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ABSTRACT

Leadership and school leadership have been topics of considerable investigation over the past century. However, there has not been a similar literature base specifically focused on school board members and their perceptions of school superintendents’ leadership behavior. The current study provides a framework for understanding this important subject and develops several hypotheses suggesting that board members views of superintendents’ leader behavior may be influenced by demographic factors. The Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ)-Form XII was used in gathering information from board members. Through multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) the data were analyzed. Results indicated that significant differences might be influenced by superintendents’ and board members’ years of experience, as well as the gender of board members.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Included in this first chapter is a general introduction to the study and some background information, the statement of the problem, the purpose of the study, some assumptions regarding the study, a description of the general research question and hypothesis, definition of terms, and a summary of the remainder of the study.

General Introduction and Background

Leadership has been defined, constructed, and explained in a variety of ways over the centuries. A single, precise meaning has been difficult to ascertain and has resulted in a conception of leadership that has evolved from static to dispersed over the past century (Donmoyer, 1999; Heck & Hallinger, 1999) and several more specific streams of research including decision-making, leader-follower interaction, power/influence, and cultural and gender differences (Bass, 1990; Kouzes & Posner, 2002).

Early research, however, was primarily focused on internal qualities of leaders that were believed to differentiate the leaders from followers, as well as distinguishing effective from ineffective leaders (Horner, 1997; Vechio, 2006; Yukl, 1989). It was a commonly held belief that great leaders were born, rather than developed, resulting in studies of traits that set these “natural-born” leaders apart and theories such as the “Great Man Theory” (Bass, 1990; Cawthon, 1996). Ultimately, a simple pattern of traits that was strongly and consistently related to leadership was not demonstrated, although
current research continues to identify and study characteristics of leaders (Cawthon, 1996; Kouzes & Posner, 2002). The emphasis of leadership research shifted to behavior, rather than traits, and resulted in the contrasting notion that leader behaviors could be identified and taught for development purposes (Horner, 1997). This attention regarding leader behaviors was primarily focused on individuals until the 1950s when studies began to include the behaviors exhibited by members of groups. Findings supported the notion that for groups to be effective, attention to getting the job done and meeting goals must be accompanied by concern for the feelings and welfare of group members (Vechio, 2006).

The Ohio State leadership studies occurred in the 1940s and 1950s, resulting in the behavior constructs of consideration (people-related behavior) and initiation of structure (task-related behavior). Most current theoretical frameworks of leadership are built upon or inherently include high concern for both people and production. The interaction between a leader’s traits, behaviors, and a given situation resulted in contingency theories, which further advanced the thinking to include the belief that the relative importance of leadership behaviors could depend on the situation. Leadership, given the contingency approach, allowed for the possibility of different behaviors in any given context (Bolman & Deal, 2003; Horner, 1997).

The work of Hersey and Blanchard (1982) is an example of the contingency approach in which the researchers proposed a model such that the constructs of initiation of structure and consideration were to be approached differently based upon the maturity level of the followers. Path-Goal Theory (House, 1971, 1996) is another example of combining leader behavior with the context, in which leaders’ behaviors are
complimentary to subordinates’ environments and abilities. Power influence is another manner in which to study leadership and includes the idea of a leader having the capacity to produce effects on or to influence others (Bass, 1990; House, 1984), as well as two essential elements of power, motive and resource (Burns, 1978).

French and Raven (1959) identified five types of power bases that are widely cited throughout the research literature: expert power, referent power, legitimate power, reward power, and coercive power. While earlier studies of power were somewhat dualistic in that they viewed leaders and followers, most of the current literature and theory includes a view of power being shared among lower-level workers. This concept of leadership is evident in much of the current organizational and shared leadership theories, in which the sharing of power between leaders and followers is highly encouraged, and leadership is being investigated as a process of coordinating efforts and moving together as a group rather than studying a single leader (Horner, 1997). There is an increasingly blurred line between leaders and followers in the current context of dispersed leadership.

Current leadership theory includes transformational theory, in which the status quo is challenged by appealing to followers’ sense of higher purpose and values, articulation of a vision for the organization, and providing followers a cause around which they can rally (Bass, 1995; Burns, 1978). The current leadership research literature is saturated with the concept of vision, especially as it relates to organizational leadership, although Manasse (1986) identifies four components of vision: organization, future, personal, and strategic. Vision is inherent in a majority of literature regarding transformational theory as an essential element (Burns, 1978; Fields & Herold, 1997;
Rafferty & Griffin, 2004). In the past decade, a great deal of literature has focused on ethics surrounding leadership, particularly with recent attention being given to moral failures of organizations and their leaders (Kouzes & Posner, 2002; Peterson, 2004). Additionally, normative, political, and symbolic concepts of leadership have been studied as they relate to the ethics of the leader (Leithwood & Duke, 1999). Furthermore, participative leadership theory is found extensively in current literature, taking the focus from a single leader to that of the group and includes the notion that organizational effectiveness is improved or enhanced by utilizing participative leadership, stressing the importance of collaboration and group decision-making processes.

Most literature found on the topic of school leadership parallels that found in the nonschool setting text, only with a specified focus on educational concerns, with the nonschool literature prominent in the conceptualizations of leadership models within the educational context. There is scant research on the topic of board members’ perceptions of school superintendents’ leader behaviors (Hoyle & Skrla, 1999; Peterson & Short, 2001; Soares & Soares, 2000; Tallerico, 1989). Ross (1983) conducted a study attempting to investigate board members’ perceptions of real and ideal superintendent leadership behaviors. Although the results were inconclusive, it provided a basis for further investigation within the current study.

Statement of the Problem

The relationship between a public school superintendent and that person’s school board is critical. The board of education is responsible for hiring, evaluating, and compensating the superintendent. Boards of education hire superintendents as the local school district’s leader. Numerous superintendents, having moved from the classroom
through various administrative positions and into the top spot, have never acquired the skills that will ensure a strong superintendent-board relationship, resulting in dissatisfied, frustrated, and angry boards (Houston & Eadie, 2005). These administrators, according to Houston and Eadie had performed well in other administrative roles in the district, but these roles did not prepare them for the consistent interaction with board members required by the position of superintendent. Therefore, board of education members’ perceptions of their superintendent’s leadership behavior are extremely important. The purpose of the current study was to investigate selected board members’ perceptions of leadership behavior of Ohio superintendents. The primary focus of this research is on the relationship between board of education members and superintendents in order to determine if differences exist in board members’ perceptions between the real leader behavior and the ideal leader behavior. This study is a replication of that done by Ross (1983), but the study is not an exact duplication. The research questions and hypotheses have been reduced in number in order to maintain a focus on specific issues that may be related to board members’ perceptions of their superintendent’s leader behavior. Furthermore, advances in statistical analysis allow for more focused evaluation of subject responses resulting in the ability to more exacting hypotheses.

Information gained as a result of the current study is extremely important and useful to both superintendents and board of education members for several practical reasons. Today’s superintendents are organizational leaders who are simultaneously public figures who, by design, must work closely with boards of education (Cambron-McCabe, Cunningham, Harvey, & Koff, 2005). There is a high turnover rate among superintendents that is not attributed to a lack of competence as much as it is to poor
board-superintendent relationships, based on perceptions held by board members (Houston & Eadie, 2005). Job security, agreement in philosophy and vision, effective communication, and organizational stability are outcomes more likely to occur when a superintendent’s leadership behavior closely matches that of board members’ ideal perceptions of leadership behavior. Conversely, it is more likely that these outcomes will become nonexistent when the leader’s actual behavior does not match that of board members’ ideal perceptions of a superintendent’s behavior (Cambron-McCabe et al., 2005).

This study built on other research that emphasizes two predominant areas of leadership: a “task” or organizational one and a “people” or interpersonal one. The most influential research in leadership behavior was pioneered in the 1950s and 1960s at The Ohio State University (Bensimon, Neumann, & Birnbaum, 1989; Yukl, 1989). The Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ) was developed through one of The Ohio State Leadership Project studies, and much of the research on leadership behavior has followed the pattern that was established at The Ohio State University (Yukl, 1989). Two dimensions of leadership are identified and measured on the LBDQ: “initiating structure” referring to a leader’s organizational behavior; and “consideration” referring to behavior indicative of friendship, trust, respect, and warmth with members of the group (Ross, 1983). In a behavioral sense, leadership requires relationship behaviors that improve interpersonal relations within the group and task behaviors that assist group members in completing tasks. The LBDQ appears to measure both of these leadership qualities, which are transactional in nature and seem to be of high importance to most boards of education. The LBDQ-Form XII is a revision of the original LBDQ.
Additionally, possible demographic, environmental factors that may influence a board member’s perception have been assessed. These factors led to several hypotheses that could shed further light on identifying expectations and perceptions of board members. The study conducted by Ross (1983) found significant differences on several demographic variables concerned with either the real or ideal dimension, but findings were not significant when investigating the interaction between the real and ideal dimensions based upon the demographic factors.

Purpose, Assumptions, and Limitations of the Study

The purpose of the current study was to provide both board of education members and superintendents the opportunity to study board members’ perceptions of superintendents’ leader behavior, both in terms of what is expected by board members, as well as perceptions of reality. The information provided by this study offers insights for both board members and superintendents into expectations held by board members, patterns of behavior exhibited by superintendents, and offers assistance in self-reflection about what should be and what actually exists in terms of superintendents’ leadership. The knowledge gained from this study has the potential for superintendent development programs both within and outside of the university setting. It is the sincere hope of the author that the study resulted in providing a foundation on which improved relationships between board of education members and superintendents are established, better decisions are made, ultimately resulting in an enhanced or improved environment for learning in school districts across the state of Ohio.

Several assumptions underlie this study. One is that the researcher assumed that participants are a representative sample of public school board members from across
Ohio. The sampling procedure and population is described in Chapter III. Second, it is assumed that the self-reported demographic information and LBDQ responses are free of error. Third, the honesty of respondents is assumed in their responses to survey questions. Finally, it is assumed that board members and superintendents desire a positive, congruent relationship with one another built on respect and mutual trust.

Limitations of the study include the following: the response generated from the sampling limits the generalizability of this study. Sampling is discussed in Chapter III; another limitation is that the study was dependent upon the voluntary cooperation of the board president or school superintendent to distribute the survey materials to board members. The fact of cooperation or noncooperation is a possible intervening variable; the study was also dependent upon the voluntary cooperation of respondents to complete and return the surveys. Finally, the honesty of respondents could be a limiting factor to the extent that respondents did not report honestly.

General Research Questions

A basic question that was asked in the original study and again in this replication study is the following: Are there significant differences in the perceptions of school board members regarding ideal leader behaviors and the actual leader behaviors (“what should be” versus “what is”) of their school superintendents? Secondly, what are the factors that contribute to the differences in these perceptions; are these factors associated with demographics?
Definition of Terms

Behavior – the exhibited, observable actions of an individual.

Consideration – a subscale on the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire – Form XII (Stogdill, 1963) regarding the comfort, well being, status, and contributions of followers.

Ideal – the manner in which a leader should act; what a leader is expected to do; how one ought to behave.

Initiation of structure – a subscale on the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire – Form XII (Stogdill, 1963) referring to a leader who clearly defines own role, and lets followers know what is expected.

Leadership – Within the current study, “leadership” as defined by Vechio (2006) will be used: “leadership can be defined as a process through which a person tries to get organizational members to do something that the person desires.”

Perception – an awareness of external objects, conditions, and relationships, as a result of sensory stimulation.

Real – the actual manner in which a leader acts, as observed by another; what a leader actually does and how a person behaves. It is important to understand that “real” behavior is based upon another’s perception for the purposes of this research.

School board (board of education) – the agency created by the state of Ohio, generally elected by popular vote, on which the responsibility for conducting the local public education system rests.

Superintendent – the chief executive officer appointed by the school board for the purpose of executing school board policies through an administrative office or position
SUMMARY

This chapter provided the reader with general introduction and background information regarding leadership literature and more specifically, the literature surrounding the school board-superintendent relationship. This study attempted to provide board of education members and superintendents an analysis of board members’ perceptions of superintendents’ leader behavior since their perceptions play a critical role in the success of the superintendent. The study sought to investigate the factors that may influence board members’ perceptions of superintendents’ leader behaviors in Ohio.

As a current public school superintendent, the researcher understands from a first-hand perspective, the importance of a close, positive board-superintendent working relationship. It is a fragile relationship and can be affected by any one of countless factors such as local politics, union unrest, and labor negotiations, among others, as observed by the researcher. It is with this personal perspective in mind that the current study adds valuable quantitative information to the minute existing literature and provides an impetus for further study.
CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

Definitions of leadership have been offered by some of the most prominent authors on the subject, as well as many other individuals considered by the general public to be a leader in a given situation or setting. Leadership is one of the most talked about but least understood phenomena on earth, and is a source of confusion and disagreement regarding its meaning and how much difference it can make (Bolman & Deal, 2003; Burns, 1978; Vechio, 2006). General Dwight Eisenhower once said that the essence of leadership is to make people do what you want them to with as much will, determination, and enthusiasm as if they had decided for themselves. The leadership literature deals with questions such as how does the leader influence followers? What are sources of the leader’s influence? What types of influence exist between the leader and subordinates? What is the situation in which the leader operates?

In addition to the general literature itself, the field of leadership has a myriad of specific streams such as decision-making, leader-follower interaction, power of the leader, cultural and gender differences among leaders, as well as several other contributions that have added to our understanding of the topic (Bass, 1990; Kouzes &
Posner, 2002). For the purposes of this dissertation, major themes of historical leadership theory will be presented and reviewed in order to provide a contextual understanding of the study. The major themes reviewed include a trait approach, a behavior approach, a contingency approach, a power-influence approach, and team or shared leadership approach. The major themes reviewed move from a view of leadership that has evolved from static to dualistic and then from dualistic to shared or dispersed. Following this historical review of leadership, current literature will be offered on the topic, as well as a more focused review of school leadership, and finally a discussion of the unique relationship between superintendents and school board members will conclude the chapter.

Leadership Theory

Traits

The first observed trend of leadership theory addresses the personal attributes of great leaders. Basketball coaching legend Bobby Knight, in speaking to an undergraduate class enrolled in organizational management, on the topic of leadership, began his speech by telling business students, “The first thing you people need to know about leadership is that most of you simply don’t have it in you” (Organ, 1996, p. 1). The focus of early research in the field was on the internal qualities that differentiated leaders from followers and effective leaders from ineffective leaders (Horner, 1997; Vechio, 2006; Yukl, 1989). The thought existed that once these differentiating qualities were identified, successful leaders could be rather quickly assessed and placed into leadership positions. A somewhat related idea was that leaders were born, rather than developed, and thus, traits such as personality, physical characteristics, and mental distinctiveness
were studied (Yukl, 1989). The Great Man Theory (Bass, 1990; Cawthon, 1996) was widely accepted prior to the mid-20th century, but as the research progressed, the number of traits of suspected importance continued to grow, resulting in a lack of clarity on what specific traits were consistently associated with great leadership. Although trait research abounded throughout the time period, the massive effort failed to show any simple pattern of traits that was both strongly and consistently related to leadership. Situational and environmental factors were not considered in studies during this time period, thus they did not appear in the body of literature. Recently, Kouzes and Posner (2002) have identified six characteristics that people most admire in leaders, including honesty, forward-looking, inspiring, competent, fair-minded, and supportive. Cawthon (1996) asserts that the field has spent too much time recently in observation of behaviors and should acknowledge more openly the idea of inborn traits in leaders. The author goes so far as to state that “. . . unless we are willing to confront those basic philosophical issues that have challenged minds throughout history, we are doomed to wallow in the obscurity of meaningless observations – observations that describe yet do little to penetrate the mystery of leadership” (p.4).

**Behaviors**

The second major emphasis of leadership theory was on leader behavior concerns, shifting the focus from how leaders appear in the view of others (traits) to what successful leaders actually do. The notion of a behavior approach was that leadership was not necessarily an inborn quality, but behaviors can be identified and thus taught for leadership development purposes (Horner, 1997). The emphasis of this research was on what leaders actually do while on the job. The studies began to identify leadership
behaviors that would increase the effectiveness of the organization. Some of the earliest studies of leader behavior, conducted at the University of Iowa, addressed the question of whether a democratic style of leadership is more effective than an authoritarian or a laissez-faire style. Lewin, Lippitt, and White (1939), conducted a study in which leaders were identified as exhibiting one of three general types of behavior: autocratic, democratic, or laissez-faire. The autocratic leader was one who was directive and this type of leadership resulted in a submissive employee group. The democratic leader demonstrated participative behavior resulting in a more cohesive group. The leader who exhibited laissez-faire behaviors gave no direction with the result often being frustration, disorganization, and low quality. The focus of these studies was not so much on the person being studied, but on the observed behavior of the leader.

During the 1950s, attention turned to the behaviors that members exhibit in groups, finding that for groups to be effective, they must have some attention shown to getting the job done and meeting goals, as well as attention to concerns for the feelings and welfare of group members (Vechio, 2006). The well-known Ohio State leadership studies occurred during this time period, resulting in the creation of the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ), a commonly used instrument to assess leadership behavior. This 150-item questionnaire examined leader behavior as perceived by subordinates. Factor analyses resulted in the identification of two behavior constructs: consideration and initiation of structure. Consideration included items that indicated a leader’s friendliness, supportiveness, and compassion, while initiating structures were items that indicated the degree of structure that a leader imposed on subordinates, such as assignment of tasks, deadlines, and the following of procedures.
In an effort to ground these ideas in models of historically well-known leadership, Phillips (1992) studied Abraham Lincoln’s leadership behaviors, focusing on the constructs of consideration and initiation of structure. Many of Lincoln’s identified behaviors such as circulating among the troops, complimenting people, being available to followers, and creating a compassionate culture were consistent with the construct of consideration. Other identified behaviors of Lincoln’s leadership were more closely aligned to the concept of initiation of structure and include decisiveness, setting and monitoring progress of identified aims or goals, paying attention to task details, and removing managers when progress is impeded as a result of that manager’s leadership decisions.

The leadership literature demonstrates that questionnaire research of leader behavior is dominated by the Ohio State studies. The Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ) scales remain a significant data collection instrument in conducting research nearly 50 years after the initial studies.

During this same time period, the University of Michigan also was conducting leadership studies. According to Likert (1961), three types of leadership behavior were identified through these studies: task-oriented behavior, relationship-oriented behavior, and participative leadership. Task-oriented behaviors were closely aligned with the initiating structures in the Ohio State studies, while relationship-oriented behaviors were considered to be similar to the construct of consideration. One main difference, however, between the two studies was that the results of the University of Michigan study suggested participative leadership to be separate from the other relationship-oriented (consideration) behaviors. Group supervision was emphasized, rather than separate,
individual supervision (Likert, 1961; Yukl, 1989). Participative leadership was closely aligned to the democratic style studied by Lewin et al. (1939) and referred to the degree to which other people can influence the leader’s decisions. Although several theories and suppositions have appeared throughout the literature since the Ohio State and Michigan studies, the two general constructs of consideration and initiation of structure are still widely accepted and studied today. In fact, Horner (1997) states that “justification seems to exist for giving continued attention to both task-related and people-related behaviors, because neither one has been shown to be the primary determinant of leader success” (p. 285).

Other researchers have extended the findings from the Ohio State and University of Michigan studies, generally focusing on identification of leadership behaviors, determining whether these behaviors have positive relationships with leadership success, and the development of such behaviors. One conceptualization that is an extension of the aforementioned studies profiled leader behavior on two dimensions: concern for people and concern for production/task (Blake & McCanse, 1991; Bolman & Deal, 2003) as identified on the Leadership Grid. In further supporting the concepts of the consideration and initiating of structure, Cacioppe (1997) stated, “While it sounds simple in this story, it is an extraordinary ability of a leader to know the mind of his/her followers and to act precisely and wisely at the time – for the good of both the task and the follower” (p. 339). Stone, Russell, and Patterson (2004) explained that transformational and servant leadership attributes are extensions of the themes identified as initiation and consideration. Both theoretical frameworks, transformational leadership and servant leadership, emphasize high concern for both people and production.
Contingency

Another approach to studying leadership was one regarding the interaction between the leader’s traits, behaviors, and the situation in which the leader operated. Situational leadership theory was one contingency theory that advanced the belief that the relative importance of leadership behaviors depended on the situation. Aspects of the situation that modify the importance of behavior were called situational moderator variables. This concept was a major shift in thinking at the time, allowing for the possibility that leadership could be different in any given situation (Bolman & Deal, 2003; Horner, 1997). Fiedler (1967) proposed one contingency model to predict leadership effectiveness from a measure called the least preferred coworker (LPC) score. The leader was asked to grade their least favorite worker on a series of bipolar adjectives (pleasant versus unpleasant, friendly versus unfriendly, gloomy versus cheerful, etc.), with the scales designed so that the most lenient leader would receive the highest LPC score. Fiedler’s rationale essentially was that leaders who receive a high LPC score are motivated by relationships, with task objectives being a secondary motivator. The concept of situational favorability, or the ease of influencing followers, was included in Fiedler’s theory and defined as a combination of leader-member relations, task structure, and position power. Fiedler later developed another theory called cognitive resource theory (Fiedler, 1986). This theory attempted to examine the conditions in which intelligence, experience, and expertise were predictive of leadership effectiveness.

Hersey and Blanchard (1982) proposed a model to explain why leadership effectiveness varied across the two dimensions of task behaviors and relationship behaviors, similar in definition to consideration and initiating structure identified on the
Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire. The theory proposed that the maturity level of followers was an independent variable existing on a continuum ranging from immature to mature. Different combinations of task and relationship behaviors tended to increase leadership effectiveness if the level of task and relationship behaviors was appropriately matched to the maturity level of the individual follower (Hersey & Blanchard, 1982; Yukl, 1989).

House’s (1971) Path-Goal Theory included the interaction of leadership behaviors with situation characteristics in determining the leader’s effectiveness, and suggested that leaders can influence the satisfaction, motivation, and performance of group members in several ways. House identified four leadership behaviors: directive, achievement-oriented, supportive, and participative. The theory also included two situational variables: subordinates’ personal characteristics and environmental demands such as organizational rules and procedures. The leadership behaviors and situational variables combine to strongly contribute to the leader’s effectiveness. According to the theory’s most fundamental underpinnings, the effective leader will provide or ensure the availability of valued rewards for followers (the “goal”) and then help them find the best way of getting there (the “path”). House (1996) later reformulated the theory to include eight classes of leader behavior, with the theory’s essence being that “leaders, to be effective, engage in behaviors that compliment subordinates’ environments and abilities in a manner that compensates for deficiencies and is instrumental to subordinate satisfaction and individual and work unit performance” (p. 323).

Another view of leadership was developed by Vroom and Yetton (1973), describing what leaders should do in certain situations concerning the level of decision-
making involvement of followers. A decision tree that inquired about the need for participation was utilized in the process, and a conclusion could then be drawn about the level of followers’ involvement in order for the leader to be most effective. This model, known as the normative decision model, placed the leader into one of five levels of participation: autocratic, in which the leader solved the problem or made the decision without followers’ involvement; informed-autocratic, defined as solving the problem after obtaining relative information from followers; individual-consultative, in which the leader shared the problem and sought input from individuals, then made a decision which may or may not have reflected the influence of subordinates; group-consultative, in which a group was formed, the problem was shared with the group, the group’s ideas were sought, and the leader made the final decision; and group-agreement, in which followers understood the problem and worked with the leader to reach consensus on a solution. Hoy and Tarter (2004a) further this model, making use of a decision tree, based on the belief that the key to maximizing effectiveness in decisions is to match the decision style with the decision rules.

The manner in which leaders respond to unique organizational conditions was the focus of contingent school leadership. Combs, Miser, and Whitaker (1999) recognize the fact that school leaders function within an organization that is dynamic and must wear different hats for different situations. School leaders find themselves in roles as managers, controllers, and directors, which are roles akin to initiating structure, as well as helpers, aides, assistors, and ministers, which parallel the construct of consideration. The fact is evident that several observations and theories of leadership are congruent with much of the original work out of the Ohio State studies, essentially focusing on tasks and
people, supporting the original ideas of initiation and consideration included on the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire. Additionally, school leaders have several contextual influencing factors that may affect their leadership behaviors. School leaders, to be effective, must understand the liberal, conservative, and radical frames (Cibulka, 1999) and their ideological differences that can have a major impact on the educational organization.

**Power Influence**

The quest for power has dominated human history and is one way in which to study leadership. Power has been defined as the capacity to produce effects on others (House, 1984), or the potential to influence others (Bass, 1990). According to Burns (1978), the two essentials of power are motive and resource, and if either one of these two essentials is lacking, then power will collapse. One of the earliest works on management was *The Prince*, in which Machiavelli (1469 - 1527), a Renaissance Italian philosopher and statesman, laid out a set of principles that would help nobles maintain their leadership and control over the populous. However, a close examination of Machiavellian theory reveals the theory was situational in nature, a strong leader being needed in tough times, and a positive leader during good times. Additionally, Machiavellian theory included concepts of power that influence trait theory and views of power throughout the current literature.

French and Raven (1959) identified five distinct sources, or bases, of power by which an individual can potentially influence others. A given leader may possess each of the five types of power to varying degrees, and the use of one power base can affect the strength of another. The five power bases included: expert power, or the power of
knowledge, usually in a particular area; referent power, or the strength of relationship between the leader and followers, often as a result of the leader’s attractive personality; legitimate power, which is dependent on a person’s organizational role and stemming from the willingness of others to accept an individual’s direction; reward power, involving one’s control over desired resources; and coercive power, which is the ability to influence others through the use of negative sanctions or the removal of positive events, stemming from the capacity to produce fear in others.

Yukl (1989) defined power as “an agent’s potential influence over the attitudes and behavior of one or more designated target persons” (p. 14). He proposed a taxonomy of power according to position, personal, or political. Position power referred to a person’s official position within an organization. Personal power referred to interactions of a person with other members of the organization. It frequently comes from a person’s expertise or from loyalties and friendships developed over long periods of time. Political power involved deliberate attempts by groups or individuals to increase or maintain their existing level of power, including actions to gain control or influence over decision-making processes. Social exchange theory (Hollander, 1979) explained how power was won and lost by understanding the interaction processes between individuals. The theory studied how leaders emerge in groups as a result of their interactions with other members of the group. More recently, dispersed leadership theories have treated power as being transferred to lower-level workers (Gordon, 2002). This sharing of power renders earlier leadership theories somewhat problematic in that they rely on a dualistic view of leader and followers. Presently, dispersed leadership theory offers an insufficient treatment of power.
Issues of motivation are inherent within much of the leadership theory reviewed thus far, and several related suppositions such as expectancy theory, equity theory, goal setting, and reinforcement have been studied (Horner, 1997). Despite motivation theories not being a focus of the current study, they do add to the literature on leadership because of an emphasis on the followers and the causes of their actions. The theories are worth briefly mentioning at this point because a thorough study of leadership includes an investigation of followers’ traits, behaviors, skills, and activities.

Organizational Culture/Shared Leadership/Teams

The literature on leadership is varied and suggests that there are several appropriate ways in which to lead. Contingency theories are different from and have built on the trait and behavior theories, as the philosophy that one best personality or way to lead evolved into an analysis of both the leader and the context. Organizational leadership is similar to the contingency explanation, in that it looks beyond an individual leader. Rather than dealing with a single leader and multi-follower concept, organizational leadership is pluralistic in nature. According to this view, issues related to the culture must be identified with clarity, such as change, culture management, and motivation. Popper and Zakkai (1994) suggest a framework of organizational psychological conditions that lend themselves to varying degrees of three common leadership styles found in the literature including transactional, charismatic, and transformational. In a different study (Movva, 2004), myths were identified as an organizational vehicle for understanding, expressing, and facilitating the organizational transformation process, taking into account the fact that myths often represent reality in the minds of the organization’s workforce of what that organization was, is, and could be.
Dispersed leadership theory, which promoted the sharing of power between leaders and followers, has emerged in response to the nature of organizational changes (Gordon, 2002). Organizations have been changing in terms of their structure, and the entire workforce from CEO to ground-floor worker is being increasingly encouraged to provide ideas, make decisions, and respond to changes. According to Horner (1997), as teams have taken on significant responsibilities within organizations, questions exist as to the extent of need for positional leaders. Some of the recent literature has begun to focus on leadership as a process of coordinating efforts and moving together as a group, taking the emphasis away from an individual (Horner, 1997). Leaders are thought of as members of the community, rather than one who leads followers by use of dominance, influence, and motivation. In this context, leadership is the process of aligned goals and actions as a group, and diminishes the emphasis from an individual leader. It includes a systems perspective on various aspects of the organization, in order that individuals, both leaders and followers, see themselves as connected to the larger organization (Senge, 1990). Another framework in which to observe leadership is to study it as a part of the larger organization (Ogawa & Bossert, 1995). Leadership, within this framework, is treated as a systemic characteristic of organizations, arguing that leadership flows through networks of roles that are inherent within any organization. This view is quite different than the traditional one in which the focus is on persons within the organization. The view of leadership is from an institutional perspective, rather than a technical-rational perspective. The function of leadership, organizational roles, individual traits and behaviors, and cultural context are each viewed differently from an institutional perspective as compared to the more traditional technical-rational perspective.
As teams further appear in organizational settings as important decision-making entities, the contextual nature of leadership may change, which in turn has the potential to change the manner in which leadership has traditionally been considered. There is an increasingly blurred line between leaders and followers in this context, and the traditional research of investigating the relationship between a leader and followers does not accurately fit an environment in which there is an emphasis on team or dispersed leadership.

Current Leadership Research and School Leadership Foci

*Leaders and Managers*

There has been an emphasis on differentiating leaders from managers over the past 25 years. Burns (1978) describes managers as transactors and leaders as transformers. According to Bolman and Deal (2003), leadership and management are different from one another but are often confused. Managers focus on the “nuts and bolts” and facilitate the work of an organization, making sure procedures and rules are being followed. Leaders are people of vision and facilitate the identity of organizational goals. The central theme of the research is that those who find themselves supervising people should be good managers and good leaders.

*Managerial*

The focus of managerial school leadership is on functions, tasks, and behaviors of school leaders, with the underlying assumption that if these three areas are effectively carried out by the leader, then work throughout the organization will also be accomplished in a competent manner (Sergiovanni, 1996). Traditionally, school organizations have been established to accomplish preconceived goals (Combs et al.,
1999), operating within clearly defined parameters and under the supervision of supervisors who ensure the orderly completion of tasks.

**Transformational and Transactional**

Burns (1978) maintained that power and leadership are two distinct entities. The theory then further differentiates leadership into one of two categories: transactional or transformational. Transactional leadership occurs, according to Burns, when leaders and followers are in some type of exchange relationship in order to get needs met. Exchanges could be based upon economic, political, or psychological needs. Two important aspects of transactional leadership are evident: transactional leadership is extremely common and it is normally transitory because there may be no purpose to hold parties together once a transaction is made. A leader-follower relationship does not exist beyond the transaction itself when the leader adheres to an exclusive transactional leadership mode of behavior. In contrast, transformational leaders motivate followers to achieve performance beyond expectations by transforming followers’ attitudes, beliefs, and values rather than simply gaining compliance (Burns, 1978; Rafferty & Griffin, 2004).

Transformational leadership serves to change the status quo by appealing to followers’ values and sense of higher purpose. Transformational leaders articulate problems within the current system, as well as a vision for what a new organization could be. Burns (1978) argued that this type of leadership is moral because it raises the standard of human conduct and goes on to identify three characteristics of a transformational leader: the leader manifests values and advances the standards of good conduct for humankind, works to achieve end values, and has a positive impact on the lives of followers. Bass’ (1995) model of transformational leadership, extending the
work of Burns, has been widely accepted by scholars and practitioners alike as one way in which organizations can encourage employees to perform beyond expectations (Rafferty & Griffin, 2004). The transformational leader provides followers with a cause around which they can rally, going beyond self interests for the good of the larger group to which they belong (Bass, 1995).

Transformational leadership is concerned with the commitments of followers, as well as their capacities for meeting organizational objectives. The literature regarding transformational leadership in school settings builds on the work in the general leadership body of knowledge. Both the leader and follower are elevated in terms of their purposes and capacities (Leithwood & Duke, 1999). This builds directly upon the seminal work completed by Burns (1978). Deal and Peterson (1999) noted that school leaders can build collaboration and commitment from followers through utilization and expansion of symbolic roles. They identified the following symbolic roles that leaders assume: historian, anthropological sleuth, visionary, symbol, potter, poet, actor, and healer. Leithwood and Jantzi (1999) studied the effects of transformational leadership in the school setting on organizational conditions and on student engagement. Findings indicated strong, significant effects on organizational conditions, and weak but still significant effects on student engagement.

Vision

Current leadership literature more often than not characterizes the leader as the vision holder in an organization. DePree (1989) asserted, “the first responsibility of a leader is to define reality” (p. 9). In observing the leadership qualities of legendary football coach Vince Lombardi, Hughes, Ginnett, and Curphy (1999) noted that the
essence of leadership is vision, adding, “good leaders have a clear, precise vision of what they want for the people they lead” (p. 46). While this assertion may overstate the issue, vision is recognized throughout most quality organizational frameworks as a major underlying component or belief principle of implementing and maintaining a quality approach to organizational management. According to Manasse (1986), four types of visionary leadership existed: organization, future, personal, and strategic. Vision is associated with transformational leadership throughout the literature (Burns, 1978; Fields & Herold, 1997; Rafferty & Griffin, 2004).

In order that vision is realized, a leader must share it with followers. Some research indicates that this sharing of vision with members of an organization is what differentiates a true leader from a manager (Dilenschneider, 1992; Domm, 2001; Manasse, 1986). Kouzes and Posner (2002) identified the act of inspiring a shared vision as one of five leadership dimensions and include it as an item of measurement on the Leadership Practices Inventory. The concept of shared vision is identified as one of five essential disciplines necessary to build a successful learning organization (Senge, 1994) and is defined as “building a sense of commitment in a group, by developing shared images of the future we seek to create, and the principles and guiding practices by which we hope to get there” (p. 6), thus providing a corporate commonality and impetus for creativity. The concept clearly exists throughout recent literature, that visionary leadership is a two-way street between the leader and followers, and in order for a leader to articulate a vision, the beliefs, values, and concerns of the followers must be understood (Bolman & Deal, 2003; Kouzes & Posner, 2002).
Valuing Human Resources

There is an emphasis in recent literature that emphasizes leaders going beyond vision and concentrating on the value of human resources within the organization (DePree, 1989; Greenleaf, 1977; Walton 1985). Organizations certainly need people and the opposite statement appears to be true. Either the organization or personnel may suffer, or in some cases both may suffer, if the fit between the organization and people is not a good one. Conversely, both reap benefits when there is a good fit and the leader acts as a catalyst (Bolman & Deal, 2003). These leaders work to provide an environment that promotes individual contributions to the organization’s work, and develop collaborative relationships formed during the development of the shared vision. Skills and training needed by both teams and individuals are provided, along with resources, in order to fulfill the shared vision. This emphasis on human resources is aligned with that of consideration on the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire discussed in the section regarding leader behavior.

Ethical

Recently, there has been an emphasis on the ethical behavior of leaders, particularly in light of recent attention concerning the moral failures of many organizational leaders and companies (Kouzes & Posner, 2002; Peterson, 2004). A growing body of research literature exists, and several concepts will be discussed throughout this section.

Mastrangelo, Eddy, and Lorenzet (2004) defined personal leadership as “the personal behavior of leaders in performing the responsibilities of professional leadership, including demonstrating expertise, building trust, caring and sharing for people, and
acting in a moral way” (p. 436). Personal leadership appears to be a mediating factor of the relationship between professional leadership and the presence of willing cooperation in followers. A study that examined the relationship between perceived leader integrity, belief in universal moral rules, and employees’ ethical intentions indicated that leaders may have a very strong influence on followers, especially when those followers have relative moral values (Peterson, 2004).

A great deal of literature in the past decade has focused on the values and ethics of the leader, including the normative, political, and symbolic concepts of leadership (Leithwood & Duke, 1999). Several different approaches are evident as one reviews the body of literature. Whether explicit or implicit, there is a great deal of emphasis on moral issues in the school setting. Sergiovanni (1996) recommended that schools become a moral voice of community and form covenants based on a series of questions. The belief that schools are covenantal communities sharing purposes, values, and beliefs implies that the school is not merely another secular institution, but a sacred enterprise.

Trust is a concept that is identified as a key element to effective leadership (Dirks & Ferrin, 2002; Kouzes & Posner, 2002) and implied as an essential element of school leadership according to several authors (Bryk & Schneider, 2002; Evans, 1996; Hoy & Tarter, 2004a; Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 1998). Evans (1996) distinguishes authentic leaders by their integrity and savvy, having built their leadership from the inside out. Hoy and Tarter (2004b) found trust in both the school principal and in colleagues to be closely associated with organizational justice within the school setting. Bryk and Schneider (2002) explored the construct of relational trust in the school setting, defining relational trust as a high level cognitive activity of discerning others’ intentions, with
these trust relations ultimately impacting the organization itself. The growth of relational trust in schools appears to contribute to improved student learning, according to the study. Tschannen-Moran (2004) presents a multidimensional framework of trustworthy leadership in which the five facets of trust (benevolence, honesty, openness, reliability, and competence) relate to the constituencies of schools (administration, teaching personnel, students, parents, and the general public), as well as the five functions of leadership (visioning, modeling, coaching, managing, and mediating). This framework of trustworthy leadership encourages practitioner-leaders to interface the five facets of trust with the five functions of leadership as leaders relate to the various stakeholders, identified as the five constituencies, in order to better become a learning community (Tschannen-Moran, 2004).

**Participative**

Participative leadership refers to the decision-making processes of the group and takes the focus away from a single leader. Often, it refers to the degree to which other people can influence a leader’s decisions. Recent literature reviews and analyses have been inconclusive, with most research consisting of short-term field studies, susceptible to the Hawthorne effect, a temporary positive effect from being the focus of attention (Miller & Monge, 1986; Wagner & Gooding, 1987; Yukl, 1989). Research in educational settings parallels much of the general leadership literature, with an emphasis on teams and groups. There is a notion that by utilizing participative leadership in the educational setting, organizational effectiveness is improved or enhanced (Leithwood & Duke, 1999). Much of the literature includes the idea of teacher leadership, stressing
collaboration and the potential for more effective educational organizations by utilizing teachers as leaders (Lieberman, Saxl, & Miles, 1988; Little, 1988).

*Instructional Leadership*

Instructional leadership normally focuses on teacher behaviors as they are working to enhance students’ educational progress. Several contrary definitions and descriptions appear throughout the literature, perhaps as a result of varying cultural influences and philosophies including essentialism, perennialism, progressivism, existentialism, and reconstructionism (Ornstein & Hunkins, 1998; Parkay & Hass, 2000), but the majority of articles focus on an individual person, such as the superintendent or school principal as the instructional leader of a building. The role of instructional leader, as a teacher of teachers, fell to the superintendent from the mid 1800s to the early 1900s, and has seen somewhat of a resurgence recently through school reform and accountability efforts (Kowalski, 1999). While instructional leadership is often mentioned and discussed throughout the literature, there is little to offer in terms of defining an instructional leader. Several professional and/or accrediting organizations such as the American Association for School Administrators (AASA) and the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) included and defined instructional leadership in terms of education administration practices (Hoyle, Bjork, Collier, & Glass, 2005). The National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) includes in administrator standards a major section on instructional leadership, defining it as

> The knowledge, skills, and attributes to design with other appropriate curricula and instructional programs, to develop learner centered school cultures, to assess outcomes, to provide student personnel services, and to plan with faculty professional development activities aimed at improving instruction. (Sergiovanni, Burlingame, Coombs, & Thurston, 1999, p. 107)
Blase and Blase (1998) focused on principals as instructional leaders, including several areas of focus: training for principals in the area of supervision; professional growth of teachers; training in observation and reflection; and integration of supervision with staff development, curriculum development, and school improvement systems. According to some authors (Hallinger & McCary, 1990; Marsh, 1997), there exist three broad categories of instructional leadership in practice: defining the mission of the school organization, administration of the instructional program, and promoting the academic learning climate. However, this view is steeped in tradition and appears to be changing to one in which there exists increased collaboration, work teams, and a learning community that is driven by results (Marsh, 1997).

A considerable amount of literature on the topic of school leadership exists with several frameworks and approaches evident as ways in which to study the matter. Much of the literature is similar to that found in the nonschool leadership text but with a specific contextual focus and more narrowly related to educational concerns. In fact, instructional leadership is the only model that is without a counterpart in the nonschool literature. The fact that the literature found on school leadership is somewhat parallel to that found in the business world and other nonschool organizations is troubling to some authors. Many researchers have instead maintained that schools are extremely different from business practices in terms of their purposes, customers, work conditions needed for effectiveness, and relationships required for effectiveness (Sergiovanni, 1996). With this said, the nonschool literature on leadership nonetheless remains prominent in the conceptualization of the school leadership models. The intellectual landscape and manner in which school leadership is studied has continually changed and evolved.
(Donmoyer, 1999; Heck & Hallinger, 1999) from a static and individually bound construct to one that embraces leaders at all levels of the organization, sharing and dispersing those tasks commonly ascribed to leaders among an exceedingly growing number of members within the organization.

Related Research on School Board Members and Superintendents

It was the intent of the author to review research literature that centered on the school superintendent and board of education member relations, as well as those studies that focus on board members’ perceptions of the superintendent and lend themselves to the purposes of the current study. The recent literature is consistent on the fact that there exists a scarcity of research on the topic of board members’ relationships with or perceptions of the superintendent (Hoyle & Skrla, 1999; Peterson & Short, 2001; Soares & Soares, 2000; Tallerico, 1989). Despite the scant research literature, it remains apparent that a positive board-superintendent relationship, as well as board members maintaining a positive perception of the superintendent, is critical to the superintendent’s effectiveness (Goodman & Zimmerman, 2000; Harrington-Lueker, 2002; Hoyle & Skrla, 1999; Peterson, 1998; Peterson & Short, 2001; Ross, 1983; Soares & Soares, 2000). This importance appears rational enough, given the fact that the board of education has authority to hire, fire, reward, renew contracts, and reinforce the work of the superintendent.

In reviewing the superintendent search process, Johnson (1996) discovered that there are three contexts that must be considered. The three contexts include local history, the community, and the organization and culture of the school system. Additionally, the direction of the search for a superintendent tends to be influenced by a desire for change,
continuity, or stability as perceived by the board of education members. According to the Arizona School Boards Association (2003), superintendents spend a great deal of time educating and training board of education members to do their job appropriately. A nationwide study of board-superintendent collaboration regarding high student achievement stressed the importance of strong leadership and teamwork between board members and superintendents as necessary for effectiveness (Goodman & Zimmerman, 2000), and also described the job of superintendent as challenging and pressure-packed. There is often tension due to a lack of clarity in roles of superintendents and board members (Mullins, 1974), and in fact, 82% of superintendents believe talented colleagues leave the field because of politics and bureaucracy, while 48% work hard to keep micro-managing and one-issue partisanship under control (Arizona School Boards Association, 2003). Kowalski (1999) asserts that rapid turnover in the superintendency is often attributed to poor relationships between a superintendent and school board members.

There exists no honeymoon period in the superintendent’s position (Harrington-Lueker, 2002), and first year superintendents credit success at least partially to building a good relationship with board of education members. Although the literature regarding superintendent and board relations is rather scant, three inter-related themes emerge: power relations, effectiveness, and perceptions. The very fact that a superintendent is hired by, evaluated by, and can be fired by board of education members evidences the power relations that are inherent within the job of being a superintendent. Peterson and Short (2002) found that the ability for a superintendent to be influential is dependent, among several other factors, on the relationship with the board president and other board members. Hoyle and Skrla (1999)
in reflecting on the evaluations of superintendents by board members noted that the process is a critical event with the possibility of being respectful or stressful and highly political.

Further, nonrenewals or firings are usually based on "differences" with boards of education, rather than a competence issue. Mountford (2004) discovered two emergent themes and further categories in a qualitative study of board of education members. The study resulted in the development of a continuum for each of the two themes: motivation and conception of power, as held by board members. Motivation includes the categories of personal and altruistic, while the concept of power includes power over (control) and power with (collaboration). The study indicated that the majority of board members who define power as “power with” also join or run for the board for altruistic motivational reasons. Conversely, the majority of those board members who define power as “power over,” join or run for a board seat because of personal motives. The implications of the study included the fact that the manner in which a superintendent will operate and relate to board members may be dependent on board members’ views or perceptions of power and reasons for joining the board. Peterson (1998) conducted research in which instructional leadership is identified as a critical issue for a superintendent.

The importance of the board’s support was inherent within the findings of this study because in order for effective instructional leadership to occur, the board of education remained supportive of the superintendent providing leeway in personnel and program decisions. Another key point included in the study was that board members’ support of the superintendent is directly related to positive educational findings in the
study. These research findings appeared to further support the notion of the critical importance of superintendents’ relationships with board members.

The importance of board members’ perceptions of superintendents is the strongest of themes discovered throughout the literature. Dillon and Halliwell (1991) found that superintendents’ perceptions of purposes, strengths, and weaknesses, as well as the importance attached to several superintendent functions throughout the process of formal superintendent evaluation, were similar to those of board members. Congruence in the perceptions is emphasized as a critical factor for ongoing superintendent effectiveness. The superintendents’ reputation and job survival are largely dependent on others' perceptions of credibility as well as ability to influence critical policy decisions at the board level, according to a study conducted by Peterson and Short (2002). The study also indicated that the ability for a superintendent to be influential with other stakeholders is dependent on the board’s perceptions of behavior. Soares and Soares (2000), in a quantitative study, summarized that it is an important fact that superintendents will be as effective in maintaining a job, as are the perceptions of board members. In the study, superintendents view themselves in their roles in accordance with the ability to satellite around board of education members. The key point is that superintendents’ perceptions of themselves are closely paralleled to that of board members, for continued superintendent effectiveness.

Numerous superintendents, having moved from the classroom through various administrative positions and into the top spot, have never acquired the skills that will ensure a strong superintendent-board relationship, resulting in dissatisfied, frustrated, and angry boards (Houston & Eadie, 2005). In fact, Houston and Eadie also purported that
the board-superintendent relationship is the most critical relationship to a superintendent’s effectiveness, determines the quality of district-level leadership, and potentially impacts the success of the entire educational enterprise.

The literature tends to indicate that a superintendent’s effectiveness, as well as survival, is in large part dependent upon the board-superintendent relationship. Board of education members’ perceptions of the superintendent appeared to play a major role in the development and maintenance of such a positive relationship.

Summary

The review of literature concerning leadership has been approached from traditional leadership theory found throughout the literature, as well as current research and leadership from the vantage point of the school setting. Major theoretical frames include attributes and trait theories (Horner, 1997; Kouzez & Posner, 2002; Organ, 1996), behavior and transactional theories (Blake & McCanse, 1991; Bolman & Deal, 2003; Horner, 1997; Lewin, Lippitt, & White, 1938; Likert, 1961), contingency and situational approaches (Bolman & Deal, 2003; Fiedler, 1967; Hersey & Blanchard, 1982; Horner, 1997; House, 1971, 1996; Hoy & Tarter, 2004b; Vroom & Yetton, 1973), a review of power influences (Bass, 1990; Hollander, 1979; House, 1984; Yukl, 1989), and shared leadership (Gordon, 2002; Horner, 1997; Movva, 2004; Popper & Zakkai, 1994. Current research literature includes a discussion of leadership and management (Bolman & Deal, 2003; Burns, 1978), managerial leadership (Coombs et al., 1999), transformational leadership (Bass, 1995; Burns, 1978; Deal & Peterson, 1999; Greenleaf, 1977; Leithwood & Duke, 1999; Leithwood & Jantzi, 1999; Rafferty & Griffin, 2004), vision (Bolman & Deal, 2003; Burns, 1978; Dilenschneider, 1992; Domm, 2001; Kouzes & Posner, 2002;
Manasse, 1986), valuing human resources (Bolman & Deal, 2003; DePree, 1989; Greenleaf, 1977; Walton, 1985), ethical approaches (Bryk & Schneider, 2002; Evans, 1996; Mastrangelo et al., 2004; Peterson, 2004; Tschannen-Moran, 2004), participative leadership (Leithwood & Duke, 1999; Miller & Monge, 1986; Wagner & Gooding, 1987; Yukl, 1989), instructional leadership (Hallinger & McCrery, 1990; Marsh, 1997; Sergiovanni et al., 1999), and a rather narrow review of existing literature on the topic of school boards and superintendents relationships, focused on the interdependency of power relations, effectiveness, and the importance of perceptions. Figure 2.1 is a conceptual model summarizing the contents of the literature review.
Figure 2.1. Conceptual model of the literature review.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

Included in Chapter III is an overview of the research design, a statement of the general and specific research hypotheses, a description of the participants, a description of the sampling procedures that were used, instrumentation of the study and a review of the assessment instruments, a variable listing, an explanation of the data collection, the statistical treatment utilized, and the limitations.

Research Design

The purpose of this replication study was to investigate the perceptions of leadership behaviors of public school superintendents in a Midwestern state by the members of school boards in that particular state. The study attempted to investigate board members’ perceptions of “what is” (real) and “what should be” (ideal) regarding the leadership behavior of superintendents, but did not exactly duplicate the original study conducted by Ross (1983). It falls somewhere between an operational replication and constructive replication (Gall, Gall, & Borg, 2003) in that different methods are utilized in this nonexperimental, causal-comparative design. Several independent variables and dependent variables were used in the design in order to determine possible causes for any observed differences between groups. Variables were selected and
measured as plausible causes based upon the author’s personal observations and interests, as well as the scarcity of causal-comparative research regarding board and superintendent relations.

Hypotheses

This study investigated whether there is a difference between board members’ perceptions of real (what is) and ideal (what should be) leadership behaviors of superintendents. An important note is that even the “real” behavior remains a perception of individual board members completing the survey instrument. The study further investigated demographic variables of gender, educational level, and years of experience as they relate to board members’ perceptions. Finally, the study investigated whether board members’ perceptions of the superintendent’s leader behavior changes based upon size and type of school district. The following is a list of specific hypotheses used to study the problem:

Hypothesis 1. There is a statistically significant difference between the real and ideal Initiating Structure scores for school superintendents based upon the gender, educational level, or years of experience of the board member.

Hypothesis 2. There is a statistically significant mean difference between the real and ideal Consideration scores for school superintendents based upon the gender, educational level, or years of experience of the board member.

Hypothesis 3. There is a statistically significant mean difference between the real and ideal Initiating Structure scores for school superintendents based upon the gender or years of experience of the superintendent.

Hypothesis 4. There is a statistically significant mean difference between the real and ideal Consideration scores for school superintendents based upon the gender or years of experience of the superintendent.

Hypothesis 5. There is a statistically significant mean difference between the real and ideal Initiating Structure scores for school superintendents based upon the type or size of the school district.
Hypothesis 6. There is a statistically significant mean difference between the real and ideal Consideration scores for school superintendents based upon the type or size of the school district.

The specific null hypotheses are as follows:

1. There is not a statistically significant difference between the real and ideal Initiating Structure scores for school superintendents based upon the gender, educational level, or years of experience of the board member.

2. There is no statistically significant mean difference between the real and ideal Consideration scores for school superintendents based upon the gender, educational level, or years of experience of the board member.

3. There is no statistically significant mean difference between the real and ideal Initiating Structure scores for school superintendents based upon the gender or years of experience of the superintendent.

4. There is not a statistically significant mean difference between the real and ideal Consideration scores for school superintendents based upon the gender or years of experience of the superintendent.

5. There is no statistically significant mean difference between the real and ideal Initiating Structure scores for school superintendents based upon the type or size of the school district.

6. There is no statistically significant mean difference between the real and ideal Consideration scores for school superintendents based upon the type or size of the school district.

Participants

School board members from public school districts throughout the state were selected for the study. Public school board members in the state from which the sample was taken are elected by the registered voters within their respective school districts and serve 4-year terms for as many terms as they are elected. The target population of this study included public board of education members across the state.

The projected sample size was minimally 750 (3 categories by size, multiplied by 50 selected districts in each category, multiplied by at least 5 board members per school
district). One hundred ninety-nine school board members completed and returned a survey for purposes of the research study which translated into a 27% response rate.

Table 3.1 displays the demographics of board-member respondents analyzed in the current study, while table 3.2 displays the superintendent demographics.

### Table 3.1

Demographic Information of Participants Analyzed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic variable</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>199</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>57.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>42.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Service</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 2 years experience</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>28.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-5 years experience</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>22.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-9 years experience</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>26.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥ 10 years experience</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>22.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ed. level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.S. diploma</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>27.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.A./B.S.</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>34.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters/Law</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>31.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 3.2

Demographic Information of Superintendents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic variable</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>85.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Service</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 2 years experience</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>35.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-5 years experience</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>30.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-9 years experience</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥ 10 years experience</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>16.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.3 displays the type and size of school districts represented in the survey.

Table 3.3
Demographic Information of School Districts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic variable</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>48.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>37.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 2000</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>37.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000 - 4000</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>27.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 4000</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>35.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sampling Procedures**

For purposes of the study, the following sampling procedures were utilized.

Public school districts are listed annually in the *Educational Directory: State of Ohio*. The 2005-2006 edition of this publication, in which 618 public school districts were listed, was used in selecting school districts. These school districts were divided into three categories: student enrollments below 2,000; student enrollments between 2,000 and 4,000; and student enrollments greater than 4,000. Following this nonproportional stratification, 50 districts from each category were randomly selected using the “sampling with replacement” method. Using this method permitted every district within each stratified population to be given an equal chance of being selected and therefore every possible sample within each category was equally probable. As the name of each school district was drawn from the population for the sample, the name of the district was then recorded and subsequently returned, guaranteeing that each school district had an equal
chance for selection to the study. Individual school board members from each of the selected districts were provided an opportunity to participate in the study.

The quality of sample data in a survey design is dependent on the proportion of that sample from whom data actually are collected (Fowler, 2002). Most boards of education have five members, but in some districts there are more members. Therefore, the projected sample size was minimally 750 (3 categories by size, multiplied by 50 selected districts in each category, multiplied by at least 5 board members per school district). There were 199 actual respondents to the survey, which translated into a 27% response rate. The response rate was less than expected, but cell sizes were generally adequate for purposes of the study, with the exception of the board members’ educational level of “Dr.” (n = 15). Other cells ranged from 29 to 170.

There are three categories of nonrespondents according to Fowler (2002): those whom the surveys do not reach; those who are unable to complete the surveys due to such reasons as illness or limited reading and writing skills; and those who refuse to do so. The first two categories are of lesser concern in that the reasons are random. The latter category may be due to people simply not wishing to take the time to complete the survey (“laziness”) or may be caused by attitudinal reasons, such as a negative attitude toward superintendents or a negative attitude of cooperation. As a result, these attitudinal reasons for nonresponse may be a possible source of bias.

A Type I error occurs if the null hypothesis is rejected when it is actually true. The alpha level, or level of statistical significance for rejecting the null hypothesis, was set at .1 for the overall study. A Type II error occurs when the null hypothesis is accepted when it is actually false. Type II errors are sensitive to sample size and as the
sample size increases, the possibility of a Type II error decreases (Salkind, 2004). The participation of 199 respondents helped to minimize the possibility of a Type II error although there was a cell size of 15 in one case, which can produce poor power (Stevens, 1996). To decrease a Type II error and increase the power, combining the use of a more liberal alpha level (.10) and sample selection of more homogeneous subjects was utilized (Stevens, 1996).

According to Fowler (2002), sample size is largely determined by the goals of the researcher, and there is seldom a definitive answer as to the size needed for a given study. The sample size of the current study was determined to be adequate because the goal of the study was to collect statistics about the population and subject them to various analyses. This goal was accomplished.

Instruments

Survey instruments are utilized as a method of collecting data from a group in order to describe characteristics, opinions, or other aspects of the population from which the sample is a part. The results derived from surveys can describe relationships among variables, as well as comparing groups through the use of statistical data analysis useful in causal-comparative research design (Fowler, 2002). Survey instruments were chosen for this study based on the study’s focus which is to investigate perceptions of superintendents’ leader behaviors from board members’ perspectives.

The Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire-Form XII (LBDQ-Real), the Ideal Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire-Form XII (LBDQ-Ideal), and a Personal Data Sheet were the survey instruments used in the collection of data in this
study. Staff members of The Ohio State Leadership Studies developed the LBDQ-Real and the LBDQ-Ideal.

The LDBQ-Form XII was developed by Stogdill (1963) as a revision of the original LBDQ, authored by Halpin. It was published by the Fisher College of Business in 1963. The instrument was developed in order to obtain descriptions of leader behavior as observed by followers within the framework of 12 factors or subscales. The 12 subscales and definitions as defined by Stogdill (1963) include:

- Representation – speaks and acts as the representative of the group.
- Demand Reconciliation – reconciles conflicting demands and reduces disorder to system.
- Tolerance of Uncertainty – is able to tolerate uncertainty and postponement without anxiety or upset.
- Persuasiveness – uses persuasion and argument effectively; exhibits strong convictions.
- Initiation of Structure – clearly defines own role and lets followers know what is expected.
- Tolerance and Freedom – allows followers scope for initiative, decision, and action.
- Role Assumption – actively exercises the leadership role, rather than surrendering leadership to others.
- Consideration – regards the comfort, well being, status, and contributions of followers.
- Production Emphasis – applies pressure for productive output.
- Predictive Accuracy – exhibits foresight and ability to predict outcome accurately.
- Integration – maintains a closely-knit organization; resolves inter-member conflicts.
- Superior Orientation – maintains cordial relationships with superiors; has influence with them; is striving for higher status.

Each subscale contains either 5 or 10 items. The participant indicates a response by circling one of five letters (A, B, C, D, or E). Each item is scored on a 5, 4, 3, 2, 1 basis coinciding with the letters, with the exception of 20 items which are scored in reverse order (1, 2, 3, 4, 5). A higher response as indicated by these numbers indicates a
stronger observed leader behavior on the LBDQ Real or a higher leader behavior expectation on the LBDQ Ideal. The entire questionnaire is designed to take the participant approximately 20 minutes to complete. Only 20 items were scored on each instrument; 10 for each of the two dimensions of Initiation of Structure and Consideration. Items were scored as noted previously, with items twelve, eighteen, and twenty scored in reverse order. The remaining 80 items on the remaining 10 subscales were deleted from the instrument in order to minimize the time needed for completion of the survey (approximately 5 minutes), in an attempt to maximize the response rate.

The actual items on the two subscales of Initiation and Consideration for both the Ideal and Real ratings are presented in Table 3.4. Even though there are two separate instruments, one for Ideal and one for Real, the wording for Initiation of Structure and Consideration are the same on both instruments. Therefore, Table 3.4 presents the items in two columns, rather than four.

The LBDQ-Form XII is a result of ongoing research and development in the general area of leadership that began in the 1940s and 1950s as part of the Ohio State Leadership Studies. Through empirical research, two broad areas of leader behavior were identified as “consideration” and “initiating structure”. These two areas became the subscales on the LBDQ. The addition of 10 subscales on the LBDQ-Form XII, which is the fourth revision, were the result of further hypotheses regarding variance in leader behavior, development of items for the hypothesized factors, revised questionnaires, item analysis, and further revision. The two factorially defined subscales of Consideration and Initiating Structure have been widely used in empirical research. Consideration is the
degree to which a leader shows concern and respect for followers, looks out for their welfare, and expresses appreciation and support (Bass, 1990). In short, Consideration

Table 3.4

Subscale Items of Initiation and Consideration (Real and Ideal)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiating structure – Real and Ideal</th>
<th>Consideration – Real and Ideal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acts as the spokesperson of the group</td>
<td>Is friendly and approachable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourages the use of uniform procedures</td>
<td>Does little things to make it pleasant to be a member of the group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tries out his/her ideas in the group</td>
<td>Puts suggestions made by the group into operation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makes his/her attitudes clear to the group</td>
<td>Treats all group members as his/her equals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decides what shall be done and how it shall be done</td>
<td>Gives advance notice of changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assigns group members to particular tasks</td>
<td>Keeps to himself/herself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makes sure that his/her part in the group is understood by the group members</td>
<td>Looks out for the personal welfare of group members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedules the work to be done</td>
<td>Is willing to make changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintains definite standards of performance</td>
<td>Refuses to explain his/her actions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asks that group members follow standard rules and regulations</td>
<td>Acts without consulting the group</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

represents the people-skills types of leader behavior. Initiating Structure, or Initiation of Structure, is the degree to which a leader defines and organizes the leader’s personal role and the roles of followers, is oriented toward goal attainment, and establishes well-
defined patterns and channels of communication (Fleishman, 1973). In short, Initiation of Structure represents the production or task behavior of leadership. Consideration and Initiating Structure have been considered to be among the most robust of leadership concepts (Fleishman, 1995). In fact, a meta-analysis of the relationship of Consideration and Initiating Structure with leadership provided support for the validity of these two subscale constructs in conducting further leadership research (Judge, Piccolo, & Ilies, 2004), revealing that both Consideration and Initiating Structure have main effects on numerous criteria that the literature points to as fundamental indicators of effective leadership. Although there are at least four different instruments measuring the two constructs, significant research has concluded that the LBDQ-XII is the best measure of Consideration and Initiating Structure (Judge et al., 2004; Knight & Holen, 1985; Schriesheim & Kerr, 1974).

Reliability of the LBDQ-Form XII appears relatively strong. Reliability essentially is the amount of measurement error in the test or scale under study. Internal consistency coefficients were reported between .70 and .80, using a modified Kuder-Richardson formula (Stogdill, 1963). Internal consistency is an estimate of the extent to which an individual who responds in a certain manner to a test item tends to respond in the same way to other test items. The internal consistency of the LBDQ-Form XII is vital in this study in that it is important to ensure that the items on the two subscales of investigation represent only one dimension. Many of the scales have a high degree of inter-rater reliability, or agreement among group members rating the leader. Test-retest reliability is high for consideration, with coefficients in the .70s, and somewhat weaker for initiating structure, with coefficients between .57 and .71 (Stogdill, 1963). Test-retest
reliability is a way to estimate reliability in which scores from the administration of an instrument at one point in time are correlated with scores obtained at another point in time using the same instrument and for the same individuals.

The test manual states that norms have not been established and that the purpose of the scale is for research, as opposed to selection, assignment, and/or assessment of leaders. The scales were developed and revised based upon scholarly literature and experts in the field of leadership. Face validity appears relatively strong according to the MMY test review (Mitchell, 1985). Face validity is a “first glance” at the items on the test, and in this case they seem to cover the content that test developers claim to measure. Having actors portray behaviors corresponding to items on the scales validated item content. Stogdill (1963) employed the assistance of a playwright who developed scenarios based on patterns of behavior using items from the subscales. Role performances for each scenario were made into a motion picture, and observers rated the supervisory roles using the LBDQ. No significant differences were found between the two actors playing the same role. Since the roles were designed to portray behaviors represented by the various subscales and since these same items were used to evaluate the supervisor, it is argued that these findings provide evidence of item content validity, that is, the items measure what they claim to measure. There is support for construct validity in a recent quantitative meta-analysis in which the validities for each construct generalized across criteria, across measures, and over time and across sources (Judge et al., 2004). Factor analysis supports the internal structure of the scales. Concurrent validity appears evident due to the fact that the LBDQ-Form XII scales correlate with
external criteria of job satisfaction and performance (Judge et al., 2004). There are no coefficients presented by the reviewers.

The LBDQ has been widely used in research settings. There are hundreds of studies that have utilized the LBDQ as a research instrument (Fleishman, 1973). Initially in the 1960s, the LBDQ was used because there was virtually no other instrument available. Often, the early studies revolved around validating the two constructs of consideration and initiating structure. Throughout the 1970s and continuing through current research studies, the LBDQ has been utilized across several areas of investigation, ranging from athletics to organizational management. The instrument identifies several leadership traits and tendencies (behaviors), and therefore, has been used in virtually every conceivable field and across cultures and continents over the past 50 years (Judge et al., 2004). It remains a much-utilized instrument in researching leader behaviors.

Variable List

Following is how the variables were coded in the present study. The independent variables are:

- Gender (1 = male; 2 = female) of board members and superintendents
- Educational level (1 = high school diploma; 2 = bachelor degree; 3 = masters or law degree; 4 = doctorate or post-masters degree) of board members
- Years of experience (1 = less than 3 years; 2 = 3 to 5 years; 3 = 6 to 9 years; 4 = 10 or more years) of board members and superintendents
- Size of district (1 = less than 2,000 students; 2 = 2,000 to 4,000 students; 3 = more than 4,000 students)
- Type of district (1 = urban/inner ring suburb; 2 = suburban; 3 = rural)

The dependent variables were:
• LBDQ - Real subscale of Initiating Structure (mean scores)
• LBDQ - Ideal subscale of Initiating Structure (mean scores)
• LBDQ - Real subscale of Consideration (mean scores)
• LBDQ - Ideal subscale of Consideration (mean scores)

The study specifically focused on the effects that the independent variables of gender, educational level, and years of experience of board members have on the perceptions of superintendents’ leader behavior as scored on the LBDQ-Form XII subscales of Initiation of Structure and Consideration, both real and ideal. Additionally, the effects of the independent variables of gender and years of experience of superintendents on board members’ perceptions were analyzed. Finally, the effects of size and type of school district on board members’ perceptions have been studied.

Data Collection

Data in this study were collected from school board members in public school districts as discussed previously in this chapter, utilizing survey research specifically with self-administered questionnaires. The school board president from each of the selected school districts received by regular mail an initial letter of invitation and explanation, followed 2 weeks later with a reminder via email to the board president and superintendents encouraging participation, and then a packet of materials was mailed to each board president one week following the email reminder. Included in the packet was a letter requesting the board president’s cooperation in disseminating the materials to fellow board members. The packet of materials included the following items for each board member:
1. A written invitation to participate in the study (Appendix A).

2. A copy of the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire-Form XII (LBDQ-Real) with instructions (Appendix B).

3. A copy of the Ideal Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire-Form XII (LBDQ-Ideal) with instructions (Appendix C).

4. A Personal Data Sheet (Appendix D).

5. A self-addressed stamped envelope so that each board member can return the completed instruments.

One month following the mailing of packets, an email was sent to superintendents in all districts in which fewer than two responses had been completed and returned. The emails were sent to encourage the superintendents to in turn encourage their board members to participate in the study. It was also stated to superintendents in the email correspondence that any needed materials would be provided immediately. Two weeks following this email, phone calls were made to districts in which there were no responses, for the same purpose of encouraging board members’ participation in the study.

The primary ethical consideration in the study was to maintain confidentiality of board members (participants), superintendents (the subjects of the surveys), and school districts. Using no names on the forms, as well as asking for no identifiable information on the surveys or demographic information sheets, has accomplished the goal of anonymity. Surveys were numerically coded for the researcher’s use in determining who had or had not responded. The Institution Review Board approved the research protocol for this study.
Statistical Treatment

Data in the study were collected using the LBDQ and a Personal Data Sheet. The data were received from school board members in public Ohio school districts. Six hypotheses have been used to investigate the perceptions of board members regarding the leader behaviors of their superintendents. Statistical tests have provided the tools for analyzing data for purposes of making implications of the research questions, as well as providing data for use in future studies.

Two-way multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was utilized in the hypotheses that compare the mean scores for the interaction between the real and ideal dimensions of leader behaviors based upon the demographic variables of gender, educational level, and years of experience. A 2 (gender) x 4 (years of experience) x 4 (educational level) factorial design was used in examining the independent variables related to board members. A 2 (gender) x 4 (years of experience) factorial design was used in examining the independent variables related to superintendents. Two-way MANOVA was also used when comparing the interaction between real and ideal dimensions of leader behaviors based upon the demographic variables of size and type of school district. A 3 x 3 factorial design was utilized.

The use of MANOVA as the statistical procedure was determined as a result of examining the relationships of groups with two dependent variables (real and ideal scores on the subscale of Initiating Structure). The focus of the MANOVA statistical analysis is on the pattern of mean differences on the dependent variables across categories of the independent variables (Spicer, 2005). A factorial design enables the researcher to
examine joint effects of the independent variables on the dependent variables, and also can lead to more powerful tests by reducing error variance (Stevens, 1996).

Assumptions and Limitations

There are four assumptions for multivariate analysis of variance (Mertler & Vannatta, 2005; Spicer, 2005). These assumptions are:

1. The observations within each sample must be random and independent of each other. This assumption is primarily a design issue.

2. The populations from which the samples were obtained must be normally distributed or approximately normally distributed. However, the MANOVA has a robust quality that allows the results to be valid even when the data are skewed.

3. The covariances of the populations must be equal; this is also known as the assumption of homoscedasticity.

4. The relationship among all pairs of dependent variables in the data matrix must be linear.

Limitations of the study included the possibility of lack of clarity of the administration and distribution of the instrument. Instructions for the purpose, administration, and distribution of the LBDQ and personal data sheet were included in the mailings to participants in order to minimize these limitations. Participants in the study have a commitment from the researcher of confidentiality and anonymity.

The results of this study have validity if they are due to the relationship of the independent variables and not on another outside influence. The possibility of widespread organizational change or organizational issues (such as labor negotiations, reductions in force, personnel problems, etc.) is not addressed in the current study.
Summary

Chapter III presented an overview of the research design, a statement of the general and specific research hypotheses, a description of the participants who were surveyed in this study, and a description of the sampling methods that were utilized. A description of the LBDQ accompanied by validity and reliability information was provided, as well as a list of the variables used in the study. An explanation of the data collection methods was given, and the statistical treatment utilized to analyze the data was explained, followed by a description of limitations of this study.

Findings from the study will help to provide data regarding the effects of demographic variables on the perceptions of school board members of their superintendents’ real and ideal leader behaviors. This information may be useful in providing a better understanding of certain biases that may exist among board of education members. Additionally, the information of this study will add to the body of research that can be helpful in further studies, especially given the fact that there is little quantitative research in the area of board and superintendent relations.
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Introduction

The previous chapter explained the methodology used in this study to test the following hypotheses:

Hypothesis 1. There is a statistically significant difference between the real and ideal Initiating Structure scores for school superintendents based upon the gender, educational level, or years of experience of the board member.

Hypothesis 2. There is a statistically significant mean difference between the real and ideal Consideration scores for school superintendents based upon the gender, educational level, or years of experience of the board member.

Hypothesis 3. There is a statistically significant mean difference between the real and ideal Initiating Structure scores for school superintendents based upon the gender or years of experience of the superintendent.

Hypothesis 4. There is a statistically significant mean difference between the real and ideal Consideration scores for school superintendents based upon the gender or years of experience of the superintendent.

Hypothesis 5. There is a statistically significant mean difference between the real and ideal Initiating Structure scores for school superintendents based upon the type or size of the school district.

Hypothesis 6. There is a statistically significant mean difference between the real and ideal Consideration scores for school superintendents based upon the type or size of the school district.

The purpose of this chapter is to report the results of the statistical analysis used to test the above hypotheses. The researcher used SPSS for Windows 10.0 as the statistical
software for conducting the analyses. The current chapter consists of descriptive statistics for the sample, results of the hypotheses, and a summary.

Descriptive Statistics

A consideration of importance in statistical analysis is that of knowing the demographics and distribution of the survey respondents. It is desirable, as mentioned in the previous chapter, for the data to be normally distributed. Table 4.1 demonstrates the distribution of the ideal and real scores for the initiation of structure subscale, with the ideal scores being slightly negatively skewed and the real scores being negatively skewed. The skewness is within the acceptable range of -1 and 1 for the Ideal score, but Table 4.1

Initiation of Structure Distribution of Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>In Ideal</th>
<th>In Real</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>4.3910</td>
<td>4.0704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>4.4000</td>
<td>4.1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>3.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skewness</td>
<td>.192</td>
<td>-1.132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Error of skewness</td>
<td>.172</td>
<td>.172</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

is moderately outside the range for the Real score. However, MANOVA is robust to moderate violations, as long as the violation is due to skewness (Mertler & Vannatta, 2005). Table 4.2 displays the distribution of the ideal and real scores for the consideration subscale, with both the ideal and real scores being slightly negatively skewed but within the acceptable range.
Table 4.2
Consideration Distribution of Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>Con Ideal 199</th>
<th>Con Real 199</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>4.3055</td>
<td>3.8894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>4.3000</td>
<td>4.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skewness</td>
<td>-.522</td>
<td>-.825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Error of Skewness</td>
<td>.172</td>
<td>.172</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results of Hypothesis 1

The test used for investigating the hypothesis was a two-way multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) to determine the effect of gender, length of service, and educational level on the two dependent variables of participants’ initiation of structure scores on the LBDQ-Form XII both real and ideal. The overall significance level was set at .10 and data were not transformed to eliminate any outliers. The Box’s test was significant, indicating that the assumption of homoscedasticity was violated, and as a result the Pillai’s Trace test statistic, which is more robust than the normally used Wilks’ Lambda, was utilized. Table 4.3 summarizes results of the MANOVA.

Results indicated that the main effect of experience (independent variable) had significant differences on the dependent variables (Pillai’s Trace = .082, F (6, 338) = 1.888, p < .10). Significant differences on the dependent variables were not evident based on the main effects of gender (Pillai’s Trace = .033, F (2, 168) = 1.888, p = .775),
educational level (Pillai’s Trace = .050, F (6, 338) = 1.446, \(p = .196\)), or interaction

effects of gender and experience (Pillai’s Trace = .007, F (6, 338) = .210, \(p = .974\)),

Table 4.3

Hypothesis 1 MANOVA Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Pillai’s Trace value</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.255</td>
<td>.775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of experience</td>
<td>.065</td>
<td>1.888</td>
<td>.082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed. level</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>1.446</td>
<td>.196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender &amp; exp.</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.210</td>
<td>.974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender &amp; ed. level</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>.730</td>
<td>.626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience &amp; ed. level</td>
<td>.092</td>
<td>.909</td>
<td>.568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender, exp., &amp; ed. level</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td>.803</td>
<td>.666</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

gender and educational level (Pillai’s Trace = .026, F (6, 338) = .730, \(p = .626\)),

experience and educational level (Pillai’s Trace = .092, F (18, 338) = .909, \(p = .568\)), or
gender, experience, and educational level (Pillai’s Trace = .064, F (14, 338) = .803, \(p = .666\)).

Univariate analysis of variance (ANOVA) was also conducted on each dependent

variable significantly affected by independent variable(s) as a follow-up test to

MANOVA. The significance level for ANOVA was set at .05 since when two dependent

variables are analyzed, the overall significance level is to be divided by the number of

dependent variables being tested (Mertler & Vannatta, 2005). ANOVA results indicate

that the real score significantly differs for years of experience (F(3, 169) = 3.545, \(p < .05\)). ANOVA results revealed that the effect of experience had no significant effect on

the ideal score (F(3, 169) = .210, \(p = .889\)). Bonferroni post hoc results for the real score
indicate that individuals with 2 years of experience or less differ significantly from those with 10 or more years of experience. Those with less than 2 years of experience had a mean score of 3.88, while those with 10 years or more of experience had a mean score of 4.30. The effect size was calculated to determine the magnitude of the difference between the groups (Cohen, 1988; Salkind, 2004). The effect size between those with less than 2 years experience and those with 10 or more years of experience was $d = .8636$. Results indicate a significant difference between those with 6 to 9 years of experience (4.02 mean score) and those with 10 or more years of experience (4.30 mean score). An effect size of $d = .2300$ was observed between those with 6 to 9 years of experience and those with 10 or more years. Table 4.4 presents the group means and mean differences of the real initiation of structure mean scores for experience of board members.

Table 4.4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>Compare exp.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Mean diff.</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>≤ 2 years</td>
<td>3 – 5</td>
<td>4.1356 -</td>
<td>.2552</td>
<td>.103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 – 9</td>
<td>4.0170 -</td>
<td>.1366</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>≥ 10</td>
<td>4.3044 -</td>
<td>.4241*</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 to 5</td>
<td>6 – 9</td>
<td>4.0170</td>
<td>.1186</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>≥ 10</td>
<td>4.3044 -</td>
<td>.1689</td>
<td>.796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 to 9</td>
<td>≥10</td>
<td>4.3044 -</td>
<td>.2875*</td>
<td>.049</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The null hypothesis was rejected as a result of the statistical analyses that were conducted for the first hypothesis.
Results of Hypothesis 2

The test used for investigating the hypothesis was a two-way multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) to determine the effect of gender, length of service, and educational level on the two dependent variables of participants’ consideration scores on the LBDQ-Form XII both real and ideal. The overall significance level was set at .10 and data were not transformed to eliminate any outliers. The Box’s test was significant, indicating that the assumption of homoscedasticity was violated, and as a result the Pillai’s Trace test statistic, which is more robust than the normally used Wilks’ Lambda, was utilized. Table 4.5 summarizes results of the MANOVA for Hypothesis 2.

Table 4.5
Hypothesis 2 MANOVA Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Pillai’s Trace value</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.175</td>
<td>.839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of experience</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td>1.558</td>
<td>.159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed. level</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>.286</td>
<td>.944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender &amp; exp.</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>.320</td>
<td>.926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender &amp; ed. level</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>.681</td>
<td>.665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience &amp; ed. level</td>
<td>.110</td>
<td>1.092</td>
<td>.358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender, exp., &amp; ed. level</td>
<td>.122</td>
<td>1.569</td>
<td>.086</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results indicated that the interactive effect of gender, experience, and educational level (independent variables) had significant differences on the dependent variables (Pillai’s Trace = .122, F (14, 338) = 1.569, p < .10). Significant differences on the dependent variables were not evident based on the main effects of gender (Pillai’s Trace = .002, F (2, 168) = .175, p = .839), experience (Pillai’s Trace = .054, F (6, 338) = 1.558, p = .159),
or educational level (Pillai’s Trace = .010, F (6, 338) = .286, p = .944). There were no significant differences based on interaction effects of gender and experience (Pillai’s Trace = .011, F (6, 338) = .320, p = .926), gender and educational level (Pillai’s Trace = .024, F (6, 338) = .681, p = .665), or experience and educational level (Pillai’s Trace = .110, F (18, 338) = 1.092, p = .358).

Individual F tests were performed as a follow-up to MANOVA (Stevens, 1996) indicating significant interaction of board members’ gender, experience, and educational level on the ideal Consideration scores (F = 2.571, p <.10) and a significant effect of board members’ experience on the real Consideration score (F = 2.497, p <.10). Two-way profiles were analyzed as a follow-up to the MANOVA (Stevens, 1996) to determine differences for the interaction effect of board members’ gender, experience, and educational level on the dependent variable of ideal mean consideration scores. Table 4.6 is a two-way profile of gender and educational levels on ideal Consideration.

Table 4.6
Consideration Ideal: Gender and Educational Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>HS</th>
<th>BA</th>
<th>MA/LAW</th>
<th>DR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>4.325</td>
<td>4.214</td>
<td>4.244</td>
<td>4.383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>4.400</td>
<td>4.297</td>
<td>4.396</td>
<td>4.300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comparing the cells, a disordinal interaction is observed in that females’ mean ideal consideration score is higher than that of males in three of the educational level categories, but reversed for those with a doctorate degree. Thus, females’ mean scores were higher than their male counterparts in three of four categories.
Table 4.7 is a two-way profile of board members’ gender and experience on ideal Consideration. An ordinal interaction is observed when comparing the cells. Females score higher in each of the four categories of experience.

Table 4.7

Consideration Ideal: Gender and Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 ≤ 2</th>
<th>3 – 5</th>
<th>6 – 9</th>
<th>≥ 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>4.277</td>
<td>4.272</td>
<td>4.224</td>
<td>4.311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>4.354</td>
<td>4.340</td>
<td>4.275</td>
<td>4.467</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.8 is a two-way profile of board members’ experience and educational level on ideal Consideration. Analysis of the cells demonstrates a disordinal interaction. Mean scores do not tend to be higher or lower based on board members’ educational level or experience.

Table 4.8

Consideration Ideal: Experience and Educational Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 ≤ 2</th>
<th>3 – 5</th>
<th>6 – 9</th>
<th>≥ 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>4.415</td>
<td>4.150</td>
<td>4.283</td>
<td>4.520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA</td>
<td>4.160</td>
<td>4.253</td>
<td>4.276</td>
<td>4.380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA/LAW</td>
<td>4.386</td>
<td>4.320</td>
<td>4.127</td>
<td>4.287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DR</td>
<td>4.400</td>
<td>4.640</td>
<td>4.200</td>
<td>4.180</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.9 is a two-way profile of board members gender and experience on real Consideration. Analysis of the cells demonstrates a disordinal interaction. Males score their superintendents higher in three of the four experience levels. The more experience
board members have, the higher the scores, with the exception of the 6-to-9 years of experience category. Those with 10 or more years of experience, regardless of gender, gave higher scores to their superintendents on the real Consideration subscale.

Table 4.9
Consideration Real: Gender and Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>( \leq 2 )</th>
<th>3 – 5</th>
<th>6 – 9</th>
<th>( \geq 10 )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3.810</td>
<td>4.041</td>
<td>3.852</td>
<td>4.112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3.639</td>
<td>3.831</td>
<td>3.814</td>
<td>4.238</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.10 is a two-way profile of board members’ educational level and experience on real Consideration. Analysis of the cells demonstrates a disordinal interaction. For both high school and bachelors degree holders, the more experience a board member has, the higher the score. However, this same trend did not hold true for those with masters/law degrees or doctoral degrees. Analyzing the data by educational level revealed that there was not a general direction of lower or higher scores with degree.

Table 4.10
Consideration Real: Educational Level and Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>( \leq 2 )</th>
<th>3 – 5</th>
<th>6 – 9</th>
<th>( \geq 10 )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>3.657</td>
<td>3.650</td>
<td>3.797</td>
<td>4.406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA</td>
<td>3.708</td>
<td>3.713</td>
<td>3.921</td>
<td>4.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA/LAW</td>
<td>3.663</td>
<td>4.022</td>
<td>3.640</td>
<td>4.144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DR</td>
<td>4.100</td>
<td>4.358</td>
<td>3.975</td>
<td>4.040</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
attained. The null hypothesis was rejected as a result of the statistical analyses performed for this second hypothesis.

Results of Hypothesis 3

A two-way MANOVA was conducted to determine the effect of superintendent’s gender and experience on the two dependent variables of respondent’s ideal initiation of structure scores and real initiation of structure scores. The overall significance level was set at .10, and the data were not transformed. The Pillai’s Trace test statistic was used as a result of the Box’s Test being significant, indicating that homogeneity of variance-covariance was violated. MANOVA results indicate that the main effects of gender (Pillai’s Trace = .006, F (2, 190) = .545, \( p = .581 \)), and experience (Pillai’s Trace = .051, F (6, 382) = 1.674, \( p = .126 \)) had no significant effects on the dependent variables, nor did the interaction effect of gender and experience (Pillai’s Trace = .002, F (4, 382) = .115, \( p = .977 \)). No univariate ANOVA or post hoc tests were conducted, as a result of the MANOVA results revealing nonsignificance. MANOVA results for Hypothesis 3 are summarized in Table 4.11. The null hypothesis was accepted as a result of the MANOVA results.

Table 4.11

Hypothesis 3 MANOVA Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Pillai’s Trace value</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.545</td>
<td>.581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of experience</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>1.674</td>
<td>.126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender &amp; exp.</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.115</td>
<td>.977</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Results of Hypothesis 4

A two-way MANOVA was conducted to determine the effect of superintendent’s gender and experience on the two dependent variables of respondent’s ideal consideration scores and real consideration scores. The overall significance level was set at .10, and the data were not transformed. The Pillai’s Trace test statistic was used as a result of the Box’s Test being significant, indicating that homoscedasticity was violated. MANOVA results indicate that the main effect of experience (Pillai’s Trace = .059, $F (6, 382) = 1.920, p < .10$) had a significant effect on the dependent variables of ideal and real scores of consideration. MANOVA results indicate that the main effect of gender (Pillai’s Trace = .011, $F (2, 190) = 1.036, p = .357$) had no significant effects on the dependent variables, nor did the interaction effect of gender and experience (Pillai’s Trace = .035, $F (4, 382) = 1.679, p = .154$). MANOVA results for Hypothesis 4 are summarized in Table 4.12.

Table 4.12
Hypothesis 4 MANOVA Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Pillai’s Trace value</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>1.036</td>
<td>.357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of experience</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>1.920</td>
<td>.077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender &amp; exp.</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td>1.679</td>
<td>.154</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Univariate ANOVA and Bonferroni post hoc tests were conducted as follow-up analyses. ANOVA results indicate that real consideration scores significantly differ for superintendent’s experience ($F(3, 191) = 2.737, p < .05$), while the ideal consideration
scores reveal no significant difference ($F(3, 191) = 1.503, p = .215$). Bonferroni post hoc tests for the real consideration score indicate that individuals with 3 to 5 years of experience differ significantly from those with 6 to 9 years of experience ($d = .5956$), and those with 6 to 9 years of experience differ significantly from those with 10 or more years of experience ($d = .6927$). Those with 3 to 5 years of experience had a mean score of 4.00, those with 6 to 9 years of experience had a mean score of 3.61, while those with 10 years or more of experience had a mean score of 4.08. The results indicated no significant differences when comparing those with 2 years or less experience to those with 3 to 5, 6 to 9, or 10 or more years of experience. There were no significant differences observed for those with 3 to 5 years of experience when compared to those with 10 or more years of experience.

Table 4.13 presents the group means and mean differences of the real consideration mean scores for experience of board members. The null hypothesis was rejected as a result of statistical analyses performed.

Table 4.13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>Compare exp.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Mean diff.</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>≤ 2 years</td>
<td>3 – 5</td>
<td>4.0049</td>
<td>-.1763</td>
<td>.818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 – 9</td>
<td>3.6059</td>
<td>.2227</td>
<td>.691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>≥ 10</td>
<td>4.0758</td>
<td>-.2472</td>
<td>.502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 to 5</td>
<td>6 – 9</td>
<td>3.6059</td>
<td>.3990*</td>
<td>.037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>≥ 10</td>
<td>4.0758</td>
<td>-.0709</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 to 9</td>
<td>≥ 10</td>
<td>4.0758</td>
<td>-.4699*</td>
<td>.029</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Results of Hypothesis 5

A two-way MANOVA was conducted to determine the effect of district size and type (urban, suburban, rural) on the two dependent variables of respondent’s scores on the ideal initiation of structure subscale and scores on the real initiation of structure subscale. The overall significance level was set at .10, and the data were not transformed. MANOVA results indicate that the main effects of district size (Wilks’ Lambda = .981, $F(4, 378) = .910, p = .458$), and district type (Wilks’ Lambda = .975, $F(4, 378) = 1.213, p = .305$) had no significant effects on the dependent variables. The interaction effect of district size and type (Wilks’ Lambda = .947, $F(8, 378) = 1.296, p = .244$) had no significant effects on the dependent variables of ideal and real initiation of structure subscale scores. No univariate ANOVA or post hoc tests were conducted, as a result of the nonsignificance revealed on the MANOVA. MANOVA results for Hypothesis 5 are summarized in Table 4.14. The null hypothesis was accepted as a result of the MANOVA results.

Table 4.14
Hypothesis 5 MANOVA Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Wilks’ Lambda value</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Size</td>
<td>.981</td>
<td>.910</td>
<td>.458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>.975</td>
<td>1.213</td>
<td>.305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size &amp; type</td>
<td>.947</td>
<td>1.296</td>
<td>.244</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Results of Hypothesis 6

A two-way MANOVA was conducted to determine the effect of district size and type (urban, suburban, rural) on the two dependent variables of respondent’s scores on the ideal consideration subscale and scores on the real consideration subscale. The overall significance level was set at .10, and the data were not transformed. MANOVA results indicate that the main effects of district size (Wilks’ Lambda = .979, F (4, 378) = .986, \(p = .415\)), and district type (Wilks’ Lambda = .997, F (4, 378) = .144, \(p = .966\)) had no significant effects on the dependent variables. The interaction effect of district size and type (Wilks’ Lambda = .945, F (8, 378) = 1.345, \(p = .220\)) had no significant effects on the dependent variables of ideal and real consideration subscale scores. No univariate ANOVA or post hoc tests were conducted, as a result of the nonsignificance revealed on the MANOVA tests. MANOVA results for Hypothesis 6 are summarized is Table 4.15. The null hypothesis was accepted as a result of the MANOVA results.

Table 4.15
Hypothesis 6 MANOVA Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Wilks’ Lambda value</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Size</td>
<td>.979</td>
<td>.986</td>
<td>.415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>.997</td>
<td>.144</td>
<td>.966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size &amp; type</td>
<td>.945</td>
<td>1.345</td>
<td>.220</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary

In summary, the results of the study indicated that there were significant differences of superintendents’ leader behavior in the perceptions of board members.
These differences were observed specifically in the following three areas: there was a main effect of board members’ experience on real initiation of structure scores; there was an interaction effect of board members’ gender, experience, and educational level on the ideal consideration scores; and there was a main effect of superintendents’ experience on the real consideration scores. There were no main or interaction effects of significance observed on the remainder of the hypotheses in the study. In general, this study supported the hypotheses that there is a statistically significant difference between the real and ideal Initiation of Structure scores as a result of the gender, educational level, or years of experience of board members; that there is a statistically significant difference between the real and ideal Consideration scores as a result of the board members’ gender, experience, or educational level; and that there is a statistically significant difference between the real and ideal Consideration scores based upon the gender or experience level of the superintendent.

The results indicate that the strongest conclusions from this study are that board members with a high level of experience may perceive their superintendents more positively than do those board members with a low level of board experience on the construct of Initiation of Structure. Board members also tend to perceive their superintendent more positively on the construct of Consideration when a high level of superintendent experience exists. Additionally, female board members may hold higher expectations on the construct of Consideration and perceive superintendents’ actual behavior lower on Consideration when compared with male respondents. Although these differences will be discussed further in Chapter V, it is evident that the experience level of both board members and superintendents have the potential to impact perceptions of
board members in regards to superintendents’ leader behaviors, both ideal and actual. In
general, it appears that the more experience board members or superintendents obtain, the
more likely it is that board members will perceive their superintendent’s actual leadership
behaviors as positive. It also appears that gender may play a role in board members’
expectations and perceptions of superintendents in the area of Consideration.
CHAPTER V
SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION

Introduction

The chapter is divided into three sections: a summary of the study, conclusions drawn from the study, and implications and suggestions for further research. The summary includes a review of the problem investigated, the procedures used for investigation, and the specific hypotheses. The conclusions will include highlights of the major findings of the study. The final section, implications, will include practical applications of the current study.

Summary

This research investigated the relationship of board members and superintendents, specifically focusing on the differences in perceptions held by board members of the real leader behavior and ideal leader behavior of superintendents. A review of leadership literature suggests that a single definition of leadership is nearly impossible to determine (Heck & Hallinger, 1999), and that theoretical studies reveal that leadership has evolved from a rather static, one-person approach to a dynamic and dispersed approach (Donmoyer, 1999; Heck & Hallinger, 1999). Current theoretical frameworks of leadership generally include, explicitly or implicitly, a focus on a concern for people and a focus on production (Vechio, 2006). The literature is extremely limited regarding board members’ perceptions of school superintendents’ leader behaviors (Hoyle & Skrla,
yet these perceptions are of tremendous importance as evidenced by the close working relationships of superintendents and board members (Cambron-McCabe, Cunningham, Harvey, & Koff, 2005), as well as the high turnover rate of superintendents often attributed to poor relationships with their boards (Houston & Eadie, 2005). The chief focus of the current study was to determine if differences exist in board members’ perceptions between the ideal leader behavior and the real leader behavior of superintendents, and the effect of several demographic variables on these perceptions.

The perceived differences in leader behavior were measured by dependent variables of two constructs that were developed through observation and research, Consideration and Initiation of Structure (Stogdill, 1963). Data were collected from school board members serving public school districts across the state. The LBDQ-Form XII was used as the survey instrument as a result of its wide use over the past 50 years, its reliability and validity, and for purposes of replicating a study conducted by Ross (1983). The hypotheses for the study were derived through a review of the leadership literature and personal observation on the part of the researcher and were tested using multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA).

The specific hypotheses that were tested for the purpose of this study were as follows:

Hypothesis 1. There is a statistically significant difference between the real and ideal Initiating Structure scores for school superintendents based upon the gender, educational level, or years of experience of the board member.

Hypothesis 2. There is a statistically significant mean difference between the real and ideal Consideration scores for school superintendents based upon the gender, educational level, or years of experience of the board member.
Hypothesis 3. There is a statistically significant mean difference between the real and ideal Initiating Structure scores for school superintendents based upon the gender or years of experience of the superintendent.

Hypothesis 4. There is a statistically significant mean difference between the real and ideal Consideration scores for school superintendents based upon the gender or years of experience of the superintendent.

Hypothesis 5. There is a statistically significant mean difference between the real and ideal Initiating Structure scores for school superintendents based upon the type or size of the school district.

Hypothesis 6. There is a statistically significant mean difference between the real and ideal Consideration scores for school superintendents based upon the type or size of the school district.

Statistical analysis led to research hypotheses one, two, and four being accepted (null hypotheses were rejected), while research hypotheses three, five, and six were rejected (null hypotheses were accepted).

Conclusions

The major findings in the statistical analyses indicated that there is a significant main effect of board members’ experience on the real Initiation of Structure scores. In particular, a board member with 10 years or more of experience had a significantly higher mean real score (4.30) than did those with 2 years or less experience (3.88), and there was a large effect size ($d = .8636$), indicating that the significance is not only statistical, but also meaningful (Salkind, 2004). Additional findings indicated a main effect of superintendents’ experience level on real Consideration to be significant. Those superintendents with 3 to 5 years of experience had a significantly higher mean score (4.00) than those with 6 to 9 years of experience (3.61) displaying a medium effect size ($d = .5956$), and those with 6 to 9 years of experience (3.61) differed significantly from those with 10 years or more of experience (4.08) demonstrating a medium-to-large effect.
size \((d = .6927)\). Finally, there was a significant interaction effect of board of education members’ gender, years of experience, and educational level attained. Two-way profiles revealed that female board members’ ideal Consideration scores were always higher than males when compared against the variable of board members’ experience, and usually higher than males when compared with the variable of board members’ educational level. Two-way profiles revealed that male board members usually ranked their superintendents higher on the real Consideration score, and those with 10 years or more of experience ranked their superintendents higher than other experience levels, regardless of the board members’ gender. A final two-way profile revealed that with 10 years or more experience and a doctoral educational level, board members usually rate their superintendents higher on the real Consideration scores.

The study confirmed the fact that board members hold high expectations of board members in the areas of Initiation of Structure (mean ideal score = 4.391), as well as in their Consideration of people (mean ideal score = 4.306). The study also confirms the fact that often boards have higher expectations than their perceptions of superintendents’ actual behavior, as evidenced by the real score of Initiation of Structure (mean real score = 4.070) and Consideration (mean real score = 3.889). These very broad scores may provide partial explanation of the relatively short tenures of many superintendents. In view of the fact that a reason offered for short tenure is a lack of clarity of the board’s expectations, as well as board expectations that are higher than board’s perceptions of superintendent’s behaviors (Kowalski, 1999).

The current study extended the knowledge of superintendents’ leader behavior as perceived by boards of education. It is evident by the results of this study that board
members who have a high level of experience perceive the actual production (real Initiation of Structure) of their superintendents as significantly higher than those board members with little experience. Additionally, superintendents with 10 years or more of experience are generally perceived more positively than those with less experience regarding their actual concern for people (real Consideration). Board members who have 10 years or more of experience rate their superintendents higher in the area of real Consideration. These results extend the current literature regarding superintendent and board relationships, indicating that there is a very good possibility that with higher levels of experience on the part of boards and/or superintendents, the superintendents’ actual behavior will be viewed more positively by board of education members (Houston & Eadie, 2005; Kowalski, 1999).

Female board members who responded to the survey generally held higher expectations of superintendents in the area of consideration of people (ideal Consideration) than do males, while the female board members tend to rate superintendents’ actual Consideration lower than do male board members. The results concerning gender provided the insight that female board members may hold higher expectations of superintendents’ people skills, while generally rating the actual behavior as lower compared to male board members. Possible reasons for this phenomenon may be due to nature and nurture considerations regarding males and females (Borisoff & Merrill, 1985; Shakeshaft, Nowell, & Perry, 1991) and are beyond the scope of this study. However, the implications are noteworthy observations with practical implications for both boards of education and superintendents.
Implications

There are several implications of, and practical applications to, the findings of the study. The role that increased experience plays, both for superintendents and boards of education, is evident through this study, as well as some gender disparities. Other practical applications are inherent when reviewing the results. The following section discusses the theoretical and practical applications this research engendered.

*Experience of Board Members*

There is a stark contrast between the training required of superintendents as compared to that of board members. While superintendents generally either come to the position with several other administrative jobs or experiences in their past, any person can be elected to a board of education, and there is absolutely no training required once elected. Additionally, there remains a paucity of available training opportunities if a board of education member so desires such training. An individual may fill a seat on the board with little or no knowledge of the school district’s mission, organizational programs, district financial condition, state funding laws, time commitment, governance responsibilities, and administrative versus board roles and functions. This lack of knowledge often can be detrimental and time consuming and the development of this knowledge base may take months or even years and often occurs through a variety of real-life situations and a great deal of communication with more experienced board members and the superintendent.

Furthermore, depending on the experience of the board, the superintendent often is placed in the potentially awkward position of training the very board members who will in turn evaluate that same superintendent. As noted in the literature, a school
superintendent is placed in a unique employment condition (Cambron-Mccabe, Cunningham, Harvey, & Koff, 2005), being hired by, reporting to, and evaluated by the collective group known as the school board. Superintendents often paradoxically spend much of their time in discussion with inexperienced board members assisting them in understanding the roles and functions of boards. This “training” of inexperienced board members usually requires prolonged and conscientious attention, and the superintendent is usually held responsible for this development (Cambron-Mccabe, Cunningham, Harvey, & Koff, 2005; Houston & Eadie, 2005).

Related to the experience factor of board members is the paradox that inexperienced board members often don’t grasp – that of supporting and governing. In the role of support for the district, board members attempt to ensure the success of the school district, by placing tax issues on the ballot, acting as ambassadors of the organization, and often bringing some level of specific expertise and authority to the district. The governance function includes protecting the public interest through selecting the superintendent and treasurer, assessing the performance of these two individuals, setting policy, and evaluating the district’s work. Inexperienced board members often mistake governance for close supervision and end up meddling in minor administrative affairs. Due to their lack of familiarity with the field of education, such meddling can become burdensome for district office personnel and potentially damaging for long-term working relationships. Superintendents and board members would be wise to remember that lack of experience may result in less positive perceptions of the superintendent, and may result in a strained rapport, connections, and associations between the board of education and superintendent. Information from this study can be helpful to both
superintendents and board members as they reflect on their relationships in terms of actual leader behavior. Additionally, results lead to the conclusion that there is a tremendous need for board development programs, as well as joint training for both superintendents and boards regarding the roles and functions of each.

**Experience of Superintendents**

The level of experience on the part of the superintendent has the potential to impact perceptions of board members, especially in the area of effectively dealing with people, as this study indicates. One assumes superintendents acquire more knowledge and understanding of constituencies over extended employment in that district. This increased experience has the potential to lead to a more positive perception on the part of board members of their superintendent. The longer one serves as a superintendent, the more likely it is that lessons can be learned from both personal and others’ mistakes (Hewitt, 1999). Results suggested that experience is valued by board members, implying that it is wise for superintendents to be students of the profession, learn lessons through the experience of both self and others, and to work diligently to understand the board as a collective whole. This approach may assist an inexperienced superintendent in making up for a lack of experience in terms of actual time on the job.

**Gender of Board Members**

The role that gender plays in the expected and actual behavior of superintendents is both interesting, and potentially important, especially when combined with the fact that there remains a scarcity of female superintendents (15% in the current study), while there is more balance with board members (42% are females in the study). These percentages are congruent with those across the state, with 18% of superintendents being female,
while 33% of board members are female. This difference in expectations and actual behavior was noticed in the area of Consideration in the current study and may be important for superintendents to clarify expectations in this area to avoid potential conflict with their boards. The possibility exists that with a rather one-sided, male-dominated profession of superintendents, combined with a more balanced group of board members, there are some inherent problems of understanding the expectations in the area of consideration of people. Perhaps male superintendents tend to be more focused on task and production issues, while many board members are focused on people skills of their superintendent. Further, female board members may communicate their expectations differently than do male board members (Borisoff & Merrill, 1985) to primarily male superintendents. In any case, it is a prudent step for a superintendent to seek clarity of expectations from the board of education in this area, especially given the fact that a superintendent’s tenure demands that expectations of the board are satisfied (Cambron-McCabe, Cunningham, Harvey, & Koff, 2005).

Communication

Results of the study indicate several points of consideration in the area of communication. Congruence of perception between the board and superintendent has been found to be important (Dillon & Halliwell, 1991). It is the personal observation and experience of the researcher that communication is critical to an effective, positive perception. A structured communication plan is essential to maintaining a positive relationship with the collective board. Weekly updates, board meeting information for agendas, crisis communication, responses to individual board members, guidelines for when to contact board members by phone, and numerous other situations cannot be
attended to in a haphazard manner. A structured approach to communication with board members is critical. Communication can also be used as a means of developing new, inexperienced board members, both explicitly and implicitly. As an example, developing a habit of calling board members a day in advance of public meetings to answer any questions or to clarify information will send an implied message that they should read their board packets in advance and may avoid surprises from the public meeting. Additionally, awareness of the results of this study may influence the manner in which one communicates with experienced versus non-experienced board members, males versus females, while still being oneself. The results of this survey indicate that more time may be needed in the area of communication with female board members or those who are relatively inexperienced as board members.

When communicating with boards of education, it is the researcher’s personal experience and observation that several practical behaviors on the part of superintendents may enhance the relationship with members of the board. One such behavior is that of being yourself. While it may be tempting to emulate and copy another’s style, the nature of frequent and often detailed communication with board members should dictate the fact that it is vital to be yourself or one runs the risk of being inconsistent and being perceived as insincere. A second behavior is to be credible and honest in communication. Superintendents can get themselves into trouble with their boards when attempting to answer every question and appear knowledgeable in every conceivable manner. It is more important to be able to back any statements or answers with factual information, and this often includes going to others for information prior to answering questions. The utilization of humor and personal anecdotes when appropriate can be extremely helpful in
developing a positive rapport with the board, especially in tense or critical situation. Humor and personal anecdotes can help put a difficult situation into perspective. Another helpful behavior in communication is that of seeking to understand the board and its members. Taking the time to ask probing questions, practice active listening skills, and reflect on board members’ statements has proven to improve mutual respect among superintendents and boards, as well as avoiding making incorrect assumptions about the boards’ motives. Finally, the author has observed that displaying passion and sincerity is vital in communication with boards, especially when making recommendations and suggestions to board members. Poor communication generally precedes or adds to an ineffective and negative relationship with the board. (Hewitt, 1999) In summary, communication must be timely, consistent, and attentive to the needs and expectations of both the board members and the superintendent (Rickabaugh & Kremer, 1997).

Decision Making

The decision-making functions of a board and superintendent are critical to a district’s success in matters ranging from levy decisions to those involving programs and personnel. An essential and sometimes overlooked consideration is to clarify the boards’ role in various decision-making situations. In most cases, boards will make decisions and take action based upon the superintendent’s recommendation. It is therefore incumbent upon superintendents to provide and communicate detailed information to all board members equally prior to requesting a decision from them. Existing board policy and practice should be considered in all board-level decisions. Experience and intent of board members should also be considered when discussing and requesting decisions from boards. The current study suggests that experience of both the board and superintendent
may be factors that influence the boards’ perceptions of the superintendents. Therefore, with less experience of either party, more attention to detail may be needed throughout the decision-making process before asking the board to make decisions of major importance or those with far-reaching effects. Through experience, the level of detail may vary from one board member to another in order to reach a comfort level prior to making a major decision.

Leadership

This study began with an overview of leadership theory. As was noted, leadership theory has evolved over the past century from a focus on a single, “great man,” into one of dispersed power and team involvement (Donmoyer, 1999; Heck & Hallinger, 1999). An abundance of prior research has focused and built upon studies of leader behaviors that include a task or production orientation, and one of interaction with people or consideration (Vechio, 2006). These two constructs have been formally defined as Initiation of Structure and Consideration and are measured on the LBDQ as separate subscales and were utilized within this study.

In practice, application of these theoretical constructs is evidenced when superintendents and boards work together, addressing the concerns and issues their district faces. During these interactions, public school board members form perceptions of their superintendents, at least in part, based upon superintendents’ exhibited behaviors, and these perceptions are critical to the board superintendent relationship. Boards typically desire a superintendent who is able to “produce results” for the district, such as increasingly high state report card scores, increased graduation rates, fiscally responsible management, and other task-related behaviors. Additionally, boards yearn for a
superintendent who pays attention to people as individuals, forms positive relationships with parents and community members, and generally works cooperatively with others. As a result of investigating these expectations and perceived behaviors that board members hold, both board members and superintendents have an opportunity for increased understanding and practice of their working relationship.

The results may be helpful to board members as they reflect on their own practices and possible perception biases. A self-awareness on the part of board members that their perceptions may be influenced by experience and/or gender factors may lead to increased board development programs and better evaluation procedures of their superintendents. Superintendents can use information from this study to “read” their boards and use a contingency leadership approach (Bolman & Deal, 2003; Hersey & Blanchard, 1982; Horner, 1997) when communicating, working through the decision-making process, and generally working on the relationship with their boards of education. Ultimately, findings from the study can be used to improve the relationships between board of education members and superintendents, with the potential to result in improved educational environments for students.

Further investigation into board perceptions of superintendents’ leader behaviors may include such variables as organizational context, labor-management relations, individual board members’ agendas, board-superintendent trust, and political relations of board members. Results from the current study indicate a need for further clarification of male-female differences in expectations and perceptions of performance of superintendents. Perhaps an exploration of whether or not this finding reflects a treatment within the general population would add further helpful insight to both board
members and superintendents. There is a shortage of existing research literature regarding these variables as they relate to board and superintendent relations (Hoyle & Skrla, 1999; Peterson & Short, 2001; Tallerico, 1989), but given the critical nature of the board and superintendent relationship, quantitative and qualitative accounts of this relationship would be most beneficial to the profession.

In summary, the findings of this study imply that differences do exist among board members perceptions of the real and ideal scores of Initiation of Structure and Consideration for superintendents. Experience of both boards and superintendents appears to be a major factor, while gender of board members may also contribute to these differences. These findings are crucial and advantageous to boards and superintendents alike in order to continuously improve the quality of professional relationships and ultimately the very education profession itself.
REFERENCES


Stogdill, R (1963). *Manual for the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire, Form XII.* Columbus, OH: The Ohio State University, Bureau of Business Research.


APPENDICES
APPENDIX A

WRITTEN INVITATION TO PARTICIPATE

May 5, 2006

Dear Board of Education Members,

My name is John Richard and I am a doctoral student at the University of Akron. My dissertation topic is focused on the perceptions that board members have of superintendents’ leadership behaviors. The following information is being provided so that you may participate only with full understanding of the research and your consent to participate.

The procedures of collecting data will be to survey board members using the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ) – Form XII, both Real and Ideal forms, and a personal data sheet. The surveys you are being asked to complete will take a total of approximately 5 - 10 minutes. The directions for the LBDQ state that you will be describing the behavior of your superintendent. If you are in the process of hiring a new superintendent or have hired a new superintendent in the past three months, please describe the behavior of your previous superintendent.

There is little or no risk involved on the part of participants. The surveys will not be identified by district name, or by individual names. They will be completed anonymously and will be maintained confidentially. I will keep the surveys in a secured file at my personal residence. The surveys will be maintained for a maximum time period of six months. All surveys will be scored and entered into a database for statistical analysis, then will be destroyed by shredding them.

Please complete the surveys and return them to me in the self addressed stamped envelope (SASE) that is included. Return the three response sheets only: the personal data sheet, the LBDQ XII – IDEAL, and the LBDQ XII – REAL. These sheets are printed on color paper. Do not return the other direction pages or this cover letter. Your completion and return of the surveys will serve as your consent. To protect the anonymity of the data, please do not put any identifying information on the surveys.

Your participation in completing the surveys is strictly voluntary. Should you have further questions, you may contact me at 330-832-6157 or my advisor, Dr. Sharon Kruse at 330-972-8177. The Institutional Review Board at the University of Akron may be contacted at 330-972-7666, should you have questions regarding the rights of research subjects.

Sincerely,

John V. Richard
APPENDIX B

LEADER BEHAVIOR DESCRIPTION QUESTIONNAIRE-FORM XII - REAL

Originated by staff members of The Ohio State Leadership Studies and revised by the Bureau of Business Research

Purpose of the Questionnaire

On the following pages is a list of items that may be used to describe the behavior of your superintendent. Each item describes a specific kind of behavior, but does not ask you to judge whether the behavior is desirable or undesirable. Although some items may appear similar, they express differences that are important in the description of leadership. Each item should be considered as a separate description. This is not a test of ability or consistency in making answers. Its only purpose is to make it possible for you to describe, as accurately as you can, the behavior of the superintendent.

Note: The term, “group” as employed in the following items, refers to a department, division, or other unit of organization that is supervised by the person being described.

The term “members,” refers to all the people in the unit of organization that is supervised by the person being described.

Copyright 1962, The Ohio State University

Published by
Fisher College of Business
The Ohio State University
Columbus, OH 43210
DIRECTIONS:

a. READ each item carefully.

b. THINK about how frequently the leader engages in the behavior described by the item.

c. DECIDE whether he/she (A) Always (B) Often, (C) Occasionally, (D) Seldom or (E) Never act as described by the item.

d. DRAW A CIRCLE around one of the five letters (A B C D E) following the item to show the answer you selected.
   A = Always
   B = Often
   C = Occasionally
   D = Seldom
   E = Never

e. MARK your answers as shown in the examples below.

   Example: Often acts as described A B C D E

   Example: Never acts as described A B C D E

   Example: Occasionally acts as described A B C D E
<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Lets group members know what is expected of them</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Is friendly and approachable</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Encourages the use of uniform procedures</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Does little things to make it pleasant to be a member of the group</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Tries out his/her ideas in the group</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Puts suggestions made by the group into operation</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Makes his/her attitudes clear to the group</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Treats all group members as his/her equals</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Decides what shall be done and how it shall be done</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Gives advance notice of changes</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Assigns group members to particular tasks</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Keeps to himself/herself</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Makes sure that his/her part in the group is understood by the group members</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Looks out for the personal welfare of group members</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Schedules the work to be done</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Is willing to make changes</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Maintains definite standards of performance</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Refuses to explain his/her actions.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Asks that group members follow standard rules and regulations.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Acts without consulting the group.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PLEASE RETURN THIS SHEET IN THE SASE.
APPENDIX C

LEADER BEHAVIOR DESCRIPTION QUESTIONNAIRE-FORM XII - IDEAL

(What You Expect of Your Leader)
Originated by staff members of The Ohio State Leadership Studies
And Revised by Studies in Leadership and Organization

On the following pages is a list of items that may be used to describe the
behavior of your superintendent, as you think this person should act. This is not a
test of ability. It simply asks you to describe what an ideal leader ought to do in
supervising a group.

Note: The term, “group” as employed in the following items, refers to a
department, division, or other unit of organization that is supervised by the
leader.

Copyright, 1962

Published by
Fisher College of Business
The Ohio State University
Columbus, OH 43210
DIRECTIONS:

a. READ each item carefully.

b. THINK about how frequently the leader engages in the behavior described by the item.

c. DECIDE whether she/he SHOULD (A) Always, (B) Often, (C) Occasionally, (D) Seldom, or (E) Never act as described by the item.

d. DRAW A CIRCLE around one of the five letters ( A B C D E ) following the item to show the answer you selected.

A = Always
B = Often
C = Occasionally
D = Seldom
E = Never
LBDQ XII - IDEAL

1. Let group members know what is expected of them
2. Be friendly and approachable
3. Encourage the use of uniform procedures
4. Do little things to make it pleasant to be a member of the group
5. Try out his ideas in the group
6. Put suggestions made by the group into operation
7. Make his attitudes clear to the group
8. Treat all group members as his equals
9. Decide what shall be done and how it shall be done
10. Give advance notice of changes
11. Assign group members to particular tasks
12. Keep to himself
13. Make sure that his part in the group is understood by the group members
14. Look out for the personal welfare of group members
15. Schedule the work to be done
16. Be willing to make changes
17. Maintain definite standards of performance
18. Refuse to explain his actions
19. Ask the group members to follow standard rules and regulations
20. Act without consulting the group

PLEASE RETURN THIS SHEET IN THE SASE.
APPENDIX D
PERSONAL DATA SHEET

Please complete the following information. This information will NOT be used for identification purposes.

1 My gender is:
   ____ MALE
   ____ FEMALE

2 My length of time as a school board member:
   ____ LESS THAN 3 YEARS
   ____ 3 TO 5 YEARS
   ____ 6 TO 9 YEARS
   ____ 10 YEARS OR MORE

3 Length of time superintendent (on survey) has been/was employed as superintendent in our district:
   ____ LESS THAN 3 YEARS
   ____ 3 TO 5 YEARS
   ____ 6 TO 9 YEARS
   ____ 10 YEARS OR MORE

4 Gender of superintendent (on survey):
   ____ MALE
   ____ FEMALE

5 The best description of our school district is:
   ____ URBAN/INNER RING SUBURB (CLEVELAND, COLUMBUS, CINCINNATI)
   ____ SUBURBAN
   ____ RURAL

6 The size of our school district:
   ____ LESS THAN 2000 STUDENTS
   ____ BETWEEN 2000 AND 4000 STUDENTS
   ____ OVER 4000 STUDENTS
7 My educational level is:
  _____ HIGH SCHOOL DIPLOMA
  _____ BACHELOR DEGREE
  _____ MASTERS OR LAW DEGREE
  _____ DOCTORAL OR POST-MASTERS DEGREE

PLEASE RETURN THIS SHEET IN THE SASE.
APPENDIX E

INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD LETTER

June 13, 2005

John V. Richard
484 S. Vincent Drive
Akron, OH 44333

Mr. Richard;

The University of Akron's Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects (IRB) completed a review of the protocol entitled "Leadership Behaviors of Ohio School Superintendents as Perceived by Board of Education Members". The IRB application number assigned to this project is 200506065.

The protocol was reviewed on June 10, 2005 and qualified for exemption from continuing IRB review. The protocol represents minimal risk to subjects and matches the following federal category for exemption:

(2) Research involving the use of educational tests (cognitive, diagnostic, aptitude, achievement), survey procedures, interview procedures or observation of public behavior, unless: (i) information is recorded in such a manner that subjects can be identified, directly or through identifiers linked to subjects; and (ii) any disclosure of responses outside the research could reasonably place the subjects at risk of civil or criminal liability or be damaging to subjects' financial standing, employability or reputation.

Enclosed is a copy of the informed consent document, which the IRB has approved for your use in this research. In addition, your request for a waiver of documentation of informed consent, as permitted under 45 CFR 46.117(c), is also approved.

Annual continuation applications are not required for exempt projects. If you make any changes or modifications to the study's design or procedures that either increase the risk to subjects or include activities that do not fall within one of the categories exempted from the regulations, please contact the IRB first, to discuss whether or not a request for change must be submitted. Any such changes or modifications must be reviewed and approved by the IRB prior to their implementation.

Please retain this letter for your files. If the research is being conducted for a master's thesis or doctoral dissertation, the student must file a copy of this letter with the thesis or dissertation.

Sincerely,

Sharon McWhorter
Associate Director

Cc: Susan Clark, Department Chair
    Sharon Kuss, Advisor
    Phil Allen, IRB Chair
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