, thank you for the office space in which Chapter II was written. Geri, you have been there since the beginning. Thank you for your steadfast friendship.

To Brenda and Tony, thank you for being the friends you call to do a bulk mailing at the last minute.

To Barbie, thank you for your many acts of kindness especially your phone skills and emergency response readiness.

To the rest of my Navarro Family: Lee and Mel, Louis and Tillie, Darryl, Sarah, Angie, Jody, Mary, David, Chris, Joe, and Joan Duncan, I thank you for your prayers and constant support and interest through the years in seeing this through to completion. It would not have happened without your faith in me.

To all of you, in the words of Gladys Knight, “If anyone should ever write my life story, you’ll be there between each line of pain and glory.” Thank you all for kindling the flame in my heart. I love you.

Next, with sincere gratitude, I would like to thank my advisor and committee chair, Dr. Stephen Stark, for his kindness, support, and expertise throughout my course work and in the completion of this dissertation.

I also want to extend my gratitude to Dr. Tim Peterson who fostered the idea of this dissertation from a class project. I am grateful for your interest, time, and input on this project.

Further, I would like to thank Dr. Clifford Whetten, Dr. Virginia Collier, and Dr. Hoyle for their time and willingness to serve on this committee. Your professional knowledge and insight have been invaluable to me in this pursuit.

To Joyce Nelson, a special thanks for always knowing the right answers, for always answering your phone, and for always returning your e-mail. I do not know what I would have done without you. You are an invaluable resource!

And last, but certainly not least, my sincerest gratitude for Miguel Guhlin, Dr. Phil Linerode, and Marilyn Oliva. This dissertation would not have been possible without your special and valued expertise.

To you all, my deepest and sincerest thanks. I am humbled by your presence in my life.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF TABLES (continued)

LIST OF TABLES (continued)

LIST OF TABLES (continued)

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Background of the Study

Superintendents have been charged with the power to "appoint and anoint formal leaders, often marginalizing those with more flexible leadership styles" (Neuman & Simmons, 2000, p. 10). In effective districts, Pollack (as cited in Southwest Educational Development Laboratory [SEDL] (1992) reports that chief executives directly participate in the selection of principals, then remain accessible to them as a means of instilling the district mission and goals to them. Usdan, McCloud, and Podmostko (2000) cite the Institute for Educational Leadership as reporting that "good school principals are the keystone of good schools. Without the principal's leadership efforts to raise student achievement schools cannot succeed" (p. 6).

Currently, there are shortages of teachers, as well as principals, around the country with the Institute for Educational Leadership (as cited in Usdan et al., 2000) reporting that due to a wave of retirements, the crisis is expected to reach a critical point by 2005. Despite the critical need for leadership, women and minorities remain as underrepresented in relation to white males (Glass, Bjork, & Brunner, 2000). The absence of women and minorities are a combined loss that in some way must account for the failure of our schools to ensure that all children are successful.

The style of this dissertation follows that of *The Journal of Educational Research.*

In 1994, Wesson and Grady described the paradigm shift evident in the organizational structure of schools in which leadership was valued over management and emphasized “collaboration, consensus-building and empowerment” as beneficial qualities, ensuring a “better fit between educational leadership and the demands of the reform movement” (p. 413).

Unfortunately, to facilitate this new leadership paradigm, Achilles and Mitchel (2001) suggest that university preparation programs are “generating large numbers of aspiring principals with curricula that would delight Fredrick Taylor and Max Weber” (p. 16). These programs focus on skills necessary for “managing the status quo of schools efficiently rather than effectively leading the current sterile bureaucracies toward tomorrow’s learning communities” (Achilles & Mitchel, 2001, p. 16).

Achilles and Mitchel (2001) cite Deming who noted that 85% of barriers to improvement are found in the organizational structure and procedures rather than in the performance of individuals. Kouzes and Posner (1997a) state that leadership is a process. Therefore, leadership is “everyone’s business” by virtue of the fact that it is an observable, learnable set of practices” (Kouzes and Posner, 1997a, p. 16). This criticism prompts the question of whether or not the current educational leadership crisis has been created by the structure and process that districts use in selecting principals.

Achieving a better leadership “fit” demands an understanding of the organizational incongruities that maintain the status quo of leadership inequality in Texas independent school districts. Within Texas, the movement

toward a more flexible organizational structure is defined by regulatory agencies, the state legislature, and the governor. In other words, non-educators set educational policy in Texas (Horn, 2001b). Horn (2001a) points out that the call for standards and standardization does not facilitate professional growth, but rather "denies the pedagogical, epistemological and programmatic differences" (p. 14). Horn (2001b) maintains that the establishment of standards for certification can be viewed as the creation of a "hierarchical, hegemonic and rigid system that denies the richness of local idiosyncrasies and adaptations or it can imply a system that seeks a balance between generalized best practice and localized effective practice" (p. 6). English (2001) agrees that school leaders are placed in a "conceptual prison" (p. 24) when forced to conform to bureaucratic demands, which restrains their autonomy within the limits established by the state. Peterson (1987) agreed that the organizational elements of school districts impinge on the instructional leadership of principals. "Folklore" is the term that Coleman (2001, p. 38) uses to dispel the myth that standards improve performance. It is knowledge and skills that are the backbone of successful school administrators (Achilles & Price, 2001; Coleman, Copeland, & Adams, 2001).

Thus, organizational incongruity is evident by the expectation that (a) principals are tested on standards that are not correlated to job skills; (b) principals are not evaluated on instructional leadership (Murphy, as cited by Olson, 2000); and (c) principals are not always chosen because they were good teachers (Goodlad, as cited by Olson, 2000). Hill and Ragland (1995)

indicate that new administrators are often selected on the basis of resemblance to their sponsors' attitude and appearance. The weakness of this type of selection process is exacerbated by the fact that most current administrators and school boards are predominantly males (Glass et al., 2000). If schools are to be successful in implementing comprehensive school reform efforts, the deleterious effects of the 'hidden curriculum' "associated with the absence of minority and female role models in positions of educational leadership" (Richards, 1988, p. 160) must be recognized by individuals who have the power and authority to ensure equitable representation of women, as well as minorities, in the applicant pool and in administrative positions.

Statement of the Problem

Blackmore (2002) indicates a need to consider the cultural conditions that constrain women. Attitudinal studies have consistently shown a bias against women compared with men for school administrative positions (Gupton & Slick, 1996). This bias has been found among members of school communities such as superintendents and school board members (Ortiz & Marshall, 1988). The prejudicial bias by school board members and superintendents in making appointments to administrative positions (Gupton & Slick, 1996; Ortiz & Marshall, 1988) is magnified by the critical number of men in gatekeeping power positions that comprise what is commonly known as the "good ol' boy" network. This network serves as one of the single, largest examples of covert discrimination. Understanding the perceptions of this network would allow society to have a better awareness of the infrastructure

needed to address the administrative shortage and the under-representation of women in school administration (Gupton & Slick, 1996).

Achievement of this rests in the perceptions of superintendents who have been charged with the power to “appoint and anoint formal leaders, often marginalizing those with more flexible leadership styles” (Neuman & Simmons, 2000, p. 10). This study attempted to gain some insight into what leadership and management behaviors superintendents value when appointing principals.

Purpose of the Study

The primary purpose of this study was to determine which management and leadership behaviors selected superintendents perceived as critical to the position of principalship. Secondly, the study attempted to explore the differences in the perceptions of desired leadership and management behaviors expressed by male and female superintendents. Finally, the study explored the differences in the perceptions found between superintendents by size of district.

Research Questions

To be more specific, the study addressed the following questions:

1. What management behaviors characterize successful principalships as perceived by selected superintendents of public independent school districts in Texas?
2. What leadership behaviors characterize successful principalships as perceived by selected superintendents of public independent school districts in Texas?

3. Does gender impact how superintendents characterize exemplary management and leadership behaviors differently in public independent school districts in Texas?
4. Does the size of district influence how superintendents characterize exemplary management and leadership behaviors in public independent school districts in Texas?

Operational Definitions

For the purpose of this study the following definitions apply:

Gender: The characteristics ascribed to people because of their sex.

Independent School District: One of the 1041 school districts in the state recognized by the Texas Education Agency.

Management and Leadership Behaviors: Behaviors associated with an employee that are valued by the employer as identified by Gary Yukl, James Kouzes, Barry Posner, and Timothy Peterson.

Perception: An attitude, impression, or preconceived idea.

Principals: Males and females who have fulfilled the prerequisite requirements of a district and are currently in the position of elementary, middle, or high school principal.

Rural District: School districts within the state supporting 2A and 1A high schools.

Superintendent: Chief operating officer of an independent school district in Texas.

University Interscholastic League High School Classifications:

5A – 1910 students & up
4A – 900 to 1909 students
3A – 345 to 899 students
2A – 180 to 344 students
1A – 179 students and below

Urban/Suburban District: The largest school districts in the state supporting 5A, 4A, and 3A high schools.

Assumptions

1. Instruments used in this study accurately measured the responses rendered by the respondents.
2. The individual who completed the survey was the individual serving in the appropriate position for the independent school district.
3. The researcher was impartial in the collection and analysis of the survey data.
4. Interpretation of the data collected accurately reflected the perceptions of the individuals surveyed.

Limitations

1. This study measured perceptions of selected superintendents toward management and leadership behaviors critical to a successful principalship within public, independent school districts in Texas.
2. The perceptions of selected superintendents reflect the principalship as a whole and did not make a distinction between elementary and secondary principals.

3. Findings can be generalized only to the population from which the sample was drawn.
4. Only superintendents serving during the 2003-2004 school year in public independent school districts in Texas identified in the 2003 Texas School Directory were surveyed.

Significance Statement

In 1909, Ella Flagg Young became the first woman superintendent of the Chicago schools as well as the first woman superintendent in the United States. In her enthusiasm, she made a confident prediction that women would rule the schools of every city (Blount, 1998). Ninety-one years later, Young's vision is still unrealized. Women comprise 70% of the teaching ranks, but occupy only 13% of all superintendent positions in the United States (Glass et al., 2000). The demographics of the gatekeepers (i.e., nonminority males) compounded by human similarity – attractiveness and the predominance of gut feelings/chemistry in critical interview interactions foster a prejudicial bias against women compared with men for school administrative positions (Tallerico, 2000).

The results of this study will seek key insights into the desired management and leadership qualities valued by superintendents. The results of the data will assist central office personnel and potential administrators in understanding the current infrastructure that allows continued inequity in our schools. It is in understanding the problem that the potential of expanding the pool of intellectual capital of school leaders exists, giving rise to the hope of

realizing the full effects of comprehensive school reform. Our nation and our children deserve an educational system led by leaders rather than managed by managers, who are committed to appointing the best person for the job whoever that may be.

Contents of the Dissertation

The dissertation is divided into five major chapters. Chapter I consists of an introduction, a statement of the problem, a need for the study, research questions, assumptions and limitations, and a definition of terms. Chapter II contains a review of the literature that is divided into five sections. The sections are as follows: a profile of educational administration, a review of the historical philosophy of educational leaders and training programs, the historical role of the administrator, the need for a paradigm shift, and the call for 21st century leadership. Chapter III includes the methodology and procedures followed for the identification of the study population, data collection, and data analysis. Chapter IV contains the analysis of the data and comparisons of the data collected in the study. Chapter V includes the researcher's summary, conclusions, and implications.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Superintendents have been charged with the power to "appoint and anoint formal leaders, often marginalizing those with more flexible leadership styles" (Neuman & Simmons, 2000, p. 11). Currently, there are shortages of teachers, principals, and superintendents around the country with the Institute for Educational Leadership (Usdan et al., 2000) reporting that due to a wave of retirements at administrative levels, the crisis is expected to reach a critical point by 2005. Despite the need for leadership, women and minorities are under-represented in relation to white males (Glass et al., 2000). Hodgkinson and Montenegro (as cited in Grogan & Andrews, 2002), question, "if 33% of assistant/associate/deputy/ and area superintendents are women, and this is the pool from which most current superintendents are selected, then why are only 13.2% 1 of the superintendents women?" (p. 238).

Grogan and Andrews (2002) question how many women and minorities certified for superintendency [and principalships] are not selected as frequently as male counterparts for administrative positions. Driscoll (2001) states that these overlooked candidates bring experiences that "challenge the dominate conceptions of leadership and suggests the realities of hiring and career advancement be examined" (p. 5).

To understand the impact of superintendents' preferences, it is necessary to develop an understanding of the profile of educational

administration over the last century as it pertains to theory and practice and the framework for educational leadership in the 21st century.

Profile of Educational Administration

Button (1966) expressed a hope that the next doctrine of educational administration would be derived from "a knowledge of schools, administration, and educational policy rather than borrowed from business management, philosophy or some other field that was perceived to be related to education in some way" (p. 223). Button noted that an educational doctrine that did not borrow from some non-educational resource would be "a symptom of maturity of the profession" (p. 223) and would, therefore, minimize the gap between theory and reality.

In examining the last 100 years, administrative practice has gone through three phases as identified by Evers and Lakomski (as cited in Kingsley, 2000): "scientific management, human relations, and human behaviors" (p. 289). Grogan and Andrews (2002) go a step further in suggesting that the "science of administration has given way to the psychology of leadership" (p. 243). Amatea, Behar-Horenstein, and Sherrard and Lucas (as cited in Grogan & Andrews, 2002) refer to the synergistic relationship between "the development of followers [teachers, parents, community members] and the improvement of student learning" (p. 243). Willower and Uline (2001) make reference to the "Big Tent" (p. 469) thinking in educational administration in which "legitimacy is conferred on every special interest groups' position regardless of cogency" (p. 455).

A profile history of the philosophy of educational leaders and training programs demonstrates a discipline engaged in paradigm enlargement. This paradigm enlargement can be explained in part by the changing context of science in society from 1875 to 1985 and consequently the impact on educational administration as a science. Culbertson (1988) indicates that the attempt of educational administration to establish itself as a legitimate field of science with a knowledge base has resulted in a move (a) from an art to a science, (b) from a practitioner-based field of researchers to professors of the academy as major inquirers, (c) from Latin phrases and poetic quotes to extensive bibliographies, (d) from generalist to specialist, and (e) from descriptions of experiences to theories.

Today, educational administration programs are defined by an infrastructure of publications, university departments, doctoral programs, professional associations, and state and national certification standards. Culbertson (1988) maintains that educational administration still looks to science for "a legitimating cloak, facilitator of inquiry and a tool to be used in the continuing quest for knowledge about the ends, means and settings of a complex social process" (p. 24).

Historical Philosophy of Educational Leaders and Training Programs

The organization and operation of schools have been the primary responsibilities of superintendents and principals since the establishment of their positions in the late 19th century. Despite a beginning best identified by

Button (1966) as a scientific management period (1870-1925), a profile of educational leaders and training programs reveals a century of incongruity.

During the early Scientific Management period between the years of 1870-1885, the philosophy of school administration was one in which the school leader was a " teacher of pedagogy" (Button, 1966, p. 217), concerned with ways to improve instruction. This philosophy was short lived as industrial development generated larger communities with urban schools that required some form of oversight. Culbertson (1988) relates that the complexities of management problems caused school board members to insist that school superintendents should have special "expertise" (p. 4). By 1890 all large cities had superintendents whose activities focused on daily operations (Grogan & Andrews, 2002).

Despite the routine process of day-to-day management, superintendents enjoyed the social status equivalent to that of a clergyman (Button, 1966). Two self-educated superintendents, William Harold Payne and William Torrey Harris became strong leaders as school administration moved into a period in which it was characterized as an applied philosophy (Button, 1966; Culbertson, 1988). During the years 1885-1905, formal training for administration included some basic pedagogy and a classical search for the "ideal" education. There were no formal courses or certifications but rather a menu of general attributes that set the expectation that candidates would be described as: "Practical men concerned about finding enough teachers, books and classrooms, as well as

[acquiring] lofty, idealistic noble philosophers seeking the inner meaning of education and pedagogy" (Cooper & Boyd, 1987, p. 7).

A popular approach during this period was the "Great Man" theory that suggested leaders were born with identifiable qualities. These innate qualities were supposedly evident in political, military, and religious leaders, and it was considered that these qualities destined one to greatness (Northouse, 2001).

The publication of Frederick Taylor's "scientific management" system propelled the movement away from the philosophy of pedagogy and into a business management framework between 1901 and 1930 (Button, 1966; Culbertson, 1988). Early professors of educational administration, e.g., Cubberley and Strayer, stressed the use of data collected through the survey method as a tool for "educational administrative diagnosis" (Culbertson, 1988, p. 9), thus grounding the profession in "scientific methods." Culbertson (1988) notes that, at the time, the concept of "science" was used more as a rhetorical expression than as a mode of inquiry reflected by an era that was not marked with critical or systemic analysis. The criteria for decision-making were based on cost efficiency, with schools operating at maximum efficiency, similar to factories with a hierarchical management (Button, 1966). In his book, *Some General Principles of Management Applied to the Problems of City-School Systems,* Franklin Bobbitt (as cited in Button, 1966) stated two principles:

I. Definite qualitative and quantitative standards must be determined for the product [the pupil].

II. When the material [the child] is acted upon by the laborer [the teacher] passes through a number of progressive stages [grades]

> moving from the raw material to the ultimate product [the graduate] where definite quantitative standards must be determined for the product at each of these stages. (p. 220)

Cooper and Boyd (1987) noted it was Bobbitt who, during this phase, emphasized centralization and control of the system as well as the quantification of school administration as a science. Without formal training, administrators were vulnerable to criticism by the public as schools became overwhelmed with the problems of immigration and were divided by urban and rural settings, race, class, and gender inequalities (Tyack & Cuban, 1995). This perceived failure was magnified by the success of business and industry. Button (1966) notes that during this time, school administration as a form of business management was widely supported. Successful superintendents were viewed as expert managers who operated efficient schools and socially were no longer identified with the clergy, but rather as business executives (Cooper & Boyd, 1987).

It was upon this system that university programs were built with coursework focusing on economics and business management. Preparation programs emphasized to students the “assuming of a role” rather than development of personal strengths that would enhance successful job performance (Campell, as cited in Brundrett, 2001). The principalship emerged during the 1920s and assumed the pedagogical role that superintendents abandoned, expanding the position to include facilitating a close relationship between school and family values (Grogan & Andrews, 2002).

Between the years of 1926 and 1950, Culbertson (1988) states that school administration as a science developed not only breadth, but depth, under the leadership of John Dewey who believed the science of education was not independent of other disciplines. Dewey (as cited in Culbertson, 1988) said, “Any methods and any facts and principles . . . that enable the problems of administration . . . to be dealt with in a bettered way are pertinent” (p. 12). Button (1966) asserts that during the mid-1930s the business management philosophy of educational administration crashed as hard as the stock market when businessmen and their mind-set fell into disrepute and economic chaos ran rampant across the country. This gave entrance to the Human Relations Period (1925-1960) as identified by Button (1966) and Culbertson (1988).

Following the social changes brought on by the Great Depression and World War I, school administrators scrambled to prepare schools for their new role as democratic organizations. Superintendents and principals often took on the role of a social agent in a society troubled by poverty and economic chaos (Brundrett, 2001). Cooper and Boyd (1987) indicate that administrators were expected to operate between instruction and the purpose of schools. Button (1966) cites Grayson, in Kefauver’s book *Changing Concepts in Educational Administration*:

> Actual leadership. . . may come from a classroom teacher, a parent or the administrator. In many situations the administrator’s leadership role will be that of encouraging others to participate effectively. (p. 221)

The Human Relations Era gave rise to three protégés of Payne, Strayer, and Cubberly – Paul Mort, Arthur Moehlman, and Jesse Sears, who pushed for

stronger inquiry in the field of educational administration (Culbertson, 1988). All made significant contributions respectively in school finance, public relations, and the administrative process as related to the political science and public administration arena. Culbertson (1988) notes that the three men broke new ground in introducing the use of the social sciences in educational administration that was enhanced by the Western Electric Studies in the 1940s.

Owens (1991) refers to a triumvirate of books that laid the groundwork for the future. The first was Chester Barnard's *The Functions of the Executive* (1938) that describes the delicate balance between the needs of the organization and the needs of the workers. Following Barnard was *Management and the Worker* (1939) by Felix J. Roethlisberger and William J. Dickson who used the Western Electric Studies to expound on the interactive relationship between the formal and informal organization. The last in the triumvirate was Herbert Simon's *Administrative Behavior* (1947), which delineated the relationship between human behaviors and the administrative process. Forsyth (1999) notes that most of the technical knowledge of educational administration was, and continues to be, borrowed from business management as demonstrated by the triumvirate.

Several events in the late 1940s and early 1950s "professionalized" educator preparation programs:

> 1947: The National Conference of Professors of Educational Administration (NCPEA) linking professors of educational administration was created (Campell et al.; Gregg, as cited in Brundrett, 2001, p. 232).

> 1955: Professional standards of performance developed by the newly established Committee for the Advancement of School Administration (CASA) (Murphy, as cited in Brundrett, 2001, p. 232).
>
> 1956: The W. K. Kellogg Foundation linked eight universities to form the Cooperative Program in Educational Administration (CPEA) designed to improve educational administrative preparation programs (Brundrett, 2001, p. 232).

Button (1966) credits the emergent prominence of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development among professionals in the 1940s as additional evidence of professionalization.

The Human Relations Period remained evident as practitioners during the 1940s and 1950s stressed the importance of patriotism and the role of education in a democratic society (Grogan & Andrews, 2002). Administrator preparation programs continued to focus on the operational tasks surrounding facilities, schedules, and budgets. Cooper and Boyd (1987) indicate that academic responsibility was not part of preparation at the time.

Culbertson (1988) noted that CPEA leaders agreed that the social sciences should be more widely used in educational administration. The infusion of the social sciences gave rise to the “theory movement.” The goal of the movement was to build an administrative science. In the same way the philosophy of pedagogy gave way to the philosophy of business management, so, too, did management fall to the hegemonic status held by science from the end of World War II to the mid-1980s (Culbertson; Greenfield; Griffiths; Murphy; as cited in Brundrett, 2001). Leaders who emerged during this period were Jacob Getzels, Daniel Griffiths, and Andrew Halpin contributing to the

literature by development of the “Social Process Theory,” decision-making, and behaviors of the superintendent, respectively. Cooper and Boyd (1987) cite Boyan’s observation:

> The more the professor of school administration looked at the social sciences for help. . . .the more the process of administering schools appeared to be like the processes of administering other organizations. The skills applicable to understanding, predicting, and controlling human behavior appeared to hold with generality in administering organizations of all kinds. (p. 11)

The Theory Movement would be considered a period of Organizational Behavior (1960-1980) as identification with the social sciences legitimized school administration in the academy to the level of business management and public administration (Cooper & Boyd, 1987). Although there was consensus on the use of the applied social sciences, Cooper and Boyd (1987) note that there was little agreement on research methods and what to teach practitioners.

Culbertson (1988) reported that the University Council for Educational Administration hosted a conference in 1957 in which Halpin articulated guiding statements for the Social Theory Movement:

> Statements about what organizations and administrators ***ought*** to do should not be in theory or science, rather theory should state how organizations and administrators ***do*** behave.
>
> Effective research has its origins in theory and is guided by theory.
>
> Social Sciences are essential to theory development and training and should be used to train administrators in the understanding of organizations. (pp. 16-17)

For almost 30 years, the Theory Movement identified leadership models that formed the knowledge base of educational administration. Southwest Educational Development Laboratory's (2001a) *History of Educational Leadership* cites the major models. Beginning with Barnard in 1938, effective leadership focused on two dimensions: effectiveness and efficiency. These two dimensions were further defined as goal achievement and group maintenance (Cartwright & Zander, as cited in SEDL, 2001a); instrumental and expressive needs (Etzioni, as cited in SEDL, 2001a); system or person oriented behaviors (Stogdill, as cited in SEDL, 2001a); and initiating structures, and consideration (Blake & Mouton; Fleishman & Harris, as cited in SEDL, 2001a).

Assessments developed to measure leadership skills based on these two dimensions were most notably, the Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ). Halpin (as cited in SEDL, 2001a) indicated that effective leadership was associated with high performance on both domains. Trait Theory made an appearance during the late 1940s with Stogdill investigating traits such as intelligence, birth order and socioeconomic status, to the conclusion that there was no consistent set of traits that determined a propensity toward leadership (SEDL, 2001a). Situational Leadership Theory maintained that the requirements of the situation determined the leadership (Hencley; Hersey & Blanchard; as cited in SEDL, 2001a) and offered leaders a directive and supportive dimension in which to operate depending on the particular situation. Hoy and Miskel (as cited in SEDL, 2001a) determined four

areas of situational properties of leadership to be structure of the organization, organizational climate, role characteristics and subordinate characteristics.

The Contingency Model concludes that there is a fit between personality characteristics, leaders' behaviors, and situational variables. Several researchers have added to this model, most notably Fiedler (as cited in Northhouse, 2001) who indicated that effective leadership is contingent upon an accurate match between the leader's style and the setting. House's (as cited in SEDL, 2001a) Path-Goal Theory gives indications for when leaders should be directive, supportive, participative or achievement orientated in an effort to improve subordinate satisfaction and performance.

Transformational Leadership (Burns, as cited in SEDL, 2001b) describes a process by which leaders and followers rise to new levels of motivation. SEDL notes that "other researchers have described this model as going beyond individual needs, focusing on a common purpose, addressing intrinsic rewards and developing commitment with followers" (AASA; Bass; Bennis & Nanus; Leithwood; Sergiovanni; as cited in SEDL, 2001a, p. 4).

Summarily, Immegart (1988) states the study of leadership has moved from an analysis of the "great man" to the "exploration of traits, styles, behaviors, situations (contingencies) and a variety of other related concerns including the interaction of multiple variables and sets of variables" (p. 261).

Culbertson (1988) reports that the Social Theory Movement prompted criticism from practitioners who cited university research and training as irrelevant to work in the field. Professors also criticized the movement,

including Halpin who was one of the first to recognize the gap between theories and the realities of educational administration. Joseph Schwab (as cited in Culberston, 1988) spoke for:

> A master practitioner model that would be a study of the school, "the missions it has undertaken"– with their failures and success; the varied structures and patterns it has used, their strengths and weaknesses; the needs and problems of the schools – so far as they are known. (p. 19)

After the issuance of *A Nation at Risk* by the National Commission of Excellence in Education in 1983, concepts about educational reform and accountability impacted the educational administration arena (Grogan & Andrews, 2002). By 1985, Drake and Roe (1986) reported that every state had its own commission, task force, and citizen groups in place studying schools and recommending a variety of actions. The message was that schools needed to be improved academically, particularly in regard to leadership, management, discipline, teaching, and learning.

The call for improvement of schools rested on the shoulders of principals who found themselves at the heart of the debate that focused on the question of whether educational administration is a product of leadership or management. "Managers are people who do things right and leaders are people who do the right thing" (Bennis & Nanus, 1985, p. 21). Burns (as cited in SEDL, 2001b) uses the descriptors of transactors [managers] and transformers [leaders]. "Management controls; leadership unleases energy and sets the vision" (Bennis & Nanus, 1985 p. 21). Gardner and Tosi (as cited in SEDL, 2001b) agreed that leading is an influencing process and managing is

the act of making choices about form and structure. Tichy and Devanna (as cited in Achilles & Mitchel, 2001) joined the debate and stated that leaders are change makers and managers control the status quo. Efficiency is a management paradigm; effectiveness is a leadership paradigm. Achilles and Mitchel (2001) cite Creighton as stating “efficiency is about competency; leadership is about character” (p. 16). Clearly, the science of educational administration had given way to the Psychology of Leadership Period (1980-1995) referred to by Grogan and Andrews (2002) who cite Amatea, Behar-Horenstein and Sherrard and Lucas as earmarked with the emphasis on the synergistic relationship between the “development of followers [teachers, parents, community members] and the improvement of student learning” (p. 243).

James MacGregor Burns (as cited in Konnert & Augenstein, 1990) stated that “leadership is one of the most observed and least understood phenomena on earth” (p. 2). Burns says that man cannot distinguish between leaders and zealots, while Bennis says that leaders cannot distinguish between the concepts of leading and managing (Konnert & Augenstein, 1990).

Burstyn (1980) suggests that in any society there are individuals who would like to be leaders, but because they belong to a certain group are not perceived by others as leaders, since leadership can occur only when a reciprocal relationship exists between the individual and potential followers.

Thus, the definition and recognition of leadership remains nebulous (Konnert & Augenstein, 1990). Smith and Blase (1988) state the idea of a

science of leadership that would allow leaders to “effectively and efficiently shape human and other resources to achieve predetermined outcomes is one of the major moral fictions of our age” (p. 2).

Achilles and Mitchel (2001) question “the premise that ‘leadership is leadership is leadership’ and that situation, purpose and goals are not especially important to leadership” (p. 17). They argue that under this premise a military general with generic leadership skills could run a school system as easily as a school superintendent with generic leadership skills could run an army. It is this lack of regard for educational administration that is prompting many states to relax requirements for educational positions, such as superintendent or teacher, and to open the door to non-educator professionals. (Mathews, as cited in Grogan & Andrews, 2002).

The Historical Role of the Administrator

As industrial development generated larger communities with urban schools, the need for an individual to supervise the schools developed. Thus, administration became supervision, with the two words used interchangeably, and the focus was placed on training and managing teachers (Button, 1966). Shakeshaft (1999) indicates that this was the beginning of the “bureaucratization” (p. 107) of schools. Supporters of this movement argued that “women should be teachers while men should be retained as principals and superintendents” (Tyack & Strober, as cited in Shakeshaft 1999, p. 107). By 1890, all large cities had superintendents who supervised schools and compiled annual reports (Brunner, Grogan, & Bjork, 2002). By the end of the

1800s, school boards began to operate as a legislative body and designated the superintendent as the executive officer (Brunner et al., 2002).

Shakeshaft (1999) states that between 1820-1900, few women held public school administrative positions, and many states prohibited women from moving into administrative positions by law. In the first three decades of the 20th century, women began to win elected positions in school administration, and by 1909, Ella Flagg Young became the first female superintendent of a large district declaring, “Women are destined to rule the schools of every city” (Pigford & Tonnsen, 1993, p. 1). The years between 1900 and 1930 are sometimes referred to as the “Golden Age” for women in school administration (Tyack & Hansot, 1982). Shakeshaft (1999) states that during this time, women held 11% of the administrative positions available, although the positions were low-paying, low-status, and low-power.

During the 1920s, the role of principal emerged and assumed the pedagogical role that superintendents abandoned, expanding the position to include facilitating a close relationship between school and family values. In the 1930s the primary role of the principal was the efficient operation of the school within the understanding of the scientific management paradigm (Grogan & Andrews, 2002). Business and industry continued to influence the superintendency due to the capitalist foundations and the strength of the economy after World War II and this period was marked by efficiency and effectiveness (Brunner et al., 2002) and brought focus to the role of education in a democratic society (Lucas, as cited by Grogan & Andrews, 2002).

By the mid 1950s, Brunner et al. (2002) citing Carter and Cunningham describe the superintendent as the “advisor to the board, leader of reforms, manager of resources, and communicator to the public” (p. 220). The role of communicator was pivotal as principals and superintendents faced the ongoing issues that included the political ramifications of Brown v. Board of Education, which resulted in the order to desegregate the schools and address declining student achievement. The effects of the Cold War and the launch of Sputnik gave rise to strong academic initiatives in math and science during the 1950s and 1960s, Grogan and Andrews (2002) state that at this time, principals were using research-based strategies for management and instruction. The onset of the 1070s saw a growth of social problems including substance abuse and teen pregnancy, pulling the primary focus of the principals away from academics. Beleaguered superintendents sought to avoid political controversy as public confidence in schools began to wane (Grogan & Andrews, 2002).

The release of *A Nation at Risk* by the National Commission of Excellence in Education introduced the concepts of reform and accountability into the educational arena (Grogan & Andrews, 2002). Glass (as cited in Grogan & Andrews, 2002) state that “principals became perceived as instruments of reform, while superintendents were viewed as blockers of reform” (p. 236). This may be attributed to the increased vulnerability of the position, as the composition of boards changed with new trustees. Consequently, as the views of the members changed, superintendents were

removed. This brought the superintendent into a political role (Brunner et al., 2002).

Brunner et al. (2002) cite Bjork, Lindle and Van Meter as looking at the superintendency between 1986-1999 as a period of reform that occurred in several waves. Starting historically with “knowing about” (1982-1986) administrators needed formal knowledge of accountability and performance standards. Then the chief administrators were expected to demonstrate “knowing for” reasons related to management and improvement of schools during the years 1986-1989. “Knowing how” became the focus in improving learning, teaching and student performance as well as generating shared leadership and community support during the years 1989-1995. “Knowing why” hinged on the superintendent’s ability to understand and explain the importance of school reform as it relates to the economy and democracy from 1995 through the present (p. 224).

During the 1980s the principal was no longer seen as building manager, but as the instructional leader of the school (Grogan & Andrews, 2002). Tirozzi (2001) states that the principal’s role must “shift from a focus on management and administration to a focus on leadership and vision for facilitating the teaching and learning process” (p. 438).

With the science of administration well defined, Immegart (1988) called for educational administration to shift the focus to the act of providing leadership. Just as educational administration defined leadership as situational, definitions of instructional leadership varied (Avila, 1990). Avila (1990) cites

Keith Acheson's concept of instructional leadership as "those occasions when the principal is in direct contact with a teacher or teachers in respect to the instructional process" (p. 53). This is contrasted by Wynn DeBevoise (1984) who indicates that "those activities that a principal takes or delegates to others to promote growth in student learning" (p. 15) is the meaning of instructional leadership. Instructional leadership as defined by Pellicer, Anderson, Keefe, Kelley, and McClearly (1990) is the:

> Initiation and implementation of planned changes in a school's instructional program through influences and directions of various constituencies of the school. It begins with an attitude, an expressed commitment to school productivity from which emanates values, behaviors and functions designed to foster student satisfaction. (p. 57)

Cambron-McCabe and Cunningham (2002) refer to the principal in the more current terms of "lead learner" and "lead teacher" (p. 293). As the National Association of State Boards of Education (NASBE) (as cited in Drake & Roe, 1986) stated: "The school principal – the leader– is a critical force in determining school climate, student and teacher attitudes and instructional practices. When schools are effective, it is largely because they have effective principals" (p. 16). "The title of principal is no longer a synonym for 'THE' instructional leader of the school, but rather it can encompass any number of individuals in a school" (Pellicer et al., 1990, p. 41).

Beyer and Ruhl-Smith (1998) offer a litany of other principal descriptors by citing the following: (a) the principal examines problems collaboratively with faculty, staff, and community (Mojkowski); (b) empowers others to seek solutions to problems and acts with creativity and promotes vision (Murphy);

and (c) develops trust among stakeholders and serves as a catalyst for successful school restructuring (Murphy & Hallinger; Newman & Wehlage). The curriculum of educational administration supports “leadership that embraces personal principles, values, passion, character, commitment, and courage or what could be called a ‘spirituality of leadership’” (Achilles & Mitchel, 2001, p. 16). In educational practice we see schools continue to be under-led and over-managed (Achilles & Mitchel, 2001)

Tirozzi (2001) identifies the principal as the instructional “artist in residence” (p. 435) with the duty of establishing a climate for excellence. The principal must present a vision for continuous improvement in student performance, promote high standards in teaching, and commit to professional development for all staff members. The role of the principal, Tirozzi (2001) says, is to “ensure that the curriculum, instructional strategies and assessment of student progress are coherent components in the teaching and learning process” (p. 435). The idea that schools should be places that transform children’s lives, drives the philosophy around principalship programs that embraces a “whatever will make a difference for children’s learning” (Cambron-McCabe & Cunningham, 2002, p. 295). Cambron-McCabe and Cunningham maintain that this philosophy sets the stage of an instructional orientation as opposed to a management orientation.

Successful transformation of principals into instructional leaders and schools into learning organizations, notes John Kotter of the Harvard Business School, is “70-90 percent leadership and only 10-30% management” (cited in

Tirozzi, 2001 p. 438). Kotter argues that the management responsibilities of a school principal are important but are not the major reasons for such a position. A predilection for management keeps the school clean, but does not impact a learning organization. Tirozzi (2001) maintains that a "commitment to leadership helps principals adapt to significantly changing circumstances. It defines what the future should look like, aligns staff members with that vision and inspires them to make it happen" (p. 438). Usdan et al. (2000) in The Task Force on the Principalship stated:

> The top priority of the principalship must be leadership for learning and the principalship as it is currently constructed – a middle management position overloaded with responsibilities for basic building operation – fails to meet this fundamental priority. . . School systems must "reinvent the principalship" to meet the needs of the 21st century. (p. 1)

Summarily, the role of the administrator, superintendent, and principal in public schools has undergone several transitions. Houston (2000, p. 26) and the School Leadership for the 21st Century Initiative (as cited in Usdan, 2001) vividly and accurately describe the process of the last century:

> Moving from B keeper – buses, buildings, books, bonds and budgets to the Four Rs - race, resources, relationship and rules; into the four A's - academic standards, accountability, autonomy, and ambiguity and into the five C's collaboration, communication, connection, child advocacy and community building. (p. 2)

Leadership in educational administration is now associated with words such as collaboration, community, cooperation, teams and relationship building, rather than control, power, authority and management (Bruner et al., 2002).

Recruitment and Selection of the Principal

Given this profile of educational administration in the last 100 years, it is no surprise that United States' schools are facing one of the most massive transformations of leadership in a century. By some estimates, more than half of all principals are expected to retire in the next five years. The School Leadership for the 21st Century Initiative (Usdan, 2001) reports that too few qualified educators want to be principals and cite anecdotal reasons such as poor salary, long hours, district leadership and demanding parents and public as reasons to decline a principalship.

Estimates on the shortage in the superintendency are equally as bleak. The School Leadership for the 21st Century Initiative (as cited in Usdan, 2001) states that nearly half of the nation's 13,500 superintendents will need to be replaced by 2008. This is compounded by an increase in the length of time necessary to fill a vacancy. Some superintendents (35%) would not recommend the position as a meaningful and satisfying career, and short tenure in the position – especially in large cities – infers the same.

So schools and districts will have the unique opportunity and the significant challenge of recruiting and training a new group of leaders. Peterson and Kelley (2001) point out that this turnover is occurring at a time of decreasing applications and concerns about the scope of job responsibilities. Schools and districts have a limited window of opportunity to fill these positions, as once principals are selected they may remain in their position for

an extended period of time. Those selected for the principalship during this window will lead our schools in the new millennium and be responsible for their success or failure. Peterson and Kelley (2001) note that careful selections, significant professional development, and support will be tantamount to having successful leaders (Peterson & Kelley, 2001).

Despite the need for leadership, women and minorities remain under-represented in relation to white males (Glass et al., 2000). Grogan and Andrews (2002), citing Hodgkinson and Montenegro, question if 33% of assistant/associate/deputy and area superintendents are women, and this is the pool from which most current superintendents are selected, then why are only 13.2% (Glass et al., 2000) of the superintendents women? Grogan and Andrews (2002) question how many women and minorities licensed to be superintendents [and principals] are not selected as frequently as male counterparts.

The 1972 passage of Title IX of the Education Amendments called attention to the status of women in educational administration. At that time virtually none of the superintendents in urban districts were women. In 1979, the U.S. Department of Education reported that women occupied less than 15% of all public school administrative positions, and Costa (1981) reported that less than 2% of all superintendents were women. Leizear (1984) states, “Despite equal opportunity legislation, affirmative action, and a social climate increasingly supportive of women’s professional aspirations, women currently hold few positions of leadership or prestige in educational administration” (p.

1). The late 1980s saw the number of female school superintendents increase to 6½%, and double by the late 1990s to 13.2% (Glass et al., 2000). Women are also underrepresented in building-level administrative positions as well. Nationally, 26% of secondary principals and 52% of elementary school principals are female (Young & McLeod, 2001).

Although this is an improvement, Glass et al. (2000) states it must be contrasted against the fact that nationally, women constitute just over 50% of graduates in educational administration programs. Women are also achieving the doctorate at comparable rates to male candidates, however, only 10% opt to earn superintendency certification.

Shakeshaft (1999) states that in the past five years, women in the superintendency have barely surpassed their percentage of representation (11%) during the Golden Years (1900-1930) and the overall representation of women in administration has seen little progress at the high school principal and assistant superintendent level.

Paradigm Paralysis

School leaders have a significant impact on training our nation's future generations. They are vested with the ultimate responsibility of preparing our youth for the challenges that await them in the 21st century. Caine and Caine (1997) indicate that schools are caught in multiple tensions. Schools are challenged daily by the public via various media on instructional practices, reform initiatives, use of technology and student performance under the guise of accountability. The public awaits high stakes testing data to determine

campus and district accountability ratings. Legislative changes to teacher certification have deemed preparation programs outdated.

While these may remain pertinent yardsticks to school and student achievement, if schools are to be successful in comprehensive school reform efforts, it is Bradford (1998) who cites Richards reminding us of the deleterious effects of the 'hidden curriculum,' “associated with the absence of minority and female role models in positions of educational leadership” (p. 160). This must be recognized as the death knell for the current paradigm paralysis in educational administration.

Fullan and Miles (1992) believe that serious educational reforms will never be achieved until there is a significant increase in the number of people who learn how successful change takes place. Beyer and Ruhl-Smith (1998) cite several rationales for the failure of reform efforts:

> Difficulty in implementing change that is radically different from past practice (Newman & Wehlage, as cited in Beyer & Ruhl-Smith, 1998, p. 117).
>
> Failure to address needed systematic changes (Martin & Wilson, as cited in Beyer & Ruhl-Smith, 1998, p. 117).
>
> Superficial solutions introduced without thorough research and investigation (Sieber, as cited in Beyer & Ruhl-Smith, 1998 p. 117).

The traditional leadership paradigm assumes the leader operates effectively in a hierarchy and demonstrates a set of masculine traits that are manifest in a command-control style (Rosener, 1990). This traditional style has been identified as transitional, dominant, conventional, but is always characterized by top-down command, positional power and control of

information exchanged among organization members (Guido-DiBrito, Noteboom, Nathan, & Fenty, 1996). Callahan (as cited Wesson & Grady, 1994) indicated that this is the prevailing model of educational administration over the last part of the 19th through the mid-20th centuries. The researchers beg the question: "To what extent does a system of hierarchical control enhance teaching and learning?" (Wesson & Grady, 1994, p. 412).

Brunner (1999) cites Cuban and Smith and O'Day who state that documentation of reform efforts have been focused on local school communities and on state and federal change initiatives. This belief coupled with Murphy's (1995) views suggests that reform is a grassroots movement and does not require support at the superintendency level. Sergiovanni (1984) rang the bell for a paradigm shift in educational administration.

Wood (1990) notes:

> We take for granted that our schools are communities, when, in fact, they are merely institutions that can become communities only when we work at it. . . It is only within a community, not an institution that we learn how to hold fast to such principles as working for the common good, empathy, equity and self-respect. (p. 33)

Leaders within these "communities of learners" value leadership over management and emphasize collaboration, consensus building and empowerment. This framework places emphasizes vision, values, and guiding principles (Sergiovanni, 1990).

In answering Wesson and Grady's (1994) question, "To what extent does a system of hierarchical control enhance teaching and learning?" (p. 412),

the voices calling for a paradigm change indicate that the traditional school leadership style is an obstacle to growth, development and improvement. The pyramid with teachers on the bottom and administrators on top allows for little emphasis on what makes for good teaching or what encourages student learning (Cuban; Peterson & Flinn; as cited in Clinch, 1996). Clinch (1996) cites Hoy and Miskel in summarizing the traditional concept of leadership:

- Formal authority is synonymous with leadership.
- Authority is imparted through hierarchy.
- Leadership is expertise and technique.
- Leadership means making rational decisions upon empirical evidence (p. 30).

Educational administration preparation programs have focused on behavioral sciences and theory, thus producing administrators who are managers, but not leaders. Wirt (1990) points out that superintendents are too heavily involved in the management side of running a district – finance, reform, board relations – everything but providing leadership. This is supported by Bennis (as cited in Clinch, 1996) who maintains that most organizations are over-managed and under-led. If then a different type of leadership style is necessary for implementation of reform efforts, perhaps a different type of leader is required as well.

Paradigm Shift

Unlike educational administration, business and industry have abandoned the conventional interpretation of leadership in the post-industrial

age. Experts in business management (Aburdene & Naisbitt; Block; Covey; Helgensen; Peters; Wheatley; as cited by Wesson & Grady, 1994), have described the leadership changes as a shift from hierarchical control toward more flexible organizational structure in which leaders share power, information and decision making to some extent with other group members.

In defining leadership, a review of the literature includes the ability to:

- Mobilize others toward a shared goal (Kouzes & Posner, 1997a).
- Exercise influence (Cunningham, as cited in Clinch, 1996).
- Achieve stakeholder buy-in of a shared mission (Bennis & Nanus, 1985).
- Mobilize other people to want to struggle for shared aspirations (T. O. Peterson, personal communication, June 2, 2000).

Guido-DiBrito et al. (1996) identify this new style of leadership as: transformational (Burns); participative (Peters & Waterman; Ouchi); empowering (Komives), generative (Sagaria); authentic (Terry) and aspirational (Rogers & Ballard).

Accompanying these descriptors are “masculine” and “feminine” qualities of leadership. Ironically, these are social constructions, similar to the social construction that mandates superintendents and principals are to be overwhelmingly White males. Shakeshaft and Morgan (as cited by Skrla, 1998) list the following characteristics associated with males and females: “logical, rational, aggressive, dynamic, mature, competitive, strategic, reliable, intuitive,

emotional, submissive, receptive, personable, cooperative, spontaneous, and social" (p. 7).

Skrla (1998) citing Bardwick and Douvan suggests expanding the stereotypical characteristics of women by adding "dependence, passivity, fragility, low pain tolerance, nonaggression, noncompetitiveness, inner orientation, interpersonal orientation, empathy, sensitivity, nurturance, subjectivity, yieldingness, receptivity, inability to risk, emotional liability and supportiveness" (p. 6).

In order to achieve the vision of school reform as described by Giroux (1991) in which schools are "open rather than fixed, disputed rather than given, and supportive rather than intolerant " (p. 32) it becomes necessary to implement the infrastructure which can transform the current situation by including:

- Decentralized decision making i.e. site based management;
- Teacher empowerment;
- Connecting schools and communities;
- Building partnerships;
- High performance schools with emphasis on academic rigor and achievement for every child;
- Small caring environments.

Senge (1990) describes vision as that responsibility for forming and communicating a dynamic idea of what school should and could be, and it is

vision that develops a creative tension that drives the organization to greater growth and understanding. This vision of comprehensive school reform can only be accomplished by a visionary leader who:

- Searches out new and good ideas to support and recognize.
- Provides opportunities to grow, improve and learn from mistakes.
- Facilitates risk-taking, innovation, and experimentation.
- Fosters collaboration and trust.
- Provides choices.
- Develops competencies in others.
- Offers visible support and encouragement.
- Believes that leadership is a relationship founded on trust and confidence.
- Empowers others to act.
- Leads by example.
- Communicates their ideas and vision to others.

Superintendent-leaders, described as those who build, motivate and facilitate groups in collaborative decision-making, become the “center of a complex network of interpersonal relationship and are no longer at the top of the hierarchical pyramid” (Murphy; Hoyle; Henken; as cited in Clinch 1996, p. 40).

It becomes incumbent on boards of education, parents, and educators to select able leaders for the public schools in the 21st century who have strong

instructional skills, can encourage the talents of others, communicate effectively with multiple constituencies, and who can unite diverse citizen groups to solve school problems.

Call for 21st Century Leadership

In a Delphi technique study, Clinch (1996) identified the critical leadership roles and responsibilities of the 21st century superintendent. The study addressed two time periods: the immediate and near future (0-5 years) and the distant future (10-20 years). The five critical leadership roles are shown in Table 1.

Table 1. Five Critical Leadership Roles

Immediate/Near Future 0-5 Years	Distant Future 10-20 Years
Change agent	Creator/Visionary
Financier/Entrepreneur	Change Agent
Communicator	Public Relations Expert
Creator/Visionary	Instruction Leader
Collaborator/Facilitator	(only 4 identified)

The School Leadership for the 21st Century Initiative (as cited in Usdan, 2001) has stated the role of the principal will encompass “instructional, community, and visionary leadership” (p. 4). The Interstate School Leaders

Licensure Consortium (*Leadership for Student Learning: Reinventing the Principalship*), as cited by Usdan et al., 2000, has developed six standards for school leaders:

- Facilitating the development, articulation, implementation and stewardship of a vision of learning that is shared and supported by the school community
- Advocating, nurturing and sustaining a school culture and instructional program conducive to student leaning and staff professional growth
- Ensuring management of the organization, operations and resources for a safe, efficient, and effective leaning environment.
- Collaborating with families and community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs and mobilizing community resources
- Action with integrity, fairness and in an ethical manners
- Understanding and responding to and influencing the larger political, social, economic, legal and cultural context. (p. 11)

Tirrozi (2001) states that the age of accountability requires enlightened leadership. In the new enlightened environment, the principal will:

- Set tone for the building
- Facilitate the teaching and leaning process
- Provide leadership and direction to their school instructional programs and policies
- Spend significantly more time evaluating staff and mentor new teachers
- Sustain professional development for self and staff
- Nuture personalized school environments. (p. 438)

Successful school principals of the future will be individuals who raise the schoolhouse roof in every way – academic, student achievement, and faculty and staff support and community interaction. Tirrozi (2001) states the "principal will create a continual sense of urgency, to the point of crisis especially in relation to low expectations of students, poor achievement results, and inequalities between affluent and poor schools and teacher quality" (p. 439).

Peterson and Kelley (2001) indicate that the principal's responsibilities include identifying and articulating the school's mission, demonstrating instructional leadership, managing and administering policies and procedures, developing budgets/coordinating resources, organizing improvement efforts, supervising staff, assessing student learning, building effective parent involvement programs, and shaping school cultures.

No longer can one person assume all of this responsibility. Neuman and Simmons (2000) reference the Annenberg Institute suggestion of distributed leadership. "Distributed leadership cultivates collective ownership of both success and problems as well as responsibilities for results by creating a shared vision, clear priorities, continuous professional development, linking community assets and providing strong accountability" (p. 10).

Michelle Young (as cited in Horn, 2001b) characterizes the challenge of the 21st century in dealing with quantity and quality of educational leaders: "The principal in the new millennium will have diverse attributes of vision, passion, skilled communicator, prudent manager, technology wizard and student

advocate" (p. 5). In the book, *Skills for the Successful 21st Century School Leader*, Hoyle, English, and Steffy (1998) emphasize the characteristics of reflective leadership, process knowledge, collaboration skills, conflict resolution and community building skills as those most critical in the new millennium. Murphy (2002b) suggests the role of leader in education will be that of "moral steward, educator, and community builder" (p. 176).

To contrast the research rhetoric, the National School Board Association (2002) Toolkit identifies the following desirable leadership qualities: previous leadership, capacity to create or catch vision, the thrill of challenge, constructive spirit of discontent, belief there is a better way to do something, ability to identify practical ideas, willing to take responsibility, desire to complete tasks, mental toughness, peer respect, family respect, and a quality that makes people listen to them. Additionally, the National School Board Association identifies several attributes of vision: ability to view problems as opportunities, priority setting, customer focused, courageous, critical thinker, tolerance for ambiguity, positive attitude towards change, committed to innovations that are best for children.

Dunklee (2000) suggests that there is an art, as well as a science to leadership/management and effective school leaders must practice both. Van Fleet and Yukl (1986) provide an integrating framework that encompasses most of the major leadership theories and situational variables. Through the development of a broad behavioral taxonomy, Yukl (1981,1998) and Yukl and Nemeroff (1979) identify four managerial practices: (a) clarifying, (b) inspiring,

(c) supporting, and (d) team building though the formulation and refinement of the Managerial Practices Survey.

The MPS describes behaviors of managers in how they relate to subordinates, direct and motivate them. The taxonomy contains both managerial and leadership behaviors. More currently, Kouzes and Posner (2002) have developed the Leadership Practices Inventory, which uses a conceptual framework consisting of five leadership practices:

- Modeling the Way
- Inspiring a Shared Vision
- Challenging the Process
- Enabling others to Act
- Encouraging the Heart (p. 16)

The behaviors that make up these practices were developed into 30 behavioral statements. Kouzes and Posner (1997a) maintain that leadership is "everyone's business" (p. 16). Through extensive research, Kouzes and Posner (1997a) maintain that leadership is an "observable, learnable set of practices" (p. 16) and that leadership is a relationship between constituents and leader based on mutual needs. In surveying what constituents want from leaders, Kouzes and Posner (1993) began exploring values and characteristics of leaders and identified four attributes they believe are fundamentals of leadership:

Honest: "Honesty is absolutely essential to leadership" (p. 14).

Forward Looking: “Constituents ask that a leader have a well defined orientation toward the future” (p. 16).

Inspiring: “Leaders who are dynamic, uplifting, enthusiastic, positive and optimistic” (p. 16).

Competent: “A track record of getting the job done” (p. 18).

These researchers maintain the combination of attributes form the leadership foundation of credibility – the ability of constituents to believe the leader can be trusted, is knowledgeable, and excited about the vision. Maintaining that credibility is like reputation. It is earned over time and is not associated with a job or title Kouzes and Posner (1993). Building and maintaining credibility is accomplished through six disciplines:

Discovering your self: “What do you believe in? What do you stand for”(p. 52).

Appreciating constituents: “Understanding the values and desires of your constituents” (p. 53).

Affirming shared values: “Establishing common ground to build unity and shared value (p. 53).

Developing capacity: “Assure opportunities to build knowledge and skills for individuals” (p. 54).

Serving a purpose: “Make decisions on stated values and serve others” (p. 55).

Sustaining hope: “Demonstrate optimistic attitudes, be compassionate, recognize others, be flexible and be present” (p. 55).

It is apparent that the leadership styles attributed to women in Regan and Brooks (1995); McCauslan and Kleiner (1985); Skrla (1998); and Clinch (1996) are simpatico with Kouzes and Posner (1993). Regan and Brooks (1995) state that the feminist attributes of leadership are accessible to women

and men and suggest, “naming these attributes, rendering them visible and teaching others to use them will enrich the practice of leadership.” This practice would personify the qualities of caring, collaboration, intuition, vision and courage that mark the administration of women in educational settings.

What is valued, gets done (Bennis & Nanus, 1985). Current evaluation instruments appraise principals on their performance in the following areas: Instructional Management; School Morale; Personnel Management; Student Management; Professional Growth and Development; Management of Administrative Functions; and Academic Excellence Indicators. Within this framework, principals ideally rank their job responsibility as instructional and curriculum supervisor as their first and second priorities, respectively. In reality, principals indicate that the percentage of time spent as instructional leader would rank fifth and eighth, with the majority of time spent on program administration (materials and facilities) and disciplinarian (Drake & Roe, 1986).

In using the dominant lens of organizational theory, English (2001) maintains that there will be no real changes in schools because what leaders do “will be defined by institutional constraints” (p. 24) that are currently in existence. English (2001) charges that organization theory “decapitates” leadership and that schools cannot be changed as long as the leaders in them are placed in the “conceptual prison of bureaucracy” and expected to follow with conformity (pp. 23-24).

Murphy (2002b) summarizes the problem:

> The *practice* of educational leadership has very little to do with either education or leadership. . . schools are organized and managed as if we had no knowledge of either student learning or the needs of professional adults.. . schools are administered in ways that educational goals are undermined and learning is hindered. . . the profession has drawn energy almost exclusively from the taproot of management and the ideology of corporate America. This practice knowledge is not exactly the raw material from which to build a future for the profession. (p. 181)

Conclusion

"The U.S. Census Bureau has characterized the superintendency as being the most male -dominated executive position of any profession in the United States" (Glass, as cited in Bjork, 2000, p. 8). Studies have suggested that superintendents in high performing districts often create and sustain a positive district culture though their relationship with their principals (Petersen, 2002, cites Bredeson; Coleman & LaRocue; Hallinger & Murphy). "The world's future is inextricable linked to the quality of its schools, it K-12 educators and the leadership of its superintendents" according to Petersen (2002, p. 168).

The leadership/managerial perceptions of superintendents would appear to be a reflection of their instructional leadership that is linked to academic success of the district. What if they prefer managerial skills in the 21st century?

A synthesis of recent research on the instructional leadership of superintendents has outlined instructionally oriented skills and behaviors for district leaders. Petersen (2002) cites Herman as articulating five instructional leadership associated skills and competencies for district superintendents. These skills include the allocation of instructional personnel; organization of the instructional program; support of the instructional program; development of

instructional personnel and planning for the instructional program. Within an investigation of instructionally focused California superintendents, four essential leadership attributes were identified: articulation of an instructional vision' creation of an organizational structure that supports that vision; assessment and evaluation of personnel and instructional programs and organizational adaptation (Petersen, 2002, p. 160).

Nestor-Baker and Hoy (2001) cite Argyris as claiming that tacit knowledge is the primary basis for effective management. Argyris (as cited in Nestor-Baker & Hoy, 2001) argues:

> The primary basis for effective management is to define and transform the behavior essential to achieve organizational objectives into routines that work. Routines are implemented through skillful actions and skillful actions are based largely on tacit knowledge. Of course, tacit knowledge can have negative as well as positive consequences especially when such action becomes self-reinforcing of the status quo and prevents inquiry into inconsistencies. (p. 87)

According to Nestor-Baker and Hoy (2001), research on tacit knowledge of educational administrators has been overlooked even though experience and practical intelligence have long been linked to effective school administration.

Based on research by Sternberg, Wagner, and Sternberg, Nestor-Baker and Hoy (2001) outline four kinds of tacit knowledge important for managerial success:

1. Managing people – knowing how to work with and direct the work of others;

2. Managing tasks – knowing how to mange and prioritize day to day task;

3. Managing self – knowing how to maximize one's performance and productivity and

4. Managing career – know how to establish and enhance one's reputation. (p. 89)

In a study of superintendents focusing on tacit knowledge used, Nestor-Baker and Hoy found that of the 21 categories derived a cluster analysis, 11 are based all or in part on tacit knowledge concerning relationships with others. This includes using interpersonal and intra-personal relationships, hiring practices, involving subordinates, meshing staff and organization, and managing administrator problems. Successful administrators used tacit knowledge 30.48% of the time in dealing with interpersonal issues.

Nestor-Baker and Hoy (2001) cite AASA studies' outlining expected performance categories of superintendents include the following: "board/superintendents relations, community/superintendent relations, staff/superintendent relations, recruitment and supervision of personnel and management function" (p. 91). According to Nestor-Baker and Hoy (2001), the AASA studies suggest that the broad criteria are open to multiple interpretations, and the evaluation tends to be based on the tacit knowledge of the board and superintendent. Thus, say Nestor-Baker and Hoy (2001) "the evaluation of success in the superintendency appears to be predicated on how well the superintendent has understood and acted on the tacit expectations of the board and the community" (p. 91).

Carpenter (as cited Petersen & Short, 2001) points out that the school board agenda is a significant factor in district leadership because it serves as a

vehicle for promoting the district's "ideology and locus of power" (p. 528). The 1986 Institute for Educational Leadership study suggests, "Those who control agendas define problems and issues that will receive local district attention" (Petersen & Short, 2001, p. 538). Board presidents reported to Petersen and Short (2001) they had little influence in the construction of the formal board agenda, and viewed themselves as an individual who facilitated the board meetings.

Bjork (2000) cites Tallerico's work on gate-keeping factors to the superintendency as advancing our understanding of the "complex mix of tacit knowledge and proverbial understanding shared among search consultants and members of boards of education" (p. 9). Through this complex mix, consultants and board members influence selection criteria, superintendent searches and the selection process. "These social tendencies create gates and barriers for aspiring women superintendents" (Bjork, 2000, p. 9). What if this is not germane to just the superintendency?

Milstein and Associates and Murphy (as cited by Bjork, 2000) indicate that in 1993 more than half of the master's and doctoral degree students were women. Bjork (2000) cites Tallerico as suggesting that the absence of women in the superintendency [and building level administration] "may have less to do with their lack of training, availability or presence in the administrator pipeline that do other factors related to the search and selection process" (p. 9).

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Population

The population for this study consisted of all female superintendents in Texas independent school districts (N = 138) and randomly selected male superintendents from each Texas Educational Service Center area (N = 301) for a total population of (N = 439). For the purposes of this study, the term superintendent refers to the head superintendent. No assistant, associate, or deputy superintendents were included in the study.

An Excel database of the 1,041 independent school districts was developed from information in the Texas Education Agency's (2003) *Ask*TED directory. Initially, the database was developed to reflect the name of the independent school district and the Educational Service Center (ESC) where the district was located. The University Interscholastic League (UIL) was contacted for an electronic listing of the school districts' current alignment that is based on the size of each school in the district, and this information was added into the database.

The Texas Education Agency (TEA) maintains a current database to identify all personnel changes that occur within Texas school districts. TEA was contacted for a current list of female superintendents in January of 2004, and these were identified in the database. The remaining 895 school districts were identified as having a male superintendent.

The 895 school districts identified as having a male superintendent were sorted by ESC areas and by UIL classification. Stratified random sampling procedures were used to obtain a sample that was representative of the state to identify the 301 school districts with male superintendents used in the study. E-mail addresses for the sample were then collected and verified from a variety of sources: TEA, school district websites, and professional organizations. The verified e-mail addresses were entered into the Excel database.

Procedures

The Texas School Directory was obtained from the Texas Education Agency's website. The Index of Public Schools was downloaded and placed into an Excel file. All non-public schools were purged. This list was crossed referenced with the list of schools served by each Educational Service Center (ESC) and the location of each independent school district by ESC was added to the Excel database. When the database was complete, Excel was used to generate a six-digit, non-sequential code for each member of the sample.

A web page was developed on the San Antonio Independent School District server for the survey. Each survey item had a "pull down" menu indicating the 1-10 Likert scale being used. Each participant was contacted via e-mail with a cover letter (Appendix A) explaining the topic of the survey and that all responses would be kept confidential. Participants were informed that the survey would take approximately 10 minutes. The cover letter contained the website and the six-digit access code for tracking purposes. After a participant responded, a thank you note was generated automatically. As

individuals responded, their survey information was deposited into a Filemaker Pro database, which allowed the researcher to verify the number of respondents on a daily basis. Finally, the Excel database developed for the sample population was purged of the respondents' names in preparation for the subsequent, re-notification e-mailing.

In the initial e-mailing, it was learned that four individuals could not access the website, due to firewall conflicts that resulted in providing a hard copy to each individual immediately. Eight (8) individuals did not receive the initial e-mail because their mailboxes were full. After a week, the researcher re-submitted the e-mail to these participants. There were 85 respondents to the first e-mail.

A second e-mail was sent two weeks later with a reminder letter (Appendix B), to 354 non-respondents that resulted in 77 responses. The letter emphasized the importance of the individual's participation, in addition to the website and access code. The second e-mailing produced no returns.

A third e-mail and corresponding hard copy were sent two weeks later to 277 non-respondents. The third e-mailing resulted in 16 electronic responses and 46 hard-copy responses. Two weeks later, a personalized e-mail reminder (Appendix C) was sent to the 215 non-respondents. There were no responses from the e-mailing, and the researcher speculated that perhaps there were firewall issues that were not identified through any e-mail "failure notice." A second hard copy was mailed with a reminder letter and directions given about the website and access code. A handwritten post-it note was attached to the

letter with the message, “Please help me reach a 70% response rate.” Coinciding with the second U.S. postal mailing were telephone calls for a personal contact. A total of two hundred (200) messages were left with secretaries or in some cases the superintendent. In this campaign, 4 individuals indicated they did not have time to complete a survey. This combined effort resulted in 25 electronic responses and 41 hard-copy returns.

The Excel database was maintained to reflect the total sample respondents. In addition, a new worksheet was created to track the respondents by their response date. The website also kept an electronic listing of each respondent’s name, the access code, and the date of submission. A telephone log was also maintained to indicate contact and response with each non-respondent.

Response Rate

There were 89 responses from female superintendents for a response rate of 63%. Two hundred and one (201) responses were received from male superintendents for a response rate of 64%. A total of 290 responses were received for a total response rate of 66% (Table 2).

There were 36 responses from 54 5A schools for a response rate of 66.6%. Forty-five (45) responses were received out of fifty-three (53) 4A schools for a response rate of 84.9%. Fifty (50) of the 87 selected 3A schools responded for a response rate of 87.7%. Out of 88 selected 2A schools, 56 responded for a rate of 63.6%. One hundred and three (103) of the 159 1A schools contacted responded for a rate of 64.7%.

Table 2. Rate of Response for Selected Superintendents by Gender and Size of District

UIL	# of Respondents	% of Respondents
5A	36	66.6
4A	45	84.9
3A	50	87.7
2A	56	63.3
1A	103	64.7
Males	201	66.0
Females	89	64.0

Instrumentation

Two survey instruments were used in the study: The Peterson Managerial Instrument and Kouzes and Posner's (1997b) Leadership Practices Inventory. The researcher used the Peterson Managerial Leadership instrument developed by T. O. Peterson (personal communication, June 2, 2000) and patterned on Yukl's (1981, 1998) and Yukl and Nemeroff's (1979) Taxonomy of Leadership Behavior. Yukl's early work identified 9 managerial statements that he increased to 14 (Yukl & Nemeroff, 1979). By 1981, Yukl's taxonomy increased to 19 leadership behaviors. In 1989, Yukl combined several of the areas to produce a survey targeted at 11 leadership behaviors. A chart (Appendix D) shows the development of the instrument by Yukl and

Peterson. The Peterson instrument identifies 19 characteristics separating recognizing and rewarding and role clarification and goal setting for the purpose of behavioral specificity. Peterson identifies an additional 4 behaviors, “Presence, Principle, Purpose, and Performance” for a total of 24 managerial behaviors. Peterson’s instrument (Appendix E) was combined with Kouzes’ and Posner’s (1997b) Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI) for identification of 30 leadership behaviors.

The LPI was developed through a triangulation of qualitative and quantitative research methods and studies. Interviews and case studies led to the development of five leadership practices: Modeling the Way, Inspiring a Shared Vision, Challenging the Process, Enabling Others to Act, and Encouraging the Heart. Validation studies conducted by Saskin and Rosenback (as cited by Kouzes & Posner, 2002) over 15 years consistently confirm the “reliability and validity of the LPI and has been used extensively in numerous organizational settings and is highly regarded in both the academic and practitioner world” (p. 2). Leong (as cited in Kouzes & Posner, 2002) states:

> There is good evidence to support the reliability and validity of the LPI. The conceptual scheme on which the LPI is based is elegant and the test items on the LPI have excellent face validity as well as psychometric validity. Factor analyses and multiple regressions provide strong support for both the structural and concurrent validity of the LPI. (p. 16)

A letter requesting permission to use each of the instruments was written and permission granted. Copies of the letters have been included in Appendix F.

The web survey was designed to be “point and click” with drop-down menus for the 10-point Likert scale. The default was set for “1 - Almost Never.” On both the website and hard copies of the survey, there were three parts: Peterson’s instrument appeared first, followed by Kouzes’ and Posner’s (1997b) LPI. A third division was a demographics section. A copy of the survey has been included in Appendix E.

The superintendents were asked to read 25 managerial behaviors that a principal might exhibit during the course of a given day, then envision the best principal in their district and rate how frequently they perceived the individual engaging in the same behavior using the following scale: 1 - Almost never, 2 - Rarely, 3 - Seldom, 4 - Once in awhile, 5 - Occasionally, 6 - Sometimes, 7 - Fairly often, 8 - Usually, 9 - Very frequently, 10 - Almost always. In the second section, superintendents were asked to read 30 leadership statements, and using the same principal they envisioned in the first section, rate how frequently they perceived the individual engaging in the activity using the same 10-point scale. The last section requested demographic information about each superintendent, their respective district, and included the following:

1. Position
2. Gender
3. Age
4. Number of years in education
5. Number of years as superintendent
6. Ethnicity

7. Highest degree held
8. Description of school district
9. Total student population
10. Number of high schools
11. UIL Classification
12. Number of principals in the district by gender and school

Data Analysis

Results of the study have been reported using numeric tabular formats. Analysis and interpretation of the data follow the principles prescribed in *Educational Research: An Introduction* by Gall, Borg, and Gall (1996).

The data collected from the questionnaire were deposited into an Excel file. All data were then converted to FileMaker Pro and exported to SPSS for Windows 2000, version 11.5. The data were then “scrubbed” to eliminate incomplete and duplicate surveys. When the demographic data between two records were similar, but the responses were different, the researcher made the decision to keep both records under the assumption that the code was entered incorrectly. When the records were absolutely identical, the earliest response was kept and the latter eliminated. Seven records were eliminated because no responses were given.

Different statistical procedures were performed on the data in order to answer each of the research questions. The procedures included simple descriptive ranking of means for identifying the perceptions of the superintendents about their best principal. Independent samples *t* -tests were

used for determining significant differences in answers to the questions by males and females. Frequency distributions, mean scores, and correlations were also used for descriptive and inferential statistical analysis of the collected data. Demographic data were analyzed as it related to each factor. An alpha level of .05 was used to establish significance.

The data analysis included specific statistical procedures for use in answering each research question.

Research Question #1

What management behaviors characterize successful principalships as perceived by selected superintendents of public independent school districts in Texas?

To answer this question, the researcher analyzed the data using a two-step process. First, descriptive analysis was done that tabled the 10 management items. Then a one-way analysis of variance was conducted. The 10 managerial statements were examined for statistical differences and the Scheffee post hoc analysis was used to determine which means were different from which other means.

Research Question #2

What leadership behaviors characterize successful principalships as perceived by selected superintendents of public independent school districts in Texas?

The two-step process used in Research Question #1 was also used to investigate this question. Analysis was first conducted using descriptive

statistics. Then analysis was done by examining the 14 leadership statements in the Peterson instrument and conducting a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) followed by a post hoc analysis. The Scheffe post hoc analysis determined significant differences between each of the items.

The researcher, then collapsed the 30 leadership statements from the LPI into the five essential areas of leadership identified by Kouzes and Posner. A one-way ANOVA followed by the post hoc analysis on the items that were determined to have significant variance within or between groups. The Scheffe analysis determined where significant differences between the cluster means occurred.

Research Question #3

Does gender impact how superintendents characterize exemplary management and leadership behaviors differently in public independent school districts in Texas?

To answer this question the researcher conducted the analysis for all the items and clusters using an independent samples *t*-test. The *t*-test was appropriate because the data were disaggregated by a dichotomous variable – gender.

Research Question #4

Does the size of district influence how superintendents characterize exemplary management and leadership behaviors in public independent school districts in Texas?

To answer this question the researcher conducted the analysis for all the items and clusters using a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA). This was appropriate because district size was operationally defined by UIL classification. As such, there were five levels of district size.

In summary, the study population consisted of 290 school superintendents across the state of Texas. Eighty nine (89) were female and 201 were male. The instruments used were a managerial leaders' survey by Peterson and the LPI by Kouzes and Posner (1997b). Data were collected via a website and U.S. mail.

The study was primarily descriptive in nature with additional inferential analyses included. Results for the population were reported in numerical table presentations of frequency distributions, percentages, means, standard deviations, independent *t*-tests, and one-way analyses of variance. Analyses and interpretation of the data followed the principles and guidelines detailed by Gall et al. (1996).

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS OF THE STUDY

Introduction

The findings of this study are reported in this chapter. The first section presents a portion of the demographic findings necessary to establish the relevance of the population in this study to results of similar populations represented in the literature. Thereafter, data from the findings regarding each of the four research questions are discussed. The research questions were:

1. What management behaviors characterize successful principalships as perceived by selected superintendents of public independent school districts in Texas?
2. What leadership behaviors characterize successful principalships as perceived by selected superintendents of public independent school districts in Texas?
3. Does gender impact how superintendents characterize exemplary management and leadership behaviors differently in public independent school districts in Texas?
4. Does the size of district influence how superintendents characterize exemplary management and leadership behaviors in public independent school districts in Texas?

A total of 290 superintendents from independent school districts in the state of Texas completed the questionnaire (Table 3). Of the respondents 89 (31%) were women and 201 (69%) were male. There were 268 (92%) of the

respondents who indicated that they were currently in the position of superintendent, while only one individual indicated he was an assistant superintendent. There were 21 (7.2%) who did not indicate their position resulting in a difference found in Table 4 in the total number of responses.

Table 3. Number of Respondents and Percentages for the Total Group and Each Subgroup of Superintendents Responding in Texas

Superintendents	Frequency	Percent
Female	89	30.7
Male	201	69.3
Total	290	100.0

Table 4. Frequencies and Percentages of Demographic Information Regarding the Number of Superintendents Responding in Texas

Superintendent Responses	Frequency	Percent
No	1	0.3
Yes	268	92.4
Total	269	92.8
Missing	21	7.2
Total	290	100.0

Demographic Data

Demographic data are presented to provide a sense of the sample. This will enable the reader to determine how similar the sample is to the population of superintendents. Responses to questions related to demographic information such as age and experience, ethnicity, and size of district are found in Tables 5-10. Data are provided for the total group of respondents and all subgroups.

Age and Experience

Tables 5-8 describe the respondents in terms of age, education, experience in education, and as a superintendent. Table 5 indicates that 77.5% of the respondents ranged between 45-64 years of age. Only 18.3% of the superintendents were under the age of 44. This proportion intuitively seems consistent with what is observed in the general population of all superintendents. Similarly, 58.3% of the superintendents were found in the two subgroups of 26-30 years of experience and 31+ years of experience. Only 1.4% of the superintendents had between 5-10 years of experience in the field of education (Table 6). In Table 7, those who held a master's degree (60.7%) or a doctorate degree (35.9%) composed 96.6% of the respondents. Table 8 identifies the frequencies and percentages for the years of experience as a superintendent in Texas. Nearly 49.9% of the respondents have between 0-5 years on the job as a superintendent. Those having 16 years or more experience as a superintendent comprised only 9.4% of the respondents.

Table 5. Frequencies and Percentages of Demographic Information Regarding Age for the Total Group of Superintendents in Texas

Age	Frequency	Percent
34 or below	2	.7
35-44	51	17.6
45-54	126	43.4
55-64	99	34.1
65+	7	2.4
Missing	5	1.7
Total	290	100.0

Table 6. Frequencies and Percentages of Demographic Information Regarding Years of Experience in Education for the Total Group of Superintendents in Texas

Years of Experience In Education	Frequency	Percent
5-10	4	1.4
11-15	17	5.9
16-20	44	15.2
21-25	38	13.1
26-30	80	27.6
31+	89	30.7
Total	272	93.8
Missing	18	6.2
Total	290	100.0

Table 7. Frequencies and Percentages of Demographic Information Regarding Highest Degree Earned for the Total Group of Superintendents in Texas

Highest Degree Earned	Frequency	Percent
Bachelor's Degree	2	0.7
Master's Degree	176	60.7
Doctoral Degree	104	35.9
Missing	8	2.8
Total	290	100.0

Table 8. Frequencies and Percentages of Demographic Information Regarding Years of Experience as a Superintendent in Texas for the Total Group of Superintendents in Texas

Years of Experience as a Superintendent	Frequency	Percent
0-5	146	49.9
6-10	66	22.7
11-15	35	12.1
16-20	16	5.4
21-25	9	3.1
26-30+	3	.9
Total	275	94.8
Missing	15	5.2
Total	290	100.0

Ethnicity

The data report that less than 15% of the respondents identified themselves as a member of a minority group, while the 85.2% identified themselves as White/Caucasian (Table 9). Again, this proportion is consistent with what is observed.

Table 9. Frequencies and Percentages of Demographic Information Regarding Ethnicity for the Total Group of Superintendents in Texas

Ethnicity	Frequency	Percent
Other – American	1	0.3
Other – Caucasian/ Native American	1	0.3
Other – Irish/ Hispanic	1	0.3
Other	4	1.4
Asian/Pacific Islander	1	1.3
African American	8	2.8
Hispanic	21	7.2
White/Caucasian	247	85.2
Missing	6	2.1
Total	290	100.0

Size of District

Table 10 is a summary of the frequencies and percentages of responses to the question posed to the superintendents when asked to give the size of district. One hundred and three (103) of the respondents were from 1A school districts located in rural area (35.5%). There were 56 superintendents from 2A school districts (19.3%) and 50 were identified as superintendents of 3A schools (17.2%). Forty-five (45) superintendents responded from 4A districts (15.5 %) and 36 responded from 5A school districts. Responses received were evenly distributed by size of district. Small districts, 1A, made up 35.5% of the respondents, while large districts comprised 27.9% of the responses. Medium size districts represented by 2A and 3A UIL classifications made up 36.5% of the respondents. A strategy was specifically employed to obtain a greater number of larger districts. We know that there are fewer larger districts, but the fewer large districts have a substantial proportion of the state's students. To obtain sufficient responses from the larger districts, it was necessary to over sample them.

Table 10. Frequencies and Percentages of Demographic Information Regarding the Size of District for the Total Group of Superintendents in Texas

Size of District	Frequency	Percent
1A	103	35.5
2A	56	19.3
3A	50	17.2
4A	45	15.5
5A	36	12.4
Total	290	100.0

Table 11 is a summary of the frequencies and percentages of responses to the question posed to the superintendents when asked to give the gender of their envisioned best principal. Sixty-two percent (62%) indicated the envisioned best principal was female and 36% indicated that a male was envisioned. In Table 12, 79% of the respondents indicated the envisioned principal was currently serving in their district, while 47 respondents identified their ideal principal was retired (4.1%) or currently serving in another district (12.1%). The great majority of superintendents (91.4%) envisioned a principal who is still currently active in the field of education.

Table 11. Frequencies and Percentages Regarding the Gender of an Envisioned Ideal Principal for the Total Group of Superintendents in Texas

Gender	Frequency	Percent
Female	179	61.7
Male	104	35.9
Total	283	97.6
Missing	7	2.4
Total	290	100.0

Table 12. Frequencies and Percentages Regarding the Employment Status of an Envisioned Ideal Principal for the Total Group of Superintendents in Texas

Status	Frequency	Percent
Currently Serving in Your District	230	79.3
Retired	12	4.1
Serving in Another District	35	12.1
Missing	13	4.5
Total	290	100.0

Research Questions

This study examined four research questions. Each of the questions looked at several factors to answer the spirit of the question in its fullest context. Each question will now be presented and discussed.

Research Question #1

What management behaviors characterize successful principalships as perceived by selected superintendents of public independent school districts in Texas?

The respondents were asked to indicate the appropriate response that describes their envisioned best principal. Using the Peterson Managerial Leadership Instrument, respondents selected a response on a 10-point Likert scale. A response of “1” meant almost never; a response of “2” meant rarely; a response of “3” meant seldom; a response of “4” meant once in awhile; a response of “5” meant occasionally; a response of “6” meant sometimes; a response of “7” meant fairly often; a response of “8” meant usually; a response of “9” meant very frequently; and a response of “10” meant almost always.

The question was investigated using a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) procedure. Its purpose was to determine if there were appreciable differences related to how often they occurred between the ten management statements in the Peterson Managerial Leadership Instrument. Table 13 reports the descriptive statistics for the ten items.

Table 13. The Peterson Managerial Leadership Instrument: Ten Management Statements Ranked by the Mean for the Total Group of Superintendents Responding in Texas

Management Statement	N	M	SD
Work Facilitation/Performance	290	9.09	1.33
Clarifying	290	8.66	1.70
Informing	290	8.40	1.66
Coordinating	290	8.34	1.67
Discipline	290	8.19	2.14
Monitoring	290	8.11	1.86
Goal Setting	290	8.08	1.90
Autonomy Delegation	290	7.87	1.73
Training	290	7.84	1.99
Rewards	290	6.63	2.24

Table 14 provides the results of the one-way ANOVA. The level of significance was 0.001. This was less than the alpha level of 0.05. As a result, the decision was made to reject the null hypotheses of no difference. Therefore, it was inferred that at least one of the means in the population from which these sample means were drawn was different from at least one other means.

Table 14. Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) for the Peterson Managerial Leadership Instrument's Ten Managerial Statements for the Total Group of Superintendents in Texas

Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Items	1,073.37	9	119.26	35.32	0.001*
Within Items	9,758.11	2,890	3.38		
Total	10,831.48	2,899			

*Significant at < 0.05.

Because the topic of management was scored by ten items, it was necessary to conduct a post hoc analysis to determine which mean(s) were different from which other mean(s). A post hoc analysis using the Scheffe analysis indicated there were four different levels of perceived use between the ten behaviors as illustrated in Table 15.

Table 15. Post Hoc Scheffe Analysis for the Peterson Managerial Leadership Instrument's Ten Managerial Statements for the Total Group of Superintendents in Texas

Managerial Statements	N	1	2	3	4
Rewards	290	6.63			
Training	290		7.84		
Autonomy Delegation	290		7.87		
Goal Setting	290		8.08	8.08	

Table 15 (continued)

Managerial Statements	N	1	2	3	4
Monitoring	290		8.11	8.11	
Discipline	290		8.19	8.19	
Coordinating	290		8.34	8.34	
Informing	290		8.40	8.40	
Clarifying Roles and Objectives	290			8.66	8.66
Work Facilitation/ Performance	290				9.09
Sig.		1.00	.153	.115	.536

*Subset for alpha = .05.

In the lowest level, the Scheffe post hoc analysis indicated the managerial factor of *rewarding positive performance* was statistically different from all of the other managerial behaviors (Table 15). It was the least observed by superintendents when envisioning their best principal and demonstrated a mean of 6.63 on a 1-10 point scale.

In the next lowest level, group 2, seven behaviors were identified as statistically the same: *training, autonomy delegation, goal setting, monitoring, discipline, coordinating*, and *informing*. Group 3 contained the six behaviors: *goal setting, monitoring, discipline, coordinating, informing*, and *clarifying roles and objectives*. Within those two groups, five behaviors were shared. They were: *goal setting, monitoring, discipline, coordinating*, and *informing*.

Therefore, within group 2 and group 3, three means were statistically different from each other. The behaviors of *training* and *autonomy delegation* were statistically observed less often than the behavior of *clarifying roles and objectives*.

The most frequently observed behaviors were identified in the top group, group 4. Two behaviors were identified as statistically the same. They were: *clarifying roles and objectives* and *work facilitation and performance*. However, *clarifying roles and objectives* was also a part of group 3. Thus, the behavior of *work facilitation and performance* was the one most frequently observed behavior, statistically higher than eight others.

Research Question #2

What leadership behaviors characterize successful principalships as perceived by selected superintendents of public independent school districts in Texas?

The second research question addressed significant differences in the leadership behaviors that superintendents used to characterize successful principals. The respondents were asked to indicate the appropriate response that described their best principal in the district on 14 different leadership behaviors. Using Kouzes and Posner's Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI), respondents selected a response on a 10-point Likert scale. A response of "1" meant almost never; a response of "2" meant rarely; a response of "3" meant seldom; a response of "4" meant once in awhile; a response of "5" meant occasionally; a response of "6" meant sometimes; a response of "7" meant

fairly often; a response of “8” meant usually; a response of “9” meant very frequently; and a response of “10” meant almost always. Therefore, a higher mean indicated that the trait was seen as occurring more often.

Research Question #2 was investigated by using a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) that was used to determine if there was a significant difference between any of the 14 leadership statements on the Peterson instrument. Table 16 reports the descriptive statistics for the 14 statements. Table 17 provides the results of the one-way ANOVA.

Table 16. Means and Standard Deviations for the 14 Leadership Statements on the Peterson Managerial Instrument as Reported by Superintendents in Texas

Leadership Statement	N	M	SD
Consideration	290	9.13	1.33
Presence	290	9.07	1.75
Performance Emphasis	290	8.87	1.30
Purpose	290	8.73	1.86
Team Building	290	8.69	1.60
Problem Solving	290	8.66	1.66
Inspiration	290	8.65	1.50
Interactive Facilitation/ Performance	290	8.54	1.83
Principal	290	8.50	1.74
Recognition	290	8.44	1.69
Planning	290	8.26	2.14
Conflict Management	290	8.08	2.10
Networking	290	8.01	1.89
Decision Participation	290	7.87	1.81

Table 17. Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) Results of the Peterson Managerial Leadership Instrument's 14 Leadership Statements for the Total Group of Superintendents in Texas

Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Items	537.63	13	41.36	13.59	0.001*
Within Items	12,310.19	4,046	3.04		
Total	12,847.82	4,059			

*Significant at < 0.05.

The level of significance was 0.001. This was less than the alpha level of 0.05. As a result, the decision was made to reject the null hypotheses of no difference. Therefore, it was inferred that at least one of the means in the population from which these sample means were drawn was different from at least one of the other means. Because the topic of leadership was scored by 14 items, it was necessary to conduct a post hoc analysis to determine which mean(s) were different from which other mean(s). A post hoc analysis using the Scheffe analysis indicated there were six different levels of perceived frequency of use between the 14 behaviors as illustrated by Table 18.

In the lowest level, the Scheffe post hoc analysis, Table 18, indicated the leadership factor of *decision participation* in which the ideal principal consults with faculty/staff and otherwise allows them to influence his/her decision was the least valued by superintendents. It has a mean of 7.87 on a 1-10 point scale, or close to "usually."

Table 18. Post Hoc Scheffe Analysis for the Peterson Managerial Leadership Instrument's 14 Leadership Items as Reported by Superintendents in Texas

Leadership Items	N	1	2	3	4	5	6
Decision Participation	290	7.87					
Networking	290	8.01	8.01				
Conflict Management	290	8.08	8.08	8.08			
Planning	290	8.26	8.26	8.26	8.26		
Recognition	290	8.44	8.44	8.44	8.44	8.44	
Principle	290	8.50	8.50	8.50	8.50	8.50	8.50
Interactive Facilitation/ Performance	290	8.54	8.54	8.54	8.54	8.54	8.54
Inspiration	290		8.65	8.65	8.65	8.65	8.65
Problem Solving	290		8.66	8.66	8.66	8.66	8.66
Teambuilding	290		8.69	8.69	8.69	8.69	8.69
Purpose	290			8.73	8.73	8.73	8.73
Performance Emphasis	290				8.87	8.87	8.87
Presence	290					9.07	9.07
Consideration	290						9.13
Sig.		.071	.056	.90	.176	.131	.124

*Subset for alpha = .05.

In the next lowest level, group 2, nine behaviors were identified as statistically the same: *networking, conflict management, planning, recognition, principle, interactive facilitation/performance, inspiration, problem solving*, and *teambuilding*. Six of the nine (*networking, conflict management, planning,*

recognition, principle, and *interactive facilitation/performance*) were shared with group 1.

Group 3 contained nine behaviors: *conflict management, planning, recognition, principle, interactive facilitation/performance, inspiration, problem solving, team building*, and *purpose*. Within those two groups, eight behaviors were shared between group 3 and group 2. The leadership quality of *purpose* was not shared with group 2 and was more valued by superintendents with a mean of 8.73.

The next level, group 4, identified nine behaviors. They were: *planning, recognition, principle, interactive facilitation/performance, inspiration, problem solving, teambuilding, purpose*, and *performance emphasis*. Within the two groups, eight behaviors were shared. They were: *planning, recognition, principle, interactive facilitation/performance, inspiration, problem solving, teambuilding*, and *purpose*. Therefore within group 3 and group 4, one mean was statistically different from the other. The behavior of *performance emphasis* was statistically identified more by superintendents than the other behaviors.

Group 5 contained nine behaviors. They were: *recognition, principle, interactive facilitation/performance, inspiration, problem solving, teambuilding, purpose, performance emphasis*, and *presence*. Within group 4 and group 5, eight behaviors were shared. The leadership behavior of *presence* was not shared between the groups and was statistically different from the others. The

behavior of *presence* was most frequently identified by superintendents as desirable, having a mean of 9.07.

In the highest level, group 6, there were nine behaviors identified. They were: *principle, interactive facilitation/performance, inspiration, problem solving, teambuilding, purpose, performance emphasis, presence*, and *consideration*. Within group 5 and group 6, eight behaviors were shared. The *leadership* behavior of consideration was not shared between the groups and was valued most by superintendents with a mean of 9.13.

A second facet of Research Question #2 was an investigation into how superintendents perceive leadership qualities important to the principalship was explored by doing a second one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA). In this case, using the LPI, the 30 leadership statements were collapsed into the 5 leadership categories of *challenging the process, inspiring a shared vision, enabling others to act, encouraging the heart*, and *modeling the way*. Table 19 reports the descriptive statistics for the five areas.

Table 19. Means and Standard Deviations for the Five Leadership Areas on the Leadership Practices Inventory as Reported by the Total Group of Superintendents in Texas

Management Statement	N	M	SD
Modeling the Way	290	8.75	1.25
Encouraging the Heart	290	8.50	1.34
Enabling Others to Act	290	8.45	1.18
Inspiring a Shared Vision	290	8.06	1.42
Challenging the Process	290	8.00	2.43

Table 20 provides the results of the one-way ANOVA. The level of significance was 0.001. This was less than the alpha level of 0.05; therefore, it was inferred that at least one of the means in the population from which these sample means were drawn was different from at least one other mean. Because the topic of leadership was scored on 30 items that were collapsed into five key areas, it was necessary to conduct a post hoc analysis to determine which mean(s) were different from which other mean(s). A post hoc analysis using the Scheffe analysis, Table 21, indicated there were two different levels of perceived use between the five clusters.

Table 20. Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) for the Five Leadership Areas of the Leadership Practices Inventory for the Total Group of Superintendents in Texas

Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Items	115.14	4	28.79	16.31	0.001*
Within Items	2,550.58	1,445	1.77		
Total	2,665.72	1,449			

*Significant at < 0.05.

Table 21 shows two levels were identified. In the lowest level, group 1, the Scheffe post hoc analysis indicated that the LPI leadership areas of *challenging the process* and *inspiring a shared vision* were statistically different from all of the other LPI leadership areas. As noted in Table 19, above, these

qualities were the least valued by superintendents with a mean of 8.00 and 8.06, respectively. Group 2 in the Scheffe identified three key areas: *enabling others to act*, *encouraging the heart*, and *modeling the way*. Between group 1 and group 2, five means were statistically different from each other. *Enabling others to act*, *encouraging the heart*, and *modeling the way* were most valued by superintendents.

Table 21. Post Hoc Scheffe Analysis of the Leadership Practices Inventory for the Total Group of Superintendents in Texas

Leadership Clusters	N	1	2
Challenging the Process	290	7.99	
Inspiring a Shared Vision	290	8.06	
Enabling Others to Act	290		8.44
Encouraging the Heart	290		8.49
Modeling the Way	290		8.74
Sig.		.984	.120

*Subset for alpha = .05.

Research Question #3

Does gender impact how superintendents characterize exemplary management and leadership behaviors differently in public independent school districts in Texas?

The third research question addressed how gender impacts the degree to which superintendents identify the frequency of management and leadership behaviors in their best principals. The respondents were asked to indicate the appropriate response that describes their best principal in the district. Using Kouzes and Posner's Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI) and the Peterson Managerial Leadership survey, respondents selected a response on a 10-point Likert scale. This was done for each of the 24 management and leadership behaviors across both data collection tools. A response of "1" meant almost never; a response of "2" meant rarely; a response of "3" meant seldom; a response of "4" meant once in awhile; a response of "5" meant occasionally; a response of "6" meant sometimes; a response of "7" meant fairly often; a response of "8" meant usually; a response of "9" meant very frequently; and a response of "10" meant almost always. Once the results were collected, each of the 24 management and leadership behaviors was disaggregated to determine if there was a significant difference between the male and female superintendent responses.

Table 22 represents the means and standard deviations of the male and female superintendents in the Peterson Managerial Leadership Instrument. An independent samples t-test was used to determine the differences between the subgroups. Table 22 also represents the results of the independent samples t-tests for significant differences.

Table 22. Means, Standard Deviations, and Results of t-Tests of the Peterson Managerial Leadership Instrument for Each Subgroup by Gender of Superintendents in Texas

Peterson Instrument	Gender	N	Mean	SD	t	df	Sig.
Presence	Female	89	9.36	1.50	1.91	288	0.057
	Male	201	8.94	1.83			
Work Facilitation/ Performance	Female	89	9.30	0.87	2.25	266	0.026**
	Male	201	8.99	1.48			
Consideration	Female	89	9.29	1.33	1.35	288	0.178
	Male	201	9.06	1.32			
Purpose	Female	89	9.20	1.52	3.21	214	0.002**
	Male	201	8.52	1.97			
Teambuilding	Female	89	9.04	1.17	2.97	243	0.003**
	Male	201	8.53	1.74			
Problem Solving	Female	89	9.01	1.07	2.92	267	0.004**
	Male	201	5.51	1.84			
Clarifying Roles/ Objectives	Female	89	8.98	1.30	2.47	232	0.014*
	Male	201	5.51	1.83			
Performance Emphasis	Female	89	8.96	1.12	.75	288	0.453
	Male	201	8.83	1.37			
Recognition	Female	89	8.94	1.27	3.95	234	0.001**
	Male	201	8.21	1.80			
Inspiration	Female	89	8.92	1.47	2.05	288	0.042*
	Male	201	8.53	1.50			
Principle	Female	89	8.79	1.47	1.85	288	0.065
	Male	201	8.38	1.83			
Interactive Facilitation/ Performance	Female	89	8.70	1.63	.98	288	0.327
	Male	201	8.47	1.91			
Planning	Female	89	.61	1.93	1.83	288	0.068
	Male	201	8.11	2.22			
Informing	Female	89	8.55	1.71	1.05	288	0.293
	Male	201	8.33	1.64			
Coordinating	Female	89	8.48	1.40	.97	288	0.336
	Male	201	8.28	1.78			
Networking	Female	89	8.46	1.66	2.76	288	0.006*
	Male	201	7.81	1.95			
Discipline	Female	89	8.39	1.80	1.18	210	0.240
	Male	201	8.10	2.27			
Monitoring	Female	89	8.36	1.63	1.55	288	0.124
	Male	201	8.00	1.95			
Goal Setting	Female	89	8.25	1.82	1.00	288	0.318
	Male	201	8.00	1.94			
Training	Female	89	8.16	1.86	1.81	288	0.072
	Male	201	7.70	2.04			

Table 22 (continued)

Peterson Instrument	Gender	N	Mean	SD	t	df	Sig.
Decision Participation	Female	89	8.16	1.44	2.00	224	0.046**
	Male	201	7.75	1.95			
Conflict Management	Female	89	7.98	2.33	-.548	288	0.584
	Male	201	8.12	1.99			
Autonomy/Delegation	Female	89	7.93	1.62	.440	288	0.660
	Male	201	7.84	1.77			
Rewards	Female	89	6.76	2.33	.654	288	0.514
	Male	201	6.58	2.21			

*Significant at < 0.05.
**Significant at < 0.01.

In investigating the management behaviors that characterized successful principalships as perceived by superintendents of public independent school districts, data were analyzed using an independent t-test.

Table 22 represents the results of the independent samples t-tests for significant differences. There was no statistical difference between male and female superintendents on the Peterson Managerial Leadership Instrument in the following 15 areas: *performance emphasis, consideration, rewards, autonomy delegation, goal setting, monitoring, training, informing, coordination, interactive facilitation/performance, conflict management, discipline, planning, principle*, and *presence*.

Statistical differences were found between male and female superintendents on the Peterson Managerial Leadership Instrument on the following nine items: *inspiration, recognition, team-building, decision*

participation, clarifying roles and objectives, problem solving, work facilitation performance, networking, and *purpose*. Female superintendents valued these management qualities over male superintendents in every significant comparison.

Research Question #3 was also investigated by examining the LPI cluster scores. Table 23 presents the descriptive statistics of the male and female superintendents in the responses to the LPI. An independent samples t-test was used to determine the differences between the subgroups. Table 23 also represents the results of the independent samples t-tests for significant differences.

Table 23. Means, Standard Deviations, and Results of t-Tests of Leadership Practices Inventory Responses for Each Subgroup by Gender of Superintendents in Texas

LPI Responses	Gender	N	Mean	SD	t	df	Sig.
Modeling the Way	Female	89	8.97	1.04	2.06	288	0.040*
	Male	201	8.65	1.32			
Encouraging the Heart	Female	89	8.76	1.07	1.07	288	0.023*
	Male	201	8.38	1.43			
Enabling Others to Act	Female	89	8.69	0.97	2.62	288	0.009**
	Male	201	8.34	1.25			
Inspiring a Shared Vision	Female	89	8.35	1.23	2.28	288	0.024*
	Male	201	7.94	1.48			
Challenging the Process	Female	89	8.26	1.29	2.09	288	0.038*
	Male	201	7.88	1.48			

*Significant at < 0.05.
**Significant at < 0.01.

In Table 23, the data report indicates that there were statistical differences between male and female superintendents and how they viewed the frequency of occurrence in the leadership qualities in their best principals. Female superintendents perceived each of the leadership qualities occurring more regularly than male superintendents in every LPI category: *challenging the process, inspiring a shared vision, enabling others to act, modeling the way,* and *encouraging the heart*.

Research Question #4

Does the size of district influence how superintendents characterize exemplary management and leadership behaviors in public independent schools districts in Texas?

The fourth research question investigated any significant differences in the ways superintendents from different size districts viewed exemplary management and leadership behaviors in successful principals. The respondents were asked to indicate the appropriate response that describes their best principal in the district. Using Kouzes and Posner's Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI) respondents selected a response on a 10-point Likert scale. A response of "1" meant almost never; a response of "2" meant rarely; a response of "3" meant seldom; a response of "4" meant once in awhile; a response of "5" meant occasionally; a response of "6" meant sometimes; a response of "7" meant fairly often; a response of "8" meant usually; a response of "9" meant very frequently; and a response of "10" meant almost always.

The data from the LPI were collapsed into the five areas of leadership and were examined using a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) procedure. Tables 24-33 represent the descriptive statistics for the essential areas of leadership and the ANOVA results. There were no areas of statistical difference found between the size of district and how superintendent characterized leadership, based on LPI data.

Table 24 reports the descriptive statistics for the districts by size in regards to *challenging the process*.

Table 24. Means and Standard Deviations of the Leadership Practices Inventory Statements for Challenging the Process for Each Subgroup of Superintendents in Texas by Size of District

Size	N	M	SD
5A	36	8.24	1.13
4A	45	8.22	1.03
3A	50	7.96	1.39
2A	56	7.99	1.46
1A	103	7.82	1.66

Table 25 provides the results of the one-way ANOVA. The level of significance for the procedure was .458, which is greater than the alpha level of 0.05. There was no statistical difference between the size of the school district and how superintendents stated they observed the LPI statements for *challenging the process*.

Table 25. Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) for the Leadership Practices Inventory Statements for Challenging the Process for Each Subgroup of Superintendents in Texas by Size of District

Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Items	7.52	4	1.90	0.91	0.458*
Within Items	587.65	285	2.06		
Total	595.16	289			

*Significant at < 0.05.

Table 26 reports the descriptive statistics for the districts by size in regards to *inspiring a shared vision*.

Table 26. Means and Standard Deviations of the Leadership Practices Inventory Statements for Inspiring a Shared Vision for Each Subgroup of Superintendents in Texas by Size of District

Size	N	M	SD
5A	36	8.44	1.12
4A	45	8.44	1.12
3A	50	7.99	1.28
2A	56	7.93	1.39
1A	103	7.88	1.65

Table 27 provides the results of the one-way ANOVA. The level of significance for the procedure was 0.085, which is greater than the alpha level of 0.05. There was no statistical difference between the size of the school

district and how superintendents indicated they valued the LPI statements for *inspiring a shared vision*.

Table 27. Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) for the Leadership Practices Inventory Statements for Inspiring a Shared Vision for Each Subgroup of Superintendents in Texas by Size of District

Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Items	16.37	4	4.09	2.07	0.085*
Within Items	564.53	285	1.98		
Total	580.90	289			

*Significant at < 0.05.

Table 28 reports the descriptive statistics for the districts by size in regards to *enabling others to act*.

Table 28. Means and Standard Deviations of the Leadership Practices Inventory Statements for Enabling Others to Act for Each Subgroup of Superintendents in Texas by Size of District

Size	N	M	SD
5A	36	8.64	0.90
4A	45	8.60	1.03
3A	50	8.48	1.06
2A	56	8.34	1.14
1A	103	8.37	1.39

Table 29 provides the results of the one-way ANOVA. The level of significance for the procedure was .612, which is greater than the alpha level of 0.05. There was no statistical difference between the size of the school district and how superintendents valued the LPI statements for *enabling others to act*.

Table 29. Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) for the Leadership Practices Inventory Statements for Enabling Others to Act for Each Subgroup of Superintendents in Texas by Size of District

Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Items	3.75	4	.94	0.67	0.612*
Within Items	397.34	285	1.39		
Total	401.09	289			

*Significant at < 0.05.

Table 30 reports the descriptive statistics for the districts by size in regards to *modeling the way*.

Table 31 provides the results of the one-way ANOVA. The level of significance for the procedure was .364, which is greater than the alpha level of 0.05. There was no statistical difference between the size of the school district and how superintendents valued the LPI statements for *modeling the way*.

Table 30. Means and Standard Deviations of the Leadership Practices Inventory Statements for Modeling the Way for Each Subgroup of Superintendents in Texas by Size of District

Size	N	M	SD
5A	36	8.99	1.09
4A	45	8.91	0.98
3A	50	8.80	1.09
2A	56	8.75	1.13
1A	103	8.57	1.52

Table 31. Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) for the Leadership Practices Inventory Statements for Modeling the Way for Each Subgroup of Superintendents in Texas by Size of District

Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Items	6.79	4	1.70	1.09	0.364*
Within Items	445.83	285	1.56		
Total	452.62	289			

*Significant at < 0.05.

Table 32 reports the descriptive statistics for the districts by size in regards to *encouraging the heart*.

Table 32. Means and Standard Deviations of the Leadership Practices Inventory Statements for Encouraging the Heart for Each Subgroup of Superintendents in Texas by Size of District

Size	N	M	SD
5A	36	8.91	0.80
4A	5	8.49	1.12
3A	50	8.76	0.95
2A	56	8.46	1.16
1A	103	8.24	1.74

Table 33 provides the results of the one-way ANOVA. The level of significance for the procedure was 0.057, which is greater than the alpha level of 0.05. There was no statistical difference between the size of the school district and how superintendents valued the LPI statements for *encouraging the heart*.

Table 33. Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) for the Leadership Practices Inventory Statements for Encouraging the Heart for Each Subgroup of Superintendents in Texas by Size of District

Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Items	16.42	4	4.10	2.32	0.057
Within Items	504.50	285	7.77		
Total	520.91	289			

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Chapter V presents a summary of the purpose, procedures, and major findings of this research study. A discussion of the implications and recommendations for further study are also presented.

The results of the study are discussed in this chapter in further detail and conclusions drawn that suggest how the results contribute to the current body of knowledge on the desired management and leadership qualities valued by superintendents. The results are based on a survey sent to all of the female superintendents in Texas as identified by the Texas Education Agency in January 2004. The remaining school districts were identified as having a male superintendent. From this pool, randomly selected male superintendents from each Texas Educational Service Center were asked to complete the survey.

Survey responses from superintendents representing 290 Texas independent school districts were analyzed to provide answers to the following four research questions:

1. What management behaviors characterize successful principalships as perceived by selected superintendents of public independent school districts in Texas?
2. What leadership behaviors characterize successful principalships as perceived by selected superintendents of public independent school districts in Texas?

3. Does gender impact how superintendents characterize exemplary management and leadership behaviors differently in public independent schools in Texas?
4. Does the size of district influence how superintendents characterize exemplary management and leadership behaviors in public independent schools in Texas?

Summary

In 1909, Ella Flagg Young became the first woman superintendent of the Chicago schools. In her enthusiasm she declared, “Women are destined to rule the schools of every city” (Pigford & Tonnsen, 1993 p. 1). Ninety-six years later, Young’s vision is still unrealized. Today proportionally fewer women lead school systems or middle/high schools than in 1909. This must be contrasted against the fact that nationally, women constitute over 50% of graduates in educational administration programs (Shakeshaft as cited in Brunner, 2000). Educational administration is missing more than the gifts that diversity brings in ethnicity, race, and culture. It is missing approximately 50% of the nation’s intellectual capital.

The absence of women and minorities from educational administration is not an accident. Attitudinal studies have consistently shown a bias against women compared with men for school administrative positions (Gupton & Slick, 1996). This is magnified by the critical number of men in gatekeeping power positions.

Wesson and Grady (1994) describe a paradigm shift in the organizational structure of schools in which leadership is valued over management and emphasized “collaboration, consensus-building and empowerment” as beneficial qualities, ensuring a “better fit between educational leadership and the demands of the reform movement (p. 413). Achieving a better “fit” demands an understanding of organizational incongruities that maintain the status quo of leadership inequality in Texas independent school districts and prohibit women from proportional representation in a field in which they dominate the ranks.

The purpose of this study was to determine those management behaviors superintendents perceive as critical to the position of principalship as well as the leadership behaviors perceived as critical to the principalship. Thirdly, the study explored the differences in the perceptions of desired leadership and management behaviors expressed by male and female superintendents. Finally, the study sought to determine if there were differences in the perceptions of superintendents by size of school district. The following are the conclusions of the data collection and analysis of this study.

This research study will contribute to the larger body of knowledge on the recruitment and selection of principals. Two facts are known results of the current recruitment and selection process: From this research, it is known that the racial composition of superintendents in Texas is overwhelmingly male Caucasians. Yet, according to the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (personal communication, May 4, 2005), women represent over 50% of the

population in educational administration preparation programs in public universities. Why, then, are candidates who look different (from Caucasian males) not perceived as qualified and/or may not “fit” an organizational stereotype? Tallerico (2000) indicates that this phenomenon is a result of similarity-attraction theory. Results from the research will serve as a basis for understanding the current infrastructure that prohibits the equitable representation of minorities and women in the applicant pool and in administrative positions in Texas.

Conclusions

A total of 290 superintendents completed the questionnaire resulting in a 66% response rate. Eighty-nine respondents or 31% were women and 201 respondents or 69% were male. Note that all the 138 female superintendents in Texas were contacted. The 89 responses represent 65% of the female superintendents in Texas. From the 301 male superintendents contacted, 201 or 67% responded. The demographic data from the study (Tables 3-9) revealed that 77.5% of the superintendents were between the ages of 45 and 65+ years of age. Similarly, 58.3% of the superintendents had 26 years or more of experience in education. The number of years in the superintendency, however, was relatively low with 48.5% reporting 0-5 years of experience. From this percentage, 21.5% were male, with only 11.6 % identified as female. Between the ages of 45-54, the percentage of female and male superintendents were similar, at 46.5% and 45.3%, respectively. Between the ages of 55-64, females represented 41.9% and male superintendents

represented 33.2%. Female superintendents reported an average of 5.2 years on the job while male superintendents reported 7.7 years on the job. This is explained by the fact that men tend to enter administration earlier in their careers and achieve upper-level positions in the hierarchy more quickly (Williams, 1985).

The percentage of superintendents with a doctorate degree was 35.9%, while the number of superintendents with a master's degree was 60.7%; 48.8% of female superintendents held a doctorate and 32% of the males had a terminal degree. Although, female superintendents are in the minority, clearly they are better prepared. If females comprise over 50% of the population in preparation programs and are in the applicant pool as highly qualified, why are they not being chosen? Only 15% of the superintendents identified themselves as a member of a minority group. This is an alarming statistic in a state with one of the fasting growing Hispanic populations in the United States and suggests that a tokenistic approach as a quick remedy only serves to put women and minorities in a no-win situation (Clement, 1980).

There were 103 responses from 1A school districts representing a 35.5% response rate; 56 (19.3%) from 2A school districts; 50 (17.2%) from 3A school districts; 45 (15.5%) from 4A school districts and 36 (12.4%) from 5A school districts.

Superintendents were asked to give the gender and employment status of their envisioned best principal (Tables 11 and 12): 61.7% of the respondents indicated they envisioned a female as their best principal and 91.4% indicated

that the individual they envisioned was still active in the field of education, whether currently serving in their district or another district.

Research Question #1

What management behaviors characterize successful principalships as perceived by selected superintendents of public independent school districts in Texas?

In exploring which management behaviors characterized successful principalships, superintendents reported *work facilitation/performance* and *clarifying roles and objectives* from the Peterson Managerial Instrument as the two most desired management characteristics. The mean for the two areas was 9.09 and 8.66 on a 10-point Likert scale, respectively. A post hoc analysis using the Scheffe analysis indicated there were four different levels of perceived use between the ten behaviors on the Peterson Managerial Statements ($p < .05$). *Work facilitation/performance* was the most frequently observed behavior. *Clarifying roles and objectives, informing, coordinating, discipline, monitoring, goal setting, autonomy delegation* and *training* were found to be statically the same. *Training* and *autonomy delegation* were statistically observed less than *clarifying roles and objectives* (Table 13-15).

Work facilitation/performance places emphasis on removing obstacles that interfere with work and assures that subordinates have all necessary supplies, equipment, and support services necessary to complete the task. *Clarifying roles and objectives* is the extent to which a leader informs subordinates about their duties, responsibilities, rules and policies that must be

observed. Superintendents value principals who demonstrate the management skills that facilitate the daily business of education and who inform faculty and staff about the rules and regulations of the campus and district. The literature calls for the principal to be “an instructional leader” (Grogan & Andrews, 2002), “facilitating the teaching and learning process” (Tirozzi, 2001), and “lead learner” (Cambron-McCabe & Cunningham, 2002). These results seem to confirm Achilles and Mitchel (2001) who state schools continue to be under-led and over-managed. Bizar and Barr (2001) agree with Achilles and Mitchel by stating, “the problem for a principal is how to maintain the institutional authority inherent in a management role, while at the same time engaging in shared forms of leadership” (p. 232).

Bizar and Barr (2001) state this tendency toward management serves to maintain the status quo and works against comprehensive school reform because the leadership characteristics of facilitation, innovation, and risk-taking are critical to the success of school reform. These characteristics are best fostered in an environment of trust created by collaborative leadership rather than authoritarian. Brunner (as cited in Logan, 1999) points out that women in positions of power tend to practice this collaborative style of leadership. It could be inferred that superintendents who have a predilection to management skills may be operating from the stereotype: “men manage schools, women nurture learners” (Whitaker & Lane, 1990). This stereotype may support the absence of women in educational administration given the perception that men can manage large scale tasks better than women. According to Texas A&M

University, male teachers are 20 times more likely to advance to higher administration than female teachers (Ataiyero, 2004). This absence of women in educational administration, and subsequently the absence of the collaborative leadership they bring to the arena, could be perceived as having a negative impact on school reform, which hinges on the leadership characteristics of collaboration.

Rewarding positive performance was the least observed management behavior from the Peterson Managerial Instrument noted by superintendents with a mean of 6.63 on a 10-point Likert scale. *Rewarding positive performance* is defined as the extent to which a leader rewards effective subordinate performance with tangible benefits such as a pay increase, promotion or more desirable assignments.

Given the nature of educational organizations, there is little opportunity to reward subordinates with tangible benefits such as pay increases, or promotions so it is obvious why *Rewarding positive performance* was the least valued by superintendents.

Implications

With *work facilitation/performance* and *clarifying roles and objectives* from the Peterson Managerial Instrument being most valued by superintendents, these results imply that superintendents still place heavy emphasis on principals who have strong management skills despite the literature calling for instructional leaders who are collaborative in nature. The promise of successful comprehensive school reform hinges on Texas school

districts' ability to attract, employ and retain individuals who are transformational leaders. Women have been socialized to be problem solvers and collaborators. While gender and leadership are linked only in the respect that both men and women are capable of functioning as facilitative leaders, both must be given equal opportunity.

Given the current number of female superintendents and secondary administrators, equal opportunity is missing from the equation. Therefore, the process of identifying the pool of applicants for the principalship needs to be examined by school districts and by the state to determine what formal and informal screening processes are being used as blockades to women and minorities who are qualified educators and possess the facilitative leadership skills necessary to actualize school reform. When the formal and informal screening processes are identified, then a standardized systemic procedure needs to be put in place to ensure equity in selection.

Superintendents reported *rewarding positive performance* as least observed activity. Despite the lack of tangible benefits for rewards, in the experience of the researcher, there exists within school districts a "politics of reward" in which principals who have gained favor of the superintendent may be given preferential treatment in terms of "plum" assignments, committee work, and conferences. This type of rewards system is also seen at the campus level, as principals "reward" teachers who have gained favor through participating in valued activities. In both cases, the preferential treatment is a covert action and may closely resemble a "mentoring" activity. The politics of

reward is always positive in nature for the recipient. The fact that superintendents report rewarding positive performance as the least observed behavior may reflect their tendency to utilize the politics of reward as “doing business as usual.” An inherent problem in this type of behavior could be that it supports the status quo by reinforcing inequity between males and females.

The fact that superintendents reported *rewarding positive performance* as the least observed may reflect their reluctance to acknowledge the “politics of reward” system that operates largely as “doing business as usual.” The inherent problem is that this type of behavior supports the status quo by reinforcing inequity within the system. While it is unlikely that human bias will ever be eliminated from the school districts, professional development on appropriate procedures and heightened personal awareness on behalf of those in positions of power could help to minimize the covert practices.

Research Question #2

What leadership behaviors characterize successful principalships as perceived by selected superintendents of public independent school districts in Texas?

Research Question #2 examined which leadership behaviors characterized a successful principal (Tables 16-18) On the Peterson Managerial Instrument, 14 leadership statements were reviewed. Superintendents reported *consideration* and *presence* as the two most desired leadership characteristics, with a mean of 9.13 and 9.07 on a 10-point Likert scale, respectively. A post hoc analysis using the Scheffe analysis (Table 18)

indicated there were six different levels of perceived use between the 14 leadership behaviors on the Peterson instrument ($p < .05$). *Consideration* and *presence* emerged significantly different from the others and were most valued by superintendents. *Consideration* is defined as the extent to which a leader is friendly and supportive toward subordinates and tries to be fair and objective. *Presence* is defined as an aura that builds trust, commands attention, and is authentic and credible.

Performance emphasis was found in the next group to be statistically different from the others. It refers to the extent to which a leader emphasizes the importance of performance, tries to improve productivity and efficiency, and ensures that subordinates are working to their capacity.

Purpose was found in the second group of the Scheffe analysis to be statistically different and more valued by superintendents with a mean of 8.73. In the lowest level of the Scheffe, *decision participation* was found to be the least valued by superintendents with a mean of 7.87 on a 1-10 point scale or close to “usually.” The least valued, *decision participation,* is defined as the extent to which a leader consults with subordinates and otherwise allows them to influence decisions. This finding is contrary to the literature that calls for educational leadership to be collaborative and to “examine problems collaboratively with faculty, staff, and community” (Brunner et al., 2002). Bizar and Barr (2001) cite Eubanks and Parish indicating that the obstacles to collaborative leadership in schools are due to a reluctance to relinquish power due to a lack of trust of teachers and parents. It must be noted, however, that

particular events within educational circumstances and situations dictate how principals respond.

The leadership preferences of superintendents were also examined using Kouzes and Posner's Leadership Practices Inventory. The 30 statements were collapsed into five leadership categories (Tables 19-21). A one-way analysis of variance was performed followed by a post hoc analysis using the Scheffe analysis (Table 21) to determine which means were different from each other at $p < .05$. In the lowest level of the Scheffe, *Challenging the process* and *inspiring a shared vision* were statistically different from the other areas with a mean of 8.00 and 8.06, on a 10-point Likert scale, respectively, suggesting these qualities were valued least by the superintendents.

These findings are supported by Kouzes and Posner's (1993) research that indicates that *inspiring a shared vision* is a less frequently engaged leadership behavior and *enabling others to act*, *modeling the way* and *challenging the process* are the most frequently engaged leadership behaviors. The findings in this study place *challenging the process* as one of the least valued leadership behaviors by superintendents, differing from the research of Kouzes and Posner. However, this finding is supported by English (2001) who believes that school administrators are in a "conceptual prison of bureaucracy " and expected to follow with conformity (pp. 23-24).

In the second group, *enabling others to act*, *encouraging the heart*, and *modeling the way* from the Leadership Practices Inventory were found to be

statistically different from each other and most valued with means of 8.44, 8.49, and 8.74, on a 10-point Likert scale, respectively.

Superintendents valued *encouraging the heart* and *modeling the way* the most, although the appraisal instruments for administrators make no mention of fostering collaboration and building teams, setting examples, or celebrating accomplishments, as defined by the two behaviors. Lashway (2005) cites Brown and Irby who indicate that skills such as “collaboration and shared decision-making are not easily captured by traditional assessment instruments” (p. 7). Lashway (2005) also cites Reeves as stating, “leadership evaluation at present is a mess” (p. 7) based on assessment instruments and the perceptions of 500 school leaders in 21 states.

Implications

Consideration and *presence* on the Peterson Managerial Instrument and *modeling the way* on the Leadership Practices Inventory were found to be the most valued by superintendents when reflecting on their envisioned best principal. These behaviors deal with the ability of the principal to establish the norms by which stakeholders – teachers, parents, and students – will be treated. It involves the principal’s ability to establish friendly rapport with a diverse population and act fairly and objectively. The principal who models these behaviors not only sets the standards of excellence, but also sets the example. This requires a degree of *Presence* that is defined as the ability to build trusting relationships through the personal qualities of authenticity and credibility.

Performance emphasis from the Peterson Managerial Instrument and *enabling others to act* and *encouraging the way* from the Leadership Practices Inventory emerged as secondary, but highly valued behaviors. These are principals who try to improve productivity by collaborating with others and strengthening them through empowerment. When the goal is achieved, these principals recognize and celebrate the contributions of individuals.

These findings imply that leaders are involved and committed to individuals in the organization. These findings also run counter to the management philosophy that the task takes precedent over the individual that suggests despite the standards movement, educators are in the people business, first and foremost.

It becomes incumbent on human resource departments to seek new and innovative ways in which to identify leadership within the district. Too often this process depends on certified individuals submitting a letter of interest and a resume. Although certified and interested, this process does not ensure the best candidates. Of course, recommendations by colleagues may be sought in formal and informal ways, but again, this is partially how the pool of candidates remains limited. This process rules out individuals who may excel in the areas of leadership, but are not included in the search for principals simply because they are highly committed and campus focused. This narrowing of the applicant pool works against efforts to increase diversity. School districts, especially larger districts, should investigate the use of personality and leadership instruments in developing a cohort of upcoming leaders, then seek training

opportunities for the cohort so they can be observed in numerous settings prior to submitting a letter of interest. Additionally, as indicated by the research, principal evaluations should be adjusted to reflect the exercise of these leadership behaviors in proportion to other managerial expectations.

Purpose and *decision participation* from the Peterson Managerial Instrument and *challenging the process* and *inspiring a shared vision* from the Leadership Practices Inventory were found to be the least valued by superintendents. *Purpose* and *inspiring a shared vision* are the behaviors in which principals clearly articulate their vision, mission, and goals. *Challenging the process* is the behavior in which principals seek opportunities to change the status quo through innovative ways involving experimenting and risk-taking. *Decision participation* is the behavior in which the principal allows others to be involved in the decision-making process.

In regards to *purpose*, *inspiring a shared vision*, and *challenging the process*, these findings suggest that in Texas, high stakes accountability has led education to such specificity in teaching and learning as well as the measurement of the specified teaching and learning that there is a minimizing effect on the importance of experimenting and taking risks. Inspiring others to the principal's vision is also stunted, giving way to the legislature's vision and the goals of the district suggesting that principals deliver the message given them. The nature of educational administration in the age of state-dictated curriculum, high-stakes testing, and district accountability ratings does not

allow for utilizing administrative or campus initiatives that are developed through the individual principal's vision.

Decision participation was among the least valued behavior in the superintendent's envisioned best principal despite the clarion call from the literature for collaborative and democratic leadership. The principalship is a fractured position that is constantly bombarded from every vista – students, teachers, parents, central office, the media, state agencies, and the legislators – all of whom have differing opinions on how to handle the operations of a campus and none of whom have all of the details of specific events that may be in question. The fractured nature of the principalship oftentimes requires immediacy of action, thus reducing the amount of time readily available for collaborative leadership activities such as *decision participation .* Additionally, we know from research that students perform better in small schools; yet, we continue to expect school principals to display collaborative leadership in schools that are larger than many towns and that may be operating at best in chaos as illustrated at New Britain High School (Bizar & Barr, 2001). Principals of large schools may deal with more crisis situations due to the larger population and must often act with a minimum of input and limited dialogue from their stakeholders. The sheer number of people involved in a situation may make collaborative leadership that extends to all levels of the organization impossible.

This is not to say that all large schools operate in chaos or that all small schools are successful in creating small learning communities. In the case of

both large and small campuses, the time-management skills of the principal will set the tone and level of decision participation at a base level. The larger the campus, the more difficult it may be to display collaborative leadership. Given the fractured nature of the principalship, the individual who is a poor time manager will have a much more difficult time using decision participation at a larger campus.

The action of *decision participation* is also hindered by the fact that "local control" and decisions made by campus leadership teams are nothing more than a facade as they can be over-ridden at any time by central office. Until these situations change, these leadership behaviors will continue to be absent from the schoolhouse.

Research Question #3

Does gender impact how superintendents characterize exemplary management and leadership behaviors differently in public independent school districts in Texas?

The third research question sought to determine if gender impacts the degree to which superintendents identify the frequency of management and leadership behaviors in their best principals. Independent samples t-tests were performed on the Peterson Managerial Leadership Instrument (Table 22). Statistical differences were found between males and females in the following three items at p = 0.05: *clarifying roles and objectives, inspiration,* and *networking.* In each of these items, the female superintendents had a higher mean than male superintendents. Interestingly, *clarifying roles and objectives,*

which is defined as the extent to which the principal informs subordinates about their duties and responsibilities, specifying the rules and regulations of the campus and district, female superintendents reported a mean of 8.98 while male superintendents scored a mean of 5.51 on a 10-point Likert scale. Further investigation is warranted to determine if there are differences in male and female understanding of the term.

Inspiration and n*etworking* were also found to be significant at the p=0.05 level. Female and male superintendents shared a very close mean on the characteristic of i*nspiration* with a mean of 8.92 and 8.53, on a 10-point Likert scale, respectively. On the item of n*etworking,* female superintendents reported a mean of 8.46 and male superintendents reported a mean of 7.81 on a 10-point Likert scale.

Statistical differences were found between males and females in the following six items at p = 0.01: *Work facilitation/performance, purpose, teambuilding, problem solving, recognition* and *decision participation.* In the item *problem solving*, female superintendents reported a mean of 9.01, with male superintendents reporting a mean of only 5.51 on a 10-point Likert scale. The difference between the female and male superintendents on *Problem Solving* is especially interesting at the p=0.01 level.

Female superintendents valued all nine of the behaviors over male superintendents in every significant comparison. Interestingly, only *work facilitation/performance* and *clarifying roles and objectives* are management-based behaviors. The remaining behaviors: *purpose, teambuilding, problem*

solving, recognition, inspiration, networking, and *decision participation* are leadership based behaviors. This may infer that women superintendents identify and value leadership behaviors over management behaviors more than male superintendents.

Question #3 was also investigated by examining the Leadership Practices Inventory cluster scores of the male and female superintendents (Table 23). Female superintendents perceived each of the leadership qualities occurring more regularly than male superintendents in every LPI category demonstrated by a higher mean than male superintendents. The following LPI categories were found significant at the p= 0.05 level: *modeling the way, encouraging the heart, inspiring a shared vision*, and *challenging the process*. Once again, *challenging the process* was the least valued by male and female superintendents supporting English (2001) who indicates schools cannot change because what leaders do will be determined by "institutional constraints" (p. 24). Another possible reason may be the less favorable perception of being seen as someone who is "rocking the educational boat." District culture demands that principals act in the fashion of a "company person." It is possible that within the system of education that *challenging the process* has a negative connotation.

Enabling others to act was the only LPI category found to be significant at the p=0.01 level. Kouzes and Posner (2002) define this category as the leader's ability to "foster collaboration and build teams by strengthening others and making individuals feel capable and powerful" (p. 4).

The data from both instruments suggest that women superintendents value leadership behaviors more than men. The literature continually calls for educational “leaders” who maximize the use of collaboration, community, cooperation, teams and relationship building (Brunner et al., 2002). Eagly et al. (as cited in Young & McLeod, 2001) state that meta-analysis of educational administrators leadership styles points to female administrators as more democratic and likely to use decision participation strategies. The findings of this study corroborate this.

Murphy (2002a) states the roots of educational administration have “atrophied” (p. 76) over the last century due to a foundation based on scientific business management and social sciences. Murphy (2002a) cites Sergiovanni as calling for leadership by empowering others to build a “shared covenant” (p. 77) resulting in leadership that is “as much heart and head” (p. 77). Neuman and Simmons (2000) support the findings of this study with their profound statement that the system has “institutionalized the appointing and anointing of leaders, often marginalizing those with more flexible leadership styles” (p. 10).

Implications

The findings of the question support the concept found in the literature that women in positions of authority generally value and practice a more facilitative leadership style. Despite estimates of shortages in the principalship and superintendency, women and minorities remain under-represented in educational administration. The continued call from the literature for a new leadership style should encourage us to question as a society, as educators,

and as educational leaders, what message is being sent to students about the value of women as reflected in their role in the structure of our schools.

Research Question #4

Does the size of district influence how superintendents characterize exemplary management and leadership behaviors in public independent school districts in Texas?

This question investigated whether or not the size of the school district influenced how superintendents characterized exemplary management and leadership behaviors (Tables 24-33).

When the data from the Leadership Practices Inventory were collapsed in the five areas, there were no areas of statistical difference found between the size of district and how superintendents characterized leadership.

Murphy (2002a) indicates that the practice of leadership has very little to do with education or leadership as evidenced by the fact that schools are organized and managed as if there were no pedagogy for student learning or adult professionals. In other words, despite the clarion call in the literature and research regarding small caring environments, schools overwhelmingly tend to be organized and operated as large institutions. School restructuring strategies aimed at reorganizing large schools into smaller, more personal units include schools-within-a-school that can simulate a neighborhood tone rather than the large city climate that often permeates schools with memberships of 2000-4000 students. Murphy believes that three paradigms will emerge from school reform: (a) social justice, (b) school improvement, and (c) democratic

community, which have the ability to change school administration. The social justice paradigm will ensure that women and minorities are represented proportionately in the school system. School administrators who operate from a "pedagogic motive" (Evans, as cited in Murphy, 2002a, p. 187) will be able to refocus schools on current research on teaching and learning. The final paradigm of democratic community will come from school administrators who open the schoolhouse doors to parents and community members to the extent that all voices are honored and stakeholders are leaders among leaders. Neuman and Simmons (2000) state that this type of collective responsibility promotes the ownership of the stakeholders. Sergiovanni (as cited in Murphy, 2002a) notes, "changing our metaphors is an important prerequisite for developing a new theory of management and a new leadership practice" (p. 186).

Recommendations

As a result of this study, several recommendations are proposed for dealing with effects of organizational incongruity and its impact on maintaining leadership inequality in Texas independent school districts. These recommendations include implications for practice as well as implications for further research and development based on this study.

Recommendations Based on This Study

1. Since the data collected reported that superintendents view *work facilitation/performance* and *clarifying roles and objectives* as significant and indicative of desired management characteristics, it is

recommended that a review of principal appraisal instruments be conducted. These instruments should reflect the management tasks associated with the categories and additional investigation should be implemented to determine if these management tasks are weighted evenly against other administrative duties.

2. Based on the findings in the study, it is recommended that school districts need to examine the process of identifying the pool of applicants for the principalship to determine what formal and informal screening processes are being used that may be hindering gender equity in educational administration.
3. The data reported *challenging the process* as the least valued leadership quality by male and female superintendents. It is recommended that superintendents be made aware of the findings and encouraged to search for ways to stimulate the creativity and innovation of principals in this age of standards based education.
4. Based on the findings, it is recommended that school districts should investigate the use of personality and leadership instruments in developing a cohort of potential principals, then seek training opportunities so that individuals can be observed in various settings.
5. The data reported in this study indicated that superintendents perceived *consideration* and *presence* as two of the most desired leadership qualities. It is recommended that superintendents as a professional

group engage in discussion and reflection as to what specific actions characterize and contribute to these leadership qualities.

6. The data reported a significant difference between male and female superintendents on the qualities of *problem solving* and *clarifying roles and objectives*. It is recommended that superintendents as a professional group engage in discussions to ascertain why male and female superintendents perceive, value, and understand the definitions and qualities associated with problem-solving and with clarifying roles and objectives so differently.
7. Since the data indicated that women possess the transformational leadership skills desired for school reform and are most frequently the role model for the ideal principal, superintendents and school board members should be made aware of the pool of qualified female applicants as well as receive additional training in recruitment and hiring practices.

Recommendations for Further Research

1. An extension of this study might include qualitative research to determine the actions and attitudes superintendents feel constitute the desired qualities of *consideration* and *presence* in principals.
2. The research indicated that one of the most significant leadership qualities desired in schools was *decision participation*; yet, this quality was among the least frequently identified. It is recommended that further research be done in order to understand why there is such a dramatic

difference between the literature's call for collaborative leadership and the perceptions of the superintendents.

3. Future research needs to be conducted to determine how superintendents convey their hiring preferences to assistant superintendents in human resources and to school board members. This should include exploration into the ways in which gender and race affect the recruitment, selection, and retention process for school administrators.
4. Further investigation needs to be conducted regarding the correlation between administrator preparation programs, professional testing domains, and the desired leadership and management qualities expressed by superintendents. It is necessary to determine if all the aspects of educational administration are moving toward the same goals, in terms of the knowledge base, licensure, performance objectives, and vision of the superintendents.
5. A replication of this study could be implemented in which the researcher investigates whether or not the envisioned best principal was at the elementary or secondary level. Such an investigation could assist in distinguishing how superintendents perceive the roles of elementary and secondary principals and further elaborate on the perception that different skills are necessary for different administrative levels.

REFERENCES

Achilles, C. M., & Mitchel, C. P. (2001). But the emperor has on no clothes. *Education Leadership Review, 2*(2), 16-21.

Achilles, C. M., & Price, W. J. (2001, Winter). What is missing in the current debate about education administration standards? *The AASA Professor, 24*(2), 8-14.

Ataiyero, K. T. (2004, January 7). Women lead few school districts. *Newsobserver.com*. Retrieved January 8, 2004, from http://newsobserver.com/front/v-print/story/3189810p-2868935c.html

Avila, L. (1990). Just what is instructional leadership anyway? *NASSP Bulletin, 74*(525), 52-56.

Bennis, W., & Nanus, B. (1985). *Leaders: The strategies for taking charge*. New York: Harper & Row.

Beyer, B. M., & Ruhl-Smith, C. (1998). The principal's role in school restructuring and reform: An examination of self-perceived leadership styles. *The Journal of Leadership Studies, 5*(2), 116-128.

Bizar, M., & Barr, R. (2001). *School leadership in times of urban reform*. Mahway, NJ: Erlbaum.

Bjork, L. G. (2000). Introduction: Women in the superintendency – Advance in research and theory. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 36*(1), 5-17.

Blackmore, J. (2002). Troubling women: The upsides and downsides of leadership and the new managerialism. In C. Reynolds (Ed.), *Women*

and school leadership (pp. 49-69). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Blount, J. M. (1998). *Destined to rule the schools: Women and the superintendency 1873-1995*. New York City: New York State University Press.

Bradford, M. (1998). *The perceptions of superintendents, personnel directors, and school board presidents in southeast Texas toward attributes, barriers, and effectiveness of women as high school principals*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX.

Brundrett, M. (2001). The development of school leadership preparation programs in England and the USA. *Educational Management and Administration, 29*(2), 229-245.

Brunner, C. C. (Ed.). (1999). *Sacred dreams: Women and the superintendency*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Brunner, C. C. (2000). *Principles of power: Women superintendents and the riddle of the heart* (pp. 1-20). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Brunner, C. C., Grogan, M., & Bjork, L. G. (2002). Shifts in the discourse defining the superintendency: Historical and current foundations of the position. In J. Murphy (Ed.), *The educational leadership challenge: Redefining leadership for the 21st century* (pp. 211-238). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Burstyn, J. N. (1980). Historical perspective on women in educational leadership. In S. K. Biklen & M. B. Brannigan (Eds.), *Women and educational leadership* (pp. 65-91). Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.

Button, H. W. (1966). Doctrines of administration: A brief history. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 2*(3), 216-217.

Caine, R. N., & Caine, G. (1997). *Education on the edge of possibilities*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Cambron-McCabe, N., & Cunningham, L. (2002). National Commission for the Advancement of Educational Leadership: Opportunity for transformation. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 38*(2), 289-299.

Clement, J. (1980). Sex bias in school administration. In S. K. Bilklen & M. B. Brannigan (Eds.), *Women and educational leadership* (pp. 131-139). Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.

Clinch, L. (1996). *Women superintendents' forecast of critical leadership roles and responsibilities of the 21st century superintendent*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX.

Coleman, D. G. (2001). Standards-based preparation for school principals: A contrast to the Iowa State program modifications. *Education Leadership Review, 2*(2), 35-39.

Coleman, D. G., Copeland, D. G., & Adams, R. C. (2001). University education administration program development: Administrative skills vs. administrative standards as predictors of administrative success. In T. J.

Kowalski (Ed.), *21st century challenges for school administrators* (pp. 53-64). Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press.

Cooper, B. S., & Boyd, W. L. (1987). The evolution of training for school administrators. In J. Murphy & P. Hallinger (Eds.), *Approaches to administrative training in education* (pp. 3-27). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Costa, M. E. (1981). *A descriptive study of women superintendents of public schools in the United States*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Columbia University, Teachers College, New York.

Culbertson, J. (1988). A century's quest for a knowledge base. In N. J. Boyan (Ed.), *Handbook of research on educational administration* (pp. 3-26). New York: Longman.

DeBevoise, W. (1984, February). Synthesis of research on the principal instruction leader. *Educational Leadership, 41*(5), 14-20.

Drake, T. L., & Roe, W. H. (1986). *The principalship* (3rd ed.). New York: Macmillan.

Driscoll, M. E. (2001). The "heartland of the ordinary": The landscape of educational administration in the 21st century. *UCEA Review, 62*(1), 3-5.

Dunklee, D. R. (2000). *If you want to lead, not just manage: A primer for principals*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

English, F. W. (2001). You say you saw what? Which veil did you lift? *Education Leadership Review, 2*(2), 22-27.

Forsyth, P. B. (1999). Educational administration: An odyssey. *UCEA Review, 60*(3), 6-9.

Fullan, M. G., & Miles, M. B. (1992). Getting reform right: What works and what doesn't. *Phi Delta Kappan, 73*, 744-752.

Gall, M., Borg, W., & Gall, J. (1996). *Educational research: An introduction* (6th ed.). White Plains, NY: Longman.

Giroux, H. A. (Ed.). (1991). *Post modernism, feminism, and cultural politics*. Albany, NY: State University of New York.

Glass, T., E. , Bjork, L. G., & Brunner, C. C. (2000). *The study of the American school superintendency: A look at the superintendent of education in the new millennium.* Arlington, VA: American Association of School Administrators.

Grogan, M., & Andrews, R. (2002). Defining preparation and professional development for the future. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 38*(2), 233-256.

Guido-DiBrito, F., Noteboom, P., Nathan, L., & Fenty, J. (1996). Traditional and new paradigm leadership: The gender link source. *Initiatives, 58*(1), 27-38.

Gupton, S. L., & Slick, G. A. (1996). *Highly successful women administrators: The inside stories of how they got there*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Hill, M. S., & Ragland, J. C. (1995). *Women as educational leaders: Opening windows, pushing ceilings*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Horn, R. (2001a). Bumps or roadblocks? A pessimistic view of educational administration's response to the challenges of the 21st century. *Education Leadership Review, 2*(2), 14-15.

Horn, R. (2001b). Same old path, familiar bumps: Educational administration's response to the challenges of the 21st century. *Education Leadership Review, 2*(2), 1-9.

Houston, P. D. (2000). Commentary: Transforming the superintendent of schools into a superintendent of education. *The AASA Professor, 23*(2), 26-28.

Hoyle, J. R., English, F. W., & Steffy, B. E. (1998). *Skills for successful 21st century school leaders*. Arlington, VA: American Association of School Administrators.

Immegart, G. L. (1988). Leadership and leader behavior. In N. J. Boyan (Ed.), *Handbook of research on educational administration: A project of the American Educational Research Association* (pp. 259-227). New York: Longman.

Kingsley, H. (2000). Administrative practice: New meanings through unstructured observational studies. *Journal of Educational Administration, 38*(3), 288-298.

Konnert, M. W., & Augenstein, J. J. (1990). *The superintendency in the nineties: What superintendents and board members need to know*. Lancaster, PA: Technomic.

Kouzes, J., & Posner, B. (1993). *Credibility*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Kouzes, J., & Posner, B. (1997a). *The leadership challenge*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Kouzes, J., & Posner, B. (1997b). *Leadership practices inventory (LPI): P**articipant's workbook*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Kouzes, J., & Posner, B. (2002). *The leadership practices inventory: Theory and evidence behind the five practices of exemplary leaders*. Retrieved June 2, 2002, from http://www.leadershipchallenge.com

Lashway, L. (2005). Principal evaluation. *NAESP Research Roundup, 20*(3) Retrieved January 7, 2005, from http://www.naesp.org

Leizear, J. L. (1984). *The incidence and influence of mentorship in the career development of upper level women administrators in public school systems in Texas*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX.

Logan, J. P. (1999). An educational leadership challenge: Refocusing gender equity strategies. *The AASA Professor, 22*(4), 1-8.

McCauslan, J. A., & Kleiner, B. H. (1985). Women and organization leadership. *Equal Opportunities International, 11*(6), 12-15.

Murphy, J. (1995). Restructuring in Kentucky: The changing role of the superintendent and the district office. In K. Leithwood (Ed.), *Effective school district leadership: Transforming politics into education* (p. 352). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Murphy, J. (Ed.). (2002a). *The educational leadership challenge: Redefining leadership for the 21st century* (Part I). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Murphy, J. (2002b). Reculturing the profession of educational leadership: New blueprints. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 38*(2), 176-191.

National School Board Association. (2002). *National School Board Association Toolkit*. Retrieved June 16, 2002, from http://www.nsba.org/sbot/toolkit/LeadQual.html

Nestor-Baker, N. S., & Hoy, W. K. (2001). Tacit knowledge of school superintendents: Its nature, meaning, and content. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 37*(1), 86-129.

Neuman, M., & Simmons, W. (2000). Leadership for student learning. *Phi Delta Kappan, 82*(1), 9-12.

Northouse, P. G. (2001). *Leadership: Theory and practice* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Olson, L. (2000). New thinking on what makes a leader. *Education Week on the Web*. Retrieved June 16, 2002, from http://www.edweek.org

Ortiz, F. I., & Marshall, C. (1988). Women in educational administration. In N. Boyan (Ed.), *Handbook of research on educational administration* (pp. 123-142). New York: Longman.

Owens, R. G. (1991). *Organizational behavior in education* (4th ed.). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Pellicer, L. O., Anderson, L. W., Keefe, J. W., Kelley, E. A., & McClearly, L. E. (1990). *High School Leaders and their schools* (Vol. 2). Reston, VA: National Association of Secondary School Principals.

Petersen, G. J. (2002). Singing the same tune: Principals' and school board members' perceptions of the superintendent's role as instructional leader. *Journal of Educational Administration, 40*(2), 158-171.

Petersen, G. J., & Short, P. M. (2001). The school board president's perception of the district superintendent: Applying the lenses of social influence and social style. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 37*(4), 533-570.

Peterson, K. D. (1987). Administrative control and instructional leadership. In W. Greenfield (Ed.), *Instructional leadership: Concepts, issues, and controversies* (p. 343). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Peterson, K. D., & Kelley, C. (2001). Transforming school leadership. *Leadership, 30,* 48-51.

Pigford, A. B., & Tonnsen, S. (1993). *Women in school leadership: Survival and advancement guidebook*. Lancaster, PA: Technomic.

Regan, H., & Brooks, G. (1995). *Out of women's experience: Creating relational leadership*. Newbury Park, CA: Corwin Press.

Richards, C. (1988). *Women in administration: Facilitators for change*. Newbury Park, CA: Corwin Press.

Rosener, J. B. (1990, November-December). Ways women lead. *Harvard Business Review*, pp. 119-125.

Senge, P. M. (1990). *The fifth discipline: The art and practice of the learning organization* (1st ed.). New York: Currency Doubleday.

Sergiovanni, T. J. (1984). Leadership and excellence in schooling. *Educational Leadership, 45*(5), 4-13.

Sergiovanni, T. J. (1990). *Value-added leadership: How to get extraordinary performance in schools*. San Diego: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Shakeshaft, C. (1999). The struggle to create a more gender-inclusive profession. In J. Murphy & K. S. Louis (Eds.), *Handbook of research on educational administration* (pp. 99-116). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Skrla, L. (1998). *The social construction of the gender in the superintendency.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Diego.

Smith, J. K., & Blase, J. (1988). Educational leadership: A moral and practical activity. *NASSP Bulletin, 72*(510), 1-11.

Southwest Educational Development Laboratory (SEDL). (1992). *Cultivate principals as colleagues*. Retrieved June 19, 2002, from http://www.sedl.org/change/issues/issues21.html

Southwest Educational Development Laboratory (SEDL). (2001a). *History of leadership research*. Retrieved June 19, 2002, from http://www.sedl.org/change/leadership/history.html

Southwest Educational Development Laboratory (SEDL). (2001b). *Who are the leaders?* Retrieved June 30, 2002, from http://www.sedl.org/change/issues/issues12/2.html

Tallerico, M. (2000). Gaining access to the superintendency: Headhunging gender and color. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 36*(1), 18-43.

Texas Education Agency. (2003). *Texas education directory: Public schools personnel directory*. Austin, TX: Author.

Tirozzi, G. N. (2001). The artistry of leadership: The evolving role of the secondary school principal. *Phi Delta Kappan, 82,* 434-447.

Tyack, D., & Cuban, L. (1995). *Tinkering toward Utopia*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Tyack, D., & Hansot, E. (1982). *Managers of virtue: Public school leadership in America*. New York: Basic Books.

Usdan, M. (2001). *Leadership for student learning*. Washington, DC: The Institute for Educational Leadership.

Usdan, M., McCloud, B., & Podmostko, M. (2000). *Leadership for student learning: Reinventing the principalship*. Washington, DC: The Institute for Educational Leadership.

Van Fleet, D. D., & Yukl, G. A. (1986). *Military leadership: An organizational behavior perspective* (Vol. 3). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Wesson, L. & Grady, M. (1994). An analysis of women urban superintendents: A national study. *Urban Education, 28*(4), 412-424.

Whitaker, K., & Lane, K. (1990). What is ‘a woman’s place’ in educational administration? *Education Digest, 56*, 12-16.

Williams, D. E. (1985). *Assessing the upper-level female administrator in public school districts of Texas: A profile of characteristics, processes, and*

training. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX.

Willower, D. J., & Uline, C. L. (2001). The alleged demise of science: A critical inquest. *Journal of Educational Administration, 39*(5), 455-471.

Wirt, F. M (1990). *The missing link in instructional leadership: The superintendent, conflict, and maintenance*. Urbana, IL: The National Center for School Leadership.

Wood, G. H. (1990). Teaching for democracy. *Educational Leadership, 8*(3). 32-37.

Young, M. D., & McLeod, S. (2001). Flukes, opportunities, and planned interventions: Factors affecting women's decisions to become school administrators. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 37*(4), 462-502.

Yukl, G. A. (1981). *Leadership in organizations*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Yukl, G. A. (1998). *Leadership in organizations* (4th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Yukl, G. A., & Nemeroff, W. F. (1979). Identification and measurement of specific categories of leadership behavior: A progress report. In J. G. Hunt & L. L. Larson (Eds.), *Crosscurrents in leadership* (pp. 164-200). Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.

APPENDIX A

INITIAL COVER LETTER

Katherine A. White
225 Belvidere
San Antonio, Texas 78212

May 1, 2004

Dear

I am a doctoral student at Texas A&M University in the field of Educational Administration. I am currently working under the supervision of Dr. Stephen Stark for my doctoral dissertation. This research project will seek to determine which management and leadership behaviors superintendents perceive as critical to the position of principalship.

I invite you to participate in my study by visiting the website listed below, filling out the survey and submitting it electronically. It will take approximately 10 minutes to complete. I have provided you with a validation code that you will enter when you access the website. The data collected will be confidential. Your individual responses will not be available to your district or anyone else other than the researcher and graduate committee. Only grouped data will be reported without any identifying information. All materials will be stored in a secure environment.

You may contact my Committee Chair, Dr. Stephen Stark, at 979.845.2656 or at sstark@tamu.edu. You may contact me at 210.824.1827 or StsPP@aol.com if you have any questions.

Thank you in advance for your support and consideration.

Sincerely,

Katherine White

Katherine White
Website Address:
Validation Code:

APPENDIX B

REMINDER LETTER

Katherine A. White
225 Belvidere
San Antonio, Texas 78212

May 10, 2004

Dear

I am a doctoral student at Texas A&M University in the field of Educational Administration. I am currently working under the supervision of Dr. Stephen Stark for my doctoral dissertation. This research project will seek to determine which management and leadership behaviors superintendents perceive as critical to the position of principalship. Your participation and input is extremely important to my study.

As the leader of your district, I value your views and would be grateful for your response to my survey. Please take ten minutes to assist me by visiting the website listed below, filling out the survey and submitting it electronically. I have provided you with a validation code that you will enter when you access the website. The data collected will be confidential. Your individual responses will not be available to your district or anyone else other than the researcher and graduate committee. Only grouped data will be reported without any identifying information. All materials will be stored in a secure environment.

Website Address:
Validation Code:

If you are unable to access the website, please let me know by contacting me at StsPP@aol.com.

Thank you in advance for your support and consideration.

Sincerely,

Katherine White

Katherine White

APPENDIX C

EMAIL REMINDER

Dear «Superintendent» :

Recognizing your valuable role as superintendent and educational leader in a Texas school district like «ISD», would you consider it too much of an imposition to complete a short survey? You may have missed previous survey completion requests sent via email and by snail mail.

Your participation will provide valuable feedback on the work you do, feedback that will be shared back with superintendents like you and those that may follow in your footsteps.

COMPLETE THE SURVEY BY GOING TO:
http://itls.saisd.net:591/kwsurvey

Make sure you note your access code, which is as follows: «Code»

If you have already responded, or mailed a hard copy, thank you for taking the time to share your perspective with the community. You have my profound gratitude.

Thank you

APPENDIX D

YUKL & PETERSON INSTRUMENT

Development of Yukl's Taxonomy of Leadership Behavior

1979	1981	1989	2003 Dissertation
Product Emphasis	Performance Emphasis	Monitoring Operations and the Environment	Performance Emphasis
Consideration	Consideration	Support/ Mentoring	Consideration
Training	Training and Coaching		Training and Coaching
	Inspiration (1985)		Inspiration (1985)
Positive Reinforcement	Praise and Recognition	Recognizing and Rewarding	Praise and Recognition
	Structuring Rewards		Structuring Rewards
Decision Participation	Decision Participation	Consulting and Delegating	Decision Participation
Autonomy-Delegation	Autonomy Delegation		Autonomy Delegation
Role Clarification	Role Clarification	Clarifying Roles and Objectives	Role Clarification
Goal Setting	Goal Setting		Goal Setting
	Information Dissemination	Informing	Information Dissemination
	Problem Solving	Problem Solving	Problem Solving
Planning	Planning	Planing and Organizating	Planning
Coordinating	Coordinating		Coordinating
Work Facilitation	Work Facilitation	Networking	Work Facilitation
	Representing		Networking

Interaction Facilitation	Interaction Facilitation		Interaction Facilitation
Conflict Management	Conflict Management	Managing Conflict and Team Building	Conflict Management
Criticism	Criticism - Discipline		Criticism - Discipline
		Motivating	Motivating
			Teambuilding
			Presence
			Principle (culture)
			Purpose (vision)
			Performance (action)

Correlation of Survey Instruments

Kouzes/Posner	**Yukl**
Challenging the Process #1, 6, 11, 16, 21, 26	Performance Emphasis Problem Solving Inspiration (a little bit)
Inspiring a Shared Vision # 2, 7, 12, 17, 22, 27	Inspiration Purpose Teambuilding
Modeling the Way #4, 9, 14, 19, 24, 29	Performance Emphasis Goal Setting Role Clarification
Enabling Others to Act #3, 8, 13, 18, 23, 28	Goal Setting Clarifying Roles and Objectives Training
Encouraging the Heart # 5, 10, 15, 20, 25, 30	Rewards Inspiration

Note:
Yukl's early work identified 9 managerial statements which he increased to 14 (Yukl, Nemeroff, 1979). By 1981, Yukl's taxonomy increased to 19 leadership behaviors. In 1989 Yukl combined several of the areas to produce a survey targeted at 11 leadership behaviors. In this study I will be using the 19 identified characteristics as a starting point, separating recognizing and rewarding and role clarification and goal setting for the purpose of behavioral specificity. Additionally, 4 behaviors identified by Peterson (Presence, Principal, Purpose and Performance) will be included for a total of 25 behaviors.

Hypothese

Ho 1 Male superintendents will rate Managerial behaviors as more important than leadership behaviors. Female superintendents Women will rate Leadership behaviors as more important than management behaviors.

Ho 2 There will be no difference between male and female superintendents because female superintendents have become desensitized by moving up the ranks

Ho3 Superintendents value management behaviors, while preparation programs and liscensure Exams focus on leadership thus hindering school reform

Kouzes/Posner	Yukl	ISLLC Standards	Prof. Dev. Inv. NAESP	Texas Standards
Challenging the Process	Performance Emphasis		Instructional Leadership	
	Problem Solving			
	Inspiration (a little bit)			
Inspiring a Shared Vision	Inspiration	Facilitates Vison	Group Leadership and Team Building	
	Purpose			
	Teambuilding			
Modeling the Way	Performance Emphasis	Acts with ethics and integrity	Moral Responsibility	
	Goal Setting			
	Role Clarification			
Enabling Others to Act	Goal Setting	Ensures Management	System Analysis	
	Clarifying Roles and Objectives		Instructional Analysis and Supervision	
	Training			
	Work Facilitation			
Encouraging the Heart	Rewards			
	Inspiration			
	Consideration			
	Praise and Recognition			
	Decision Participation	Collaborates with community		
	Autonomy Delegation			
	Information Dissemination			
	Problem Solving		Problem Solving	

	Planning		Planning	
	Coordinating		Organizing	
	Interaction Facilitation			
	Conflict Management			
	Criticism Discipline			
	Motivating			
	Presence			
	Principle/culture	Advocates school culture for learning	Climate Analysis	
	Purpose /vision		Vision	
	Performance/ action		Decisiveness	
	Networking	Understands political, social context and influences it		
			Creativity	

APPENDIX E

PETERSON MANAGERIAL INSTRUMENT AND

LEADERSHIP PRACTICES INVENTORY

Below are 24 managerial behaviors that a principal might exhibit during the course of a given day. All of these behaviors are important in developing and maintaining a successful learning community.

The term faculty/staff refer to all campus employees under the ultimate supervision of the principal.

Please read each statement carefully. Envision the best principal in your district, then rate how frequently you perceive the individual engaging in the described behavior using the score below:

1 Almost Never	6 Sometimes
2 Rarely	7 Fairly Often
3 Seldom	8 Usually
4 Once in a While	9 Very Frequently
5 Occasionally	10 Almost Always

_____ The principal emphasizes the importance of faculty/staff members performance, tries to improve productivity and tries to keep employees working up to their ability.

_____ The principal is friendly, supportive, and considerate in his/her behavior toward faculty/staff and tries to be fair and objective

_____ The principal stimulates enthusiasm among the faculty/staff for their work and builds faculty/staff confidence in their ability to perform assignments successfully.

_____ The principal provides praise and recognition to faculty/staff with effective performance, shows appreciation for their contributions, and makes sure the individuals get credit for their ideas and suggestions.

_____ The principal motivates effective faculty/staff performance with tangible benefits such as more desirable assignments, better schedules, comp time, or other available means.

_____ The principal builds and maintains a strong effective team that recognizes the importance of shared purpose and mutual accountability.

_____ The principal consults with faculty/staff and otherwise allows them to influence his/her decisions.

_____ The principal delegates authority and responsibility to faculty/staff and allows them to determine how to do their work.

_____ The principal informs faculty/staff about their duties and responsibilities, specifies the rules and policies that must be observed, and lets employees know what is expected of them

_____ The principal emphasizes the importance of setting specific performance goals for each important aspect of the teacher/staff's job.

_____ The principal measures progress toward the performance goals and provides concrete feedback.

_____ The principal determines professional development needs for the faculty/staff, and provides any necessary training and coaching.

_____ The principal keeps faculty/staff informed about developments that affect their work, including events in the district, or outside the organization and decisions made by central office.

_____ The principal takes the initiative in proposing solutions to serious work-related problems and acts decisively to deal with such problems when a prompt solution is needed.

_____ The principal coordinates the work of faculty/staff, and emphasizes the importance of coordination and encourages faculty to coordinate their activities.

_____ The principal obtains for faculty/staff the necessary supplies, equipment, support services, or other resources needed to complete the work.

_____ The principal establishes contact with other groups and important people in the organization, persuades them to appreciate and support his/her campus, and uses his/her influence to promote and defend the interest of the campus.

_____ The principal encourages faculty/staff to be friendly with each other, cooperate with each other, and help each other.

_____ The principal restrains faculty/staff from arguing, encourages them to resolve conflicts in a constructive manner, and helps to settle conflicts and disagreements between subordinates.

_____ The principal disciplines a faculty/staff member who shows consistently poor performance, violates a rule or disobeys directions.

_____ The principal with the site based management team plans the campus future objectives and makes contingency plans for potential problems.

_____ The principal creates a clear and compelling direction for the organization to pursue.

_____ The principal identifies and enforces the norms of the organization.

_____ The principal has a presence about him/herself that builds trust, commands attention, is authentic and credible.

Below are 30 leadership behaviors that a principal might exhibit during the course of a given day. Using the same principal you envisioned above, rate how frequently you perceive the individual engaging in the described behavior using the score below:

1 Almost Never	6 Sometimes
2 Rarely	7 Fairly Often
3 Seldom	8 Usually
4 Once in a While	9 Very Frequently
5 Occasionally	10 Almost Always

_____ The principal seeks challenging opportunities.

_____ The principal talks about future trends.

_____ The principal develops cooperative relationships.

_____ The principal sets the example of what is expected.

_____ The principal praises people for a job well done.

_____ The principal challenges faculty/staff to try new approaches.

_____ The principal describes a compelling image of the future.

_____ The principal listens to diverse points of view.

_____ The principal ensures that people adhere to agreed-on standards.

_____ The principal expresses confidence in people's abilities.

_____ The principal looks outside the organization for ways to improve.

_____ The principal appeals to others to share the dream of the future.

_____ The principal treats people with dignity and respect.

_____ The principal follows through on promises and commitments.

_____ The principal creatively rewards people for their contributions.

_____ The principal asks, "What can we learn?"

_____ The principal shows others how their interests can be realized.

_____ The principal supports other people's decisions.

_____ The principal is clear about his/her philosophy of leadership.

_____ The principal recognizes people for commitment to shared values.

_____ The principal experiments and takes risks.

_____ The principal is enthusiastic and positive about the future

_____ The principal lets faculty/staff choose how to do their work.

_____ The principal ensures that goals, plans and milestones are set.

_____ The principal finds ways to celebrate accomplishments.

_____ The principal takes initiative to overcome obstacles.

_____ The principal speaks with conviction about the meaning of work.

_____ The principal ensures that people grow in their jobs.

_____ The principal makes progress toward goals one step at a time.

_____ The principal gives team members appreciation and support.

Peterson Managerial Leadership Instrument Leadership Statements

_____ The principal emphasizes the importance of faculty/staff members performance, tries to improve productivity and tries to keep employees working up to their ability. **mL Performance emp.**

_____ The principal is friendly, supportive, and considerate in his/her behavior toward faculty/staff and tries to be fair and objective. **mL Consideration**

_____ The principal stimulates enthusiasm among the faculty/staff for their work and builds faculty/staff confidence in their ability to perform assignments successfully. **mL Inspiration**

_____ The principal provides praise and recognition to faculty/staff with effective performance, shows appreciation for their contributions, and makes sure the individuals get credit for their ideas and suggestions. **mL Recognization**

_____ The principal builds and maintains a strong effective team that recognizes the importance of shared purpose and mutual accountability. **mL Teambuilding**

_____ The principal consults with faculty/staff and otherwise allows them to influence his/her decisions.
mL Decision participation

_____ The principal takes the initiative in proposing solutions to serious work-related problems and acts decisively to deal with such problems when a prompt solution is needed. **mL Problem Solving**

_____ The principal establishes contact with other groups and important people in the organization, persuades them to appreciate and support his/her campus, and uses his/her influence to promote and defend the interest of the campus. **mL Networking**

_____ The principal encourages faculty/staff to be friendly with each other, cooperate with each other, and help each other. **mL Interactive Facilitation/Performance**

_____ The principal restrains faculty/staff from arguing, encourages them to resolve conflicts in a constructive manner, and helps to settle conflicts and disagreements between subordinates.
mL Conflict Management

_____ The principal with the site based management team plans the campus future objectives and makes contingency plans for potential problems. **mL Planning**

_____ The principal creates a clear and compelling direction for the organization to pursue. **mL Purpose**

_____ The principal identifies and enforces the norms of the organization. **mL Principle**

_____ The principal has a presence about him/herself that builds trust, commands attention, is authentic and credible. **mL Presence**

Peterson Managerial Leadership Instrument -- Managerial Statements

_____ The principal motivates effective faculty/staff performance with tangible benefits such as more desirable assignments, better schedules, comp time, or other available means. **MI Rewards**

_____ The principal delegates authority and responsibility to faculty/staff and allows them to determine how to do their work. **MI Autonomy Delegation**

_____ The principal informs faculty/staff about their duties and responsibilities, specifies the rules and policies that must be observed, and lets employees know what is expected of them. **MI Clarifying roles and Objectives**

_____ The principal emphasizes the importance of setting specific performance goals for each important aspect of the teacher/staff's job. **MI Goal Setting**

_____ The principal measures progress toward the performance goals and provides concrete feedback.
MI Monitoring

_____ The principal determines professional development needs for the faculty/staff, and provides any necessary training and coaching. **MI Training**

_____ The principal keeps faculty/staff informed about developments that affect their work, including events in the district, or outside the organization and decisions made by central office. **MI Informing**

_____ The principal coordinates the work of faculty/staff, and emphasizes the importance of coordination and encourages faculty to coordinate their activities. **MI Coordinating**

_____ The principal obtains for faculty/staff the necessary supplies, equipment, support services, or other resources needed to complete the work. **MI Work Facilitation/Performance**

_____ The principal disciplines a faculty/staff member who shows consistently poor performance, violates a rule or disobeys directions. **MI Discipline**

Peterson Managerial Instrument Collapsed into the Five Essential Leadership Areas

Challenging the Process

_____ The principal emphasizes the importance of faculty/staff members performance, tries to improve productivity and tries to keep employees working up to their ability. **mL Performance emp.**

_____ The principal takes the initiative in proposing solutions to serious work-related problems and acts decisively to deal with such problems when a prompt solution is needed. **mL Problem Solving**

_____ The principal stimulates enthusiasm among the faculty/staff for their work and builds faculty/staff confidence in their ability to perform assignments successfully. **mL Inspiration**

Inspiring a Shared Vision

_____ The principal stimulates enthusiasm among the faculty/staff for their work and builds faculty/staff confidence in their ability to perform assignments successfully. **mL Inspiration**

_____ The principal creates a clear and compelling direction for the organization to pursue. **mL Purpose**

_____ The principal builds and maintains a strong effective team that recognizes the importance of shared purpose and mutual accountability. **mL Teambuilding**

Modeling the Way

_____ The principal emphasizes the importance of faculty/staff members performance, tries to improve productivity and tries to keep employees working up to their ability. **mL Performance emp.**

_____ The principal emphasizes the importance of setting specific performance goals for each important aspect of the teacher/staff's job. **Ml Goal Setting**

_____ The principal informs faculty/staff about their duties and responsibilities, specifies the rules and policies that must be observed, and lets employees know what is expected of them. **Ml Clarifying roles and Objectives**

Enabling Others To Act

_____ The principal emphasizes the importance of setting specific performance goals for each important aspect of the teacher/staff's job. **Ml Goal Setting**

_____ The principal informs faculty/staff about their duties and responsibilities, specifies the rules and policies that must be observed, and lets employees know what is expected of them. **Ml Clarifying roles and Objectives**

_____ The principal determines professional development needs for the faculty/staff, and provides any necessary training and coaching. **Ml Training**

Encouraging the Heart

_____ The principal motivates effective faculty/staff performance with tangible benefits such as more desirable assignments, better schedules, comp time, or other available means. **Ml Rewards**

_____ The principal stimulates enthusiasm among the faculty/staff for their work and builds faculty/staff confidence in their ability to perform assignments successfully. **mL Inspiration**

Leadership Practices Inventory Collapsed

The principal seeks challenging opportunities. **1 Challenging**

_____ The principal challenges faculty/staff to try new approaches. **6 Challenging**

_____ The principal looks outside the organization for ways to improve. **11 Challenging**

_____ The principal asks, "What can we learn?" **16 Challenging**

_____ The principal experiments and takes risks. **21 Challenging**

_____ The principal takes initiative to overcome obstacles. **26 Challenging**

Inspiring A Shared Vision

_____ The principal talks about future trends. **2 Inspiring**

_____ The principal describes a compelling image of the future. **7 Inspiring**

_____ The principal appeals to others to share the dream of the future. **12 Inspiring**

_____ The principal shows others how their interests can be realized. **17 Inspiring**

_____ The principal is enthusiastic and positive about the future **22 Inspiring**

_____ The principal speaks with conviction about the meaning of work. **27 Inspiring**

Modeling the Way

_____ The principal sets the example of what is expected. **4 Modeling**

_____ The principal ensures that people adhere to agreed-on standards. **9 Modeling**

_____ The principal follows through on promises and commitments. **14 Modeling**

_____ The principal is clear about his/her philosophy of leadership. **19 Modeling**

_____ The principal ensures that goals, plans and milestones are set. **24 Modeling**

_____ The principal makes progress toward goals one step at a time. **29 Modeling**

Enabling Others to Act

_____ The principal develops cooperative relationships. **3 Enabling**

_____ The principal listens to diverse points of view. **8 Enabling**

_____ The principal treats people with dignity and respect. **13 Enabling**

_____ The principal supports other people's decisions. **18 Enabling**

_____ The principal lets faculty/staff choose how to do their work. **23 Enabling**

_____ The principal ensures that people grow in their jobs. **28 Enabling**

Encouraging the Heart

_____ The principal praises people for a job well done. **5 Encouraging**

_____ The principal expresses confidence in people's abilities. **10 Encouraging**

_____ The principal creatively rewards people for their contributions. **15 Encouraging**

_____ The principal recognizes people for commitment to shared values. **20 Encouraging**

_____ The principal finds ways to celebrate accomplishments. **25 Encouraging**

_____ The principal gives team members appreciation and support. **30 Encouraging**

APPENDIX F

PERMISSION LETTERS

KOUZES POSNER INTERNATIONAL
15419 Banyan Lane
Monte Sereno, California 95030
FAX: (408) 354-9170

July 20, 2001

Ms. Katherine A. White
225 Belvidere
San Antonio, Texas 78212

Dear Katherine:

Thank you for your request to use the Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI) in your dissertation. We are willing to allow you to reproduce the instrument as outlined in your facsimile, at no charge, with the following understandings:

(1) That the LPI is used only for research purposes and is not sold or used in conjunction with any compensated management development activities;
(2) That copyright of the LPI, or any derivation of the instrument, is retained by Kouzes Posner International, and that the following copyright statement is included on all copies of the instrument: "Copyright © 2003 James M. Kouzes and Barry Z. Posner. All rights reserved. Used with permission.";
(3) That one (1) **bound** copy of your dissertation and one (1) copy of **all** papers, reports, articles, and the like which make use of the LPI data be sent **promptly** to our attention; and,
(4) That you agree to allow us to include an abstract of your study and any other published papers utilizing the LPI on our various websites.

If the terms outlined above are acceptable, would you indicate so by signing one (1) copy of this letter and returning it to us. Best wishes for every success with your research project.

Cordially,

Barry Z. Posner, Ph.D.
Managing Partner

I understand and agree to abide by these conditions:

(Signed) _____ Date:_____

OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY

OSU
TULSA

College of Business
700 North Greenwood Avenue
Tulsa, Oklahoma 74106-0700

July 18, 2002

Dear Kathy,

I give you permission to use my managerial leadership instrument in your dissertation research. I have attached a copy of the most recent instrument. Please keep me informed of your finds.

Yours in learning,

Tim O. Peterson

Tim O. Peterson, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor of Management

VITA

KATHERINE ALIA WHITE
225 Belvidere
San Antonio, Texas 78212

EDUCATION

2005	Doctor of Education, Educational Administration Texas A&M University, College Station, Texas
1996	Master of Education, Educational Administration Our Lady of the Lake University, San Antonio, Texas
1995	Bachelor of Arts, Human Sciences Our Lady of the Lake University, San Antonio, Texas

CERTIFICATION

Professional Superintendent
Professional Mid-Management
Secondary English
Secondary Language Arts
Secondary Reading
Secondary Speech Communications
Sociology
Generic Special Education
Visiting Teacher

EXPERIENCE

2002 – Present	Assistant Principal, Navarro Academy, San Antonio, Texas
1997 – 2002	Instruction Coordinator, Navarro Achievement Center, San Antonio, Texas
1996 – 1997	Principal, Sts. Peter and Paul Catholic School, New Braunfels, Texas
1988 – 1996	Program Director, Assistant to Executive Director Healy-Murphy Center, San Antonio, Texas
1987 –1988	Development Coordinator, Incarnate Word High School San Antonio, Texas
1986 – 1987	Director of Development, St. Vincent de Paul Family Shelter, New Haven, Connecticut
1985 – 1988	Development Director, Good Shepherd, Garland, Texas
1980 – 1984	Teacher, Notre Dame High School, Shreveport, Louisiana
1978 –1980	Teacher, St. Philip the Apostle, Dallas, Texas

This dissertation was typed and edited by Marilyn M. Oliva at Action Ink, Inc.