1986

Perceptions of the leadership behavior of selected Iowa superintendents

Larry Lee Erion
Iowa State University

Erion, Larry Lee

PERCEPTIONS OF THE LEADERSHIP BEHAVIOR OF SELECTED IOWA SUPERINTENDENTS

Iowa State University PH.D. 1986

PLEASE NOTE:

In all cases this material has been filmed in the best possible way from the available copy. Problems encountered with this document have been identified here with a check mark __√__.

1. Glossy photographs or pages _____
2. Colored illustrations, paper or print _____
3. Photographs with dark background _____
4. Illustrations are poor copy _____
5. Pages with black marks, not original copy _____
6. Print shows through as there is text on both sides of page _____
7. Indistinct, broken or small print on several pages __√__
8. Print exceeds margin requirements _____
9. Tightly bound copy with print lost in spine _____
10. Computer printout pages with indistinct print _____
11. Page(s) _____ lacking when material received, and not available from school or author.
12. Page(s) _____ seem to be missing in numbering only as text follows.
13. Two pages numbered _____. Text follows.
14. Curling and wrinkled pages _____
15. Dissertation contains pages with print at a slant, filmed as received _____
16. Other _____

_____

_____

University
Microfilms
International

Perceptions of the leadership behavior of selected Iowa superintendents

by

Larry Lee Erion

A Dissertation Submitted to the
Graduate Faculty in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department: Professional Studies in Education
Major: Education (Educational Administration)

Approved:

Signature was redacted for privacy.

In Charge of Major Work

Signature was redacted for privacy.

For the Major Department

Signature was redacted for privacy.

For the Graduate College

Iowa State University
Ames, Iowa

1986

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I. INTRODUCTION

The President's National Commission on Excellence in Education and the cascade of studies and reports that followed A Nation At Risk (1983) (37) have, for the remainder of this decade, charted the course of public education to be the pursuit of excellence in school effectiveness. Although the various studies and reports have differed in their assessments and their recommendations to improve public education, they all have recognized the importance of leadership.

That leadership is vital--a factor that "makes a difference"--was substantiated in early school effectiveness research. As noted by William Bailey (2, p. 22), "...recent studies on school effectiveness have established at least one fact: Effective schools invariably have effective leaders!" The Phi Delta Kappa study which included case studies of eight exceptional elementary schools, aggregate data from 59 case studies, and aggregate data from 40 research and evaluation studies noted effective leadership as a key to exceptional schooling (42, p. 180). The research of the late Ron Edmonds also identified leadership as one of the five correlates of effective schools (9, p. 22). David Squires and a team of researchers asserted, "We have reviewed...research on characteristics of effective schools and come to the conclusion that effective schools are built on leadership and a positive school climate" (43, p. 81). That leadership is vital, critical to the pursuit of excellence in school effectiveness, has remained an unquestioned certainty. However, what has continued to be an enigma for educational researchers and practitioners

alike has been the inability to conclusively define or ascertain the composition of effective leadership.

Statement of the Problem

Found at the helm in schools in American public education is the school superintendent--the person charged with responsibility of marshaling the school's resources and articulating and navigating the course toward excellence. Unfortunately, the complexity of modern education has forged a role for the superintendent for which research to date has been unable to discern what constitutes effective or exemplary leadership. Yet, elusive as exemplary leadership has been to study, some researchers and practitioners as Robert Heller have contended that:

> Successful school executives clearly stand out from the crowd: In them, some jumble of leadership, physical stamina, emotional stability, command of language, human relations skills, self-esteem, good fortune...coalesce in a way that is instantly recognizable. Call it success, excellence, or being outstanding in a field. Whichever, you 'know' when you first meet these executives that they are the people to emulate (22, p. 18).

As important as leadership is to the role of the superintendent and to the pursuit of school effectiveness, it is imperative that the search be continued to identify that "jumble" of characteristics critical to exemplary leadership. This investigation has focused on three general questions:

(1) Do superintendents, identified by their peers as exemplary, rate higher than a randomly selected group of superintendents on a measure of overall leader effectiveness?

(2) Do superintendents, identified by their peers as exemplary, rate higher than a randomly selected group of superintendents on twelve dimensions of management effectiveness, when each dimension is considered independently?

(3) Which, if any, of twelve dimensions of management effectiveness contribute significantly to the prediction of a superintendent's overall effectiveness rating?

Need for the Study

Clark Stevens' doctoral dissertation (1973) provided information regarding two dimensions of leadership behavior of successful superintendents in districts of 5,000 student enrollment and larger. However, the limited scope of the sample investigated prevented Stevens from generalizing beyond the scope of the sample and yielded the recommendation that the leadership behavior of so-called "nonsuccessful" superintendents and superintendents in smaller districts should also be studied (44, p. 119). Another doctoral dissertation by David Haggard (1984), yielded information regarding the decision-making behavior of both exemplary superintendents and randomly selected superintendents. However, in his recommendations for further study, Haggard urged researchers to investigate the accuracy of the reputational survey technique used to identify the exemplary superintendents and to develop a full profile of indicators that could be used to identify administrators with exemplary potential (18, p. 66).

This study was, in part, a response to the Stevens and Haggard dissertations as it incorporated the recommendations cited above. The

variables examined in this study are perceived to hold value for the practicing superintendent, the potential superintendent, the institutions that provide the initial and continuing education for superintendents, and for boards of education.

First, it is believed that if peer-identified exemplary superintendents do have special characteristics (leader behaviors) compared with those of randomly selected superintendents, practicing superintendents would be assisted in improving those behaviors identified as critical to exemplary leadership for effective schools. Second, by identifying behaviors critical to exemplary leadership, an additional key would be provided in identifying and promoting aspiring superintendents who possessed exemplary potential. Third, by identifying a profile of leadership behaviors of exemplary superintendents, assistance would be given to those institutions which train and place superintendents and provide for their inservice and continuing education. Fourth, by identifying a profile of leadership behaviors of exemplary superintendents, boards of education would be assisted in their selection of superintendents.

Definition of Terms

The following operational definitions of terms were used for the purposes of this study:

SUPERINTENDENT--The chief administrative officer employed by the board of directors of a local school district.

EXEMPLARY SUPERINTENDENTS--A pool of superintendents identified for their effectiveness by their colleagues throughout the state of Iowa.

These superintendents were identified by a reputational survey conducted within each Area Education Agency. Two superintendents were identified in each area unit.

RANDOMLY SELECTED SUPERINTENDENTS--A pool of superintendents identified from a list of all Iowa superintendents by utilizing a table of random numbers.

DIMENSIONS OF MANAGEMENT EFFECTIVENESS--Behaviors that are representative of elements comprising effective or exemplary leadership by superintendents.

Sources of Data

The data in this study were gathered through the use of two instruments which were researcher-developed during the course of this study. The first instrument (Appendix A) was developed in consultation with the researcher's major advisor to ascertain that the content and length were adequate to secure demographic and personal information appropriate to the study. This instrument was then administered to the pool of exemplary superintendents and the pool of randomly selected superintendents participating in the study.

The second and primary instrument (Appendix B) used in the investigation was administered to board of education members, administrative team members, and teachers in the districts of the respective superintendents participating in the study. This instrument, entitled "Performance Assessment--Superintendent," required the respondents to rate their respective superintendents on twelve (12) leadership behaviors and on one (1) measure of overall effectiveness. The

validity of this instrument for this study was scrutinized by two professors of education considered to be experts in educational administration and then reviewed and approved by the candidate's doctoral committee. The internal reliability was established through the application of accepted statistical methods and is explained in Chapter III.

Delimitations of the Study

This study was limited in potential participants to the administrators holding superintendencies in public schools in the state of Iowa during the 1984-85 school year. From that population, thirty (30) were identified as exemplary superintendents and an equal number were randomly drawn from the remaining group.

Only twelve (12) dimensions of management effectiveness--Problem Analysis, Judgment, Organizational Ability, Decisiveness, Leadership, Stress Tolerance, Sensitivity to Others, Oral Communication, Written Communication, Financial Management, Personal Motivation, and Educational Values--were explored. Other traits or factors sometimes related to leadership were not considered. Comparisons and conclusions drawn were based only on the data limited to the superintendents' behavior regarding the twelve dimensions of management effectiveness and an overall effectiveness rating.

Organization of the Study

This study was organized into five chapters: The first chapter presented a background of the problem studied, a statement of the problem,

need for the study, definitions of terms, sources of data, and delimitations of the study. Chapter II was a review of related literature and research, and examined recent literature and research related to leadership behavior and the role of the school superintendent. Chapter III described the research paradigm, the hypotheses tested, and the methods and procedures utilized in the statistical analyses. Chapter IV presented the findings of the data obtained. Chapter V included a summary of the study, limitations of the study, conclusions, and recommendations for additional research.

Summary

This study examined the leadership behavior of superintendents in the state of Iowa. Thirty (30) exemplary superintendents were identified and profiled as was an equal number of randomly selected superintendents. School board members, administrative team members, and teachers rated their respective superintendents on twelve (12) dimensions of management effectiveness and a measure of overall effectiveness.

This study yielded information regarding the leadership behavior of exemplary superintendents which could serve as a model for practicing and potential superintendents to emulate, a guide to assist institutions in the training of administrators, and as an additional screening tool for boards of education in the selection of superintendents.

CHAPTER II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The volume of literature concerning leadership as related to educational administration was found to be extensive. It was, therefore, necessary to narrow the focus and limit examination of the literature to selected areas. For the purposes of this study, the review of the literature and related research was organized into three major divisions: (1) the concept and definition of leadership, (2) the school superintendent as leader, and (3) research related to this study.

The Concept and Definition of Leadership

Conceptual approaches to leadership

Historically, the first prevalent concept of leadership was associated with position. What distinguished leaders from followers was authority and status inherent in the position. Persons commonly found in leadership capacities were the elite and nobility, for they possessed the attributes of inheritance, wealth, and education. These trappings and the fact that authority was vested in the position and not the person enabled leadership by virtue of position to perpetuate itself and dominate for centuries (33, p. 7). In education, the one-room school with the one-person staff and later the headmaster were similar to position leadership, but educational leadership solely based on position, like the one-room school, has long since disappeared.

By the beginning of the twentieth century, the concept and focus of leadership study had shifted away from position and centered on the leader as an individual. The success of outstanding leaders was attributed to

unique qualities or characteristics which differentiated them from their followers. Hoy and Miskel (25, p. 221) noted that this so-called "great man theory of leadership" or "trait approach" dominated the study of leadership until the 1950s. However, the search by researchers for particular physical or psychological traits or constellations of traits that could be found in all successful leaders met with little success.

In reviewing over 120 traits studies of leadership completed between 1904 and 1947, Ralph Stogdill concluded that the trait approach by itself yielded negligible and confusing results (45, pp. 64-66). Also, a similar but later review covering the available literature from 1900 to 1957 and involving 500 different measures of personality traits in 125 leadership studies led Richard Mann to draw similar conclusions (31, pp. 242-247, 264-266). Often, the traits isolated as crucial in one study were found to be unimportant in others. As Hoy and Miskel noted, "In sum, the early searches for personality traits to distinguish leaders from followers were remarkably unsuccessful" (25, p. 222).

Stogdill's research and the intense reaction to the trait approach in the late 1940s led researchers in the 1950s and 1960s to focus their attention on managerial styles and the relationship between the leader and worker. Henry Mintzberg (35, p. 19) has noted that many researchers during this period were often called humanists because they were critical of the previously common autocratic, task-oriented style and advocated a participative, people-oriented style. For example, Douglas McGregor (34, pp. 33-34, 47-48), who is famous for his "Theory X and Theory Y" classifications of management approaches, asserted that management style

and the structure of organizations are based upon certain assumptions about human nature and human motivations. Assumptions supporting Theory X maintained that people are basically lazy, need to be prodded to action, and are motivated only by material rewards and punishments. Theory Y, on the other hand, maintained that people enjoy accomplishment, are self-motivated, and have a desire to make a contribution to their organization. The corollary to Theories X and Y, according to McGregor, is that each view of human nature is a self-fulfilling prophecy. If a worker is treated as being lazy and without motivation, he or she will act accordingly; however, if the worker is treated as being responsible and self-motivated, he or she will be that, too.

The work of Frederick Herzberg (24, pp. 78-82) regarding motivational influences also supported the participative, people-oriented management style. Herzberg emphasized achievement and recognition as "satisfiers" or motivational influences that had the positive effect of increasing the individual's output. In general, it was purported that greater productivity, less turnover, and more willing workers could be achieved if management talked with, listened to, and recognized employees.

Other researchers, as Robert Tannenbaum and Warren Schmidt (46, pp. 127-128), saw leadership style as a continuum stretching from manager-centered to subordinate-centered. They recognized the occasional need of manager-centered leadership, but advocated the subordinate-centered as generally the most effective. Subordinate-centered leadership involved giving subordinates freedom to make decisions within very flexible limits.

In yet a different perception of leadership style, Jacob Getzels and Egon Guba (12, pp. 436-438) suggested a "transactional" approach--a blend or harmony of the nomothetic (task-oriented) and idiographic (relationship-oriented) styles. For example, the leader would not have aimed for a middle ground between the nomothetic and idiographic, but rather have sought a thorough awareness of the limits and resources of both the individual and the institution within which the administrative action may occur. Also, expectations would be defined sharply, but not so sharply as to prohibit the appropriate behavior and creativity of the subordinate.

Over the years, as leaders and researchers have puzzled over which leadership style was most effective, they debated whether leadership should be based on Theory X or Theory Y, whether they should concentrate on the task or on human relations, or whether leaders should strive for manager-centered or subordinate-centered leadership. With the research cited above and as further research was conducted, it became apparent that no one leadership style existed that was best for all situations. The kind of leadership best suited to a given situation was found to be influenced or governed by a variety of variables. Thus, the argument arose for so-called situational and contingency theories concerning leadership.

The situational approach to leadership suggested that a variety of environmental characteristics determine the leader behavior that is needed. According to Hoy and Miskel (25, p. 223), such variables or situational determinants of leadership included structural properties of

the organization, organizational climate, role characteristics, and subordinate characteristics. However, since the 1950s, many investigations have clearly indicated that both leader personality and situational factors are important to leadership effectiveness. Consequently, the companion concept of contingency theories resulted. Best known of these contingency theories are Fiedler's contingency model and House's path-goal theory. Such theories asserted that leadership effectiveness depended upon the fit between the leader and situational variables (25, p. 235).

The basic tenets of Fred Fiedler's contingency model are that leadership style is determined by the motivations of the leader and that group effectiveness is a joint function of the leader's style and the situation's circumstances. Therefore, group performance is dependent upon the leader's control of and influence in the situation. To maximize effectiveness, Fiedler asserted, requires a careful match of the variables comprising leader style and the situation. Fiedler's model is distinguished from other models because it views the leadership situation as a circumstance in which the leader seeks both to satisfy personal needs and to accomplish organizational goals (11, p. 73). Hoy and Miskel (25, p. 360) credited Fiedler's contingency model as an important contribution to leadership theory because it combined style, situation, and effectiveness variables.

R. J. House, according to Hoy and Miskel (25, pp. 243-244), developed his Path-Goal Theory of Leadership to explain how the behavior of a leader influences the motivation and job satisfaction of subordinates. House's

theory contended that leader behavior is viewed as acceptable to subordinates to the extent that the subordinates see such behavior as either an immediate source of satisfaction or as instrumental to future satisfaction. For example, directive behavior in unstructured situations increases satisfaction by clarifying the path to goal attainment. Conversely, considerate behavior in structured situations enhances effectiveness by reducing tensions that might otherwise be created by using an unnecessary, more direct approach (25, p. 360). Although Fiedler's model emphasized that effectiveness depended upon the match of style and situation and House's path-goal theory focused on subordinate satisfaction in goal attainment, both contingency theories signaled the importance of the situation variables to leadership.

A major approach to the concept and study of leadership that captured interest in the 1970s and early 1980s was a focus on the behaviors of individuals. Katz and Kahn (28, pp. 527-528) cited behavior or a set of behaviors as one of the three major components in describing the nature and meaning of leadership. According to Brown and Sikes (5, p. 122), the foundation for this shift in interest to the analysis of behaviors of leaders could actually be traced to the development of the Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire and the Ohio State Leadership Studies in the 1960s. The interest in this approach to leadership was due in part also to the knowledge of human behavior acquired over the years and the manner in which observation of behavior lent itself to research methods. This approach will be examined further in the research related to this study.

Defining leadership

As was found in the search and failure to find one accepted concept of leadership, it was equally difficult to find one accepted definition of leadership that has stood the test of time. Luvern Cunningham captured the essence of this dilemma in the following statement:

> It is difficult to address a subject about which so much has been said but so little is really known. Biographers, historians, and social scientists of all stripes have discussed the concept of leadership for generations. Despite their efforts, the topic remains hard to pin down. In many respects, leadership is whatever people believe it to be. In his new book, Warren Bennis notes that there are more than 350 definitions of leadership recorded in the literature (7, p. 17).

Early attempts to define leadership focused on personality traits. Stuart Marshall, however, summarized the difficulty with using the trait focus in defining leadership when he stated: "A person's honesty, integrity, loyalty, perseverance, astuteness, etc., are much too subjective and relative to be meaningful criteria" (33, p. 15). Halpin (20, pp. 171-172) concurred with Marshall when he emphasized that leadership is a complex phenomenon that cannot be treated meaningfully when perceived as an isolated trait apart from related situational factors.

Many definitions, like the formulation of concepts of leadership, have placed emphasis on the relationship between the leader and worker. Leavitt, for example, asserted: "Leadership is a form of relationship between persons and, usually, with a task or goal.... Leadership is a set of functions, mostly of relational behaviors" (30, p. 217). Also recognizing the importance of the human relationship in leadership, the late Charles Cheng, according to Grant, Ridgway, and Sleeter, advocated

leadership as "a collective enterprise that demands a reciprocal relationship between leaders and those working with them" (16, p. 68).

Other researchers have defined leadership as the process of influencing. For example, Jamia Jacobsen, after reviewing a number of definitions, described leadership as "the process of influencing the activities of an individual or a group in efforts toward goal achievement in a given situation" (27, p. 48). Also examining a number of definitions of leadership, Yukl concurred with Jacobsen, stating: "...most definitions of leadership reflect the assumption that it involves an influence process whereby intentional influence is exerted by the leader over followers" (50, p. 3). He also noted, however, that in the numerous definitions of leadership that have been proposed over the years, there appeared to be little else held in common.

In summarizing the history of efforts toward leadership definition, Huckaby and Sperling stated the following:

> James McGregor Burns, in conducting research for his important book, Leadership, uncovered more than 130 definitions of leadership. Ralph M. Stogdill, over a twenty-three year period, reviewed and abstracted more than 5,000 leadership studies and found scores of definitions that he grouped into eleven broad categories, with several definitions in each. He discovered, for example, that some defined leadership as personality and its effects; some as the art of influencing people; others as an act or behavior, a form of persuasion, the initiation of structure, or a power relationship. Although certain research trends can be found, no single definition of leadership has emerged... (26, p. 20).

In the early 1980s, the most recent efforts in examining and constructing definitions of leadership have included more than a rehashing and confirmation of past ideas. Some bold departures from past

perceptions have been suggested. For example, Thomas Sergiovanni (40, pp. 6, 13) has called for "leadership density" which incorporates a hierarchy of five leadership forces presented as a pyramid with technical leadership at the base and cultural leadership at the top. G. Barry Morris (36, pp. 10-11), after a review of the literature on leadership, suggested a framework for the reconceptualization of leadership to include three components: the inner nature of the individual, futures thinking, and behavioral outcomes. Another researcher, Robert Kelley (29, pp. 116-117), likened the leader to a steward who is willing to share power and is caring, respectful, and has a positive attitude toward people. The steward-leader is one who has developed an enabling orientation rather than a controlling one. Kelley has defined leadership as follows:

> Leadership is not the same as management. It is not simply being the boss or giving orders. Instead, leadership is a particular set of skills, knowledge, and attitudes directed toward helping other people develop their own skills, knowledge, and attitudes. Leadership guides and empowers individuals, groups, and society on their way to advancement (29, p. 89).

Although no one accepted concept or single definition of leadership has surfaced that has stood the test of time, education researchers should not discontinue their efforts or be discouraged. Perhaps, as Yukl has suggested:

> It is neither feasible nor desirable at this point in the development of the discipline to resolve the controversy over the appropriate definition of leadership. For the time being, it is better to use the various conceptions of leadership as a source of different perspectives on a complex, multifaceted phenomenon (50, p. 5).

The School Superintendent as Leader

Historical development of the superintendency

The superintendent has always been the chief executive officer of a school district and, therefore, by definition has been the primary educational leader for the board of education, the staff, and the public. Over the years, however, the needs of the community and society shaped the development and leadership role of the superintendency. As categorized by Griffiths (17, pp. vii-viii), the superintendency, from its inception in 1837 until about 1910, was essentially instruction-oriented with the superintendent pictured as the resident philosopher. From the turn of the century to the close of World War II, the superintendent operated primarily as a businessman concerned with efficiency and cost effectiveness. Since World War II, the superintendency has been in a state of transition, taking a variety of emphases and portraying different images, reflecting the strong influence of a rapidly changing society.

Issues and forces impacting the superintendency

Much has been written regarding the superintendency today, and essentially two elements have captured the attention of present research and writing: the forces impacting the superintendency and the role of the superintendency. As alluded earlier, never before has the superintendency faced the complexity of modern education and the combination of issues and pressures now impacting public education. In 1975, William Dolph (8, p. 7), a practicing superintendent, noted the pressing problems of inadequate financing, declining enrollment, tax and bond election failures, rise of militant employee organizations, and increased school violence. Six years

later in 1981, another superintendent, Walter Marks (32, p. 255), asserted the following societal problems will translate into major dilemmas for public education: inflation, leveling out of enrollments, further erosion of the public school system, an older population, and a major new emphasis on technology and communication. Adding political issues and collective bargaining to the long list of problems and pressures, Volp (48, p. 1) asserted that the role expectations of the superintendency have nearly outstripped the individual's capacity to fill them. Reporting from two recent field studies regarding the superintendency, Batchler (3, p. 3) found that many of the on-the-job activities of the superintendency are not planned, but comprised of uninvited verbal encounters, externally imposed deadlines, and crises.

Current emphases and perceptions of the superintendency

The problems and crises have been varied and numerous with the only certainty being that they signaled a clarion call for leadership. The question then prompted was leadership of what nature? Unfortunately, no concensus was found in the literature regarding a discernible role or pattern of behaviors that should be ascribed to the superintendency. Recent writers have advocated a variety of emphases or behaviors. For example, Aplin and Daresh (1, pp. 216-217), after reviewing the certification requirements for the superintendency across the nation, found that the requirements in most states emphasized the competencies of a business manager. They contended this was an important and proper role for a superintendent, and should not be surprising in view of the importance today of the passage of tax levies, bond referendums, and

negotiations with teachers. In contrast to the business function, Richard Gousha (15, pp. 13-15) asserted that the superintendent's role has become less administrative and more political and, as a result, superintendents should be more concerned with public relations, governmental regulations, and delegation of authority. Reluctant to accept either business or politics as the primary role of the superintendency, Goodlad (14, p. 322) has called for school administrators to resist the temptations and pressures of becoming experts in fiscal management, public relations, collective bargaining, and the political process and focus more upon instruction and assuring a comprehensive, quality educational program.

Some writers as Pitner and Ogawa (38, pp. 49-50) emphasized a process role; they have contended that superintending means mediating and communicating in a complex network of relationships with school board members, peers, clients, and subordinates. Ronald Lippitt, in an interview with Albert Goldberg, stated that a superintendent's most important perspective or role was: "total community resource utilization, which really means having a focus on all those aspects of community, human, and material resources and settings that can provide enrichment and input into the learning experience of children" (13, p. 312). Walter Marks (32, p. 258), a practicing superintendent, suggested a larger all-encompassing role for the superintendent as a societal architect in which the superintendent combined the needs of clients with his or her beliefs and philosophy to make possible a learning environment that dealt with the future needs of society.

Research in the private sector has also influenced leadership study in education. Drawing analogies with the research Peters and Waterman reported in their book, In Search of Excellence, Harold Blackburn, Assistant Commissioner of Education in Kansas, suggested yet a different perspective or role for superintendents. Blackburn (4, pp. 141-142) advocated that superintendents be goal-oriented leaders who employed a "shared and reciprocated" management role. In a shared and reciprocated management setting, communication and the quality of attitude by managers toward people are critical, especially in a service and information based society. In a study of the urban superintendency, Larry Cuban (6, pp. 15-18) reported three dominant role conceptions of leadership by superintendents: teacher-scholar, administrative chief, and negotiator-statesman. As Cuban also indicated, these conceptions have waxed and waned with the times, for the superintendent has always been circumscribed by a complex organizational role. Again, as this summary has demonstrated, no single role or pattern of behaviors for the superintendency has been discerned or recommended in the literature.

Research Related to this Study

Over the years, the phenomenon of leadership has been studied in different ways, depending on the researcher's conception of leadership and his or her methodological preferences. As alluded earlier, Stogdill's review of over 120 trait studies of leadership yielded negligible and confusing results. Thus, the early searches for personality traits to distinguish leaders from followers were unsuccessful (25, p. 222). Situational and contingency theories, according to Yukl (50, p. 169), have

been more useful for suggesting important variables to investigate than as a source of definitive explanations about leadership effectiveness. These theories, in general, have been found to be complex, imprecisely formulated, and difficult to test. Only the theories by Fiedler and House have been extensively tested, and the results for these theories are inconclusive. In recent years, the most popular approach for studying leadership has been the examination of leader behaviors. In the behavior approach, emphasis has been placed on what leaders do instead of their traits, position, or style. This emphasis, according to some writers as Paul White (49, pp. 25-26), has carried greater meaning. White contended that effective leaders possess more than a dream; they have proven themselves effective at the tasks they are expected to lead others to undertake.

Leadership behavior, however, can also be conceptualized in a variety of ways and in different levels of abstraction. The actions of leaders may be described in terms of "activity patterns," "managerial roles," or "behavior categories" (50, p. 92). Typical activity patterns, as noted by Hoy and Miskel (25, p. 14), would be as those introduced by Henri Fayol in the early 1900s--planning, organizing, coordinating, commanding and controlling; or, as in the 1930s, when Luther Gulick expanded Fayol's list to seven activities--planning, organizing, staffing, directing, coordinating, reporting, and budgeting. As to managerial roles, perhaps the best known list has been Mintzberg's typology which included: figurehead, leader, liaison, monitor, disseminator, spokesman, entrepreneur, disturbance handler, resource allocator, and negotiator (50,

p. 99). Recently, however, Thomas Sergiovanni has challenged these perspectives, contending that theory and research have placed too much emphasis on what leaders do and not enough on the more symbolic aspect of leadership--the meanings they communicate to others (41, p. 330). For excellence in schooling and not just competence, Sergiovanni has purported five metaphorical leadership roles--"management engineer," "human engineer," "clinical practitioner," "chief," and "high priest" (40, pp. 6-7). Nevertheless, the broad, general nature of the activity patterns and the managerial roles described above has presented some of the difficulty researchers have experienced in measuring and studying leadership. For this reason, "behavior categories"--specific behavior actions--have been found to lend themselves best to observation and assessment in the study of leadership.

Accepting the assertion that specific behavior actions provide a sound base from which leadership effectiveness can be studied, the question then prompted was: Which behavior actions are meaningful? Ralph Stogdill and his colleagues at Ohio State proposed twelve dimensions of leadership--production emphasis, initiation of structure, representation, role assumption, persuasion, superior orientation, tolerance of freedom, tolerance of uncertainty, consideration, demand reconciliation, predictive accuracy, and integration. However, most of the research that has come to be known as the "Ohio State Leadership Studies" focused on two general categories of leader behavior--one concerned with production and task achievement and the other with people and interpersonal relations. This

was principally due to the extensive use of the Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ), also developed at Ohio State.

The LBDQ was designed to measure only two basic dimensions of leader behavior--initiating structure and consideration. Initiating structure included leader behaviors that delineated the relationship between the leader and the subordinate and outlined organizational and procedural patterns. Consideration included leader behavior that depicted trust, warmth, interest, and respect in the relationship between the leader and the subordinate (21, pp. 86-90). As stated earlier, the LBDQ has been used frequently in research to describe leader behavior of principals and superintendents. Some of the early studies of superintendents by Halpin (21, pp. 81-130), using the LBDQ, supported "considerate" behavior. Halpin speculated that consideration was favored due to the emphasis that human relations has received in education and, that structure was often associated with a nondemocratic role.

In a similar but more comprehensive delineation of leadership, Paul Hersey (23, p. 370) and his associates at NASSP (National Association of Secondary School Principals) have developed a list of specific dimensions for the observation and assessment of leadership effectiveness--problem analysis, judgment, organizational ability, decisiveness, leadership, sensitivity, stress tolerance, oral communication, written communication, range of interest, personal motivation, and educational values. The twelve (12) skill dimensions, found to relate to the most important characteristics of successful assistant principals and principals, were

incorporated into the process utilized by the NASSP Assessment Center Project to identify potentially strong administrators.

Superintendents themselves have suggested behavior competencies they believe are requisites for leadership effectiveness. According to a study involving 470 California superintendents conducted by Tyler and Coleman (47, p. 41), superintendents believe the following skills and competencies to be necessary for success on the job: conducting and interpreting research, writing reports, conflict resolution, time managment, operating school board meetings, decision making, communication skills, and skills in motivating staff. Other lists of behaviors exist, but there has been little agreement about which categories of leadership behavior are meaningful; there is as yet no widely accepted typology of specific behaviors (50, p. 272). Unfortunately, this lack of conclusive specification of the behaviors which comprise effective leadership, according to Hallinger and Murphy (19, p. 18), has been one of the most serious problems in educational leadership research. In addition, there have been insufficient attempts to test the validity of suggested effective behaviors at the school level.

Ross Engel, a researcher who has studied leadership for more than 20 years, has asserted that the reason we can state so little with certainty about effective leadership of school superintendents is due to the "characteristic flaw" that has burdened leadership studies.

> Consider: A cascade of studies has tried to identify the characteristics of effective superintendents. Most, if not all, are afflicted with what I call the "characteristic flaw": Before you can say which characteristics effective superintendents possess, you have to identify who

> the effective superintendents are--and you can't say who the effective ones are without knowing what makes them effective. It's the chicken-and-egg syndrome. This, in my opinion, is why no body of research exists to substantiate any of the lists that claim to identify what makes an excellent school executive (10, p. 40).

One study that attacked the problem cited by Engel was conducted by Clark Stevens in 1973. Stevens (44, pp. 1-3), a student of Engel, identified 25 outstanding superintendents in five midwestern states, using a nomination process involving the assistance of the following experts in the school field: state superintendents, professors of educational administration, and executive secretaries of state superintendent organizations. He then examined the self-perceptions (Real) and self-expectations (Ideal) of the 25 selected superintendents and compared those observations with those held for them by their respective administrative team members. The instrument utilized for this study, the Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire, measured two dimensions of leadership behavior: Consideration and Initiating Structure. The results of the study were inconclusive; only seven of the 25 "so-called" successful superintendents were perceived by their respective administrative teams as being effective leaders. Stevens concluded that further study should be conducted to examine additional variables, and that nonsuccessful superintendents should be included to determine if they have leadership behavior patterns similar to a group of effective superintendents.

Another doctoral study under Engel's direction, conducted by David Haggard (18, p. 37) in 1984, incorporated one of Stevens' recommendations.

Haggard attempted to compare the decision-making process and thinking styles of a group of exemplary superintendents with those of a control group of randomly selected superintendents. The pool of exemplary superintendents was identified by peer selection, utilizing a reputational survey based upon specific criteria. Once again, no firm conclusions were found. Haggard (18, p. 66), in turn, recommended for further research that the accuracy of the reputational survey be investigated and that a profile of indicators be developed that could be used to identify administrators with exemplary potential.

Summary

Several theories regarding the concept of leadership that have been purported through the years were discussed in the Review of Literature. Numerous definitions of leadership, as well as the emphases behind the definitions, were also examined. It was noted that no one concept or single definition of leadership has surfaced in the literature that captured the totality of leadership. However, some emphases that pertained particularly to leadership in education were cited. It appeared that the relationship between leaders and followers, the nature of the situation, and the match of leader behaviors with circumstances held importance for leadership in education.

The leadership role of the school superintendent was traced in its transition through several periods to the present. Particular attention was given to numerous societal forces and circumstances cited in the literature as impacting the superintendency today. The possible leadership roles that have been suggested to meet the complexity of modern

education and the combination of pressures and issues cited were also examined. Again, no consensus was found in the literature regarding a discernible role that should be ascribed to the superintendency.

Research related to this study and the problems inherent in conducting a study of the educational leadership phenomenon were also examined. It was noted that the literature suggested that a leadership study in education is best suited to the behavioral approach to leadership. However, leadership behavior could be described and studied as "activity patterns," "managerial roles," or "behavior categories. It was also found that the general nature of activity patterns and managerial roles presented considerable problems in measuring and studying leadership. "Behavioral categories"--specific behavior actions--appeared to lend themselves best as a means of studying leadership, but also were not without problems. Specifying which behavior actions are meaningful for study and identifying superintendents who possess those skills have been an enigma for researchers studying educational leadership. It was the expressed purpose of this study to reduce the confusion these problems present and thereby provide a meaningful contribution to the body of research regarding educational leadership.

CHAPTER III. THE EXPERIMENTAL DESIGN

The problem addressed in this study was ascertaining the definition or composition of effective leadership for the role of school superintendent. In turn, therefore, one purpose of this study was to determine in which dimensions of management effectiveness (management functions) exemplary superintendents differ from randomly selected superintendents. A second purpose was to determine if certain dimensions of management effectiveness contribute significantly to the prediction of overall leader effectiveness. To accomplish these purposes, comparisons were made between superintendents identified by their peers as being exemplary and a group of randomly selected superintendents. The methods and procedures utilized in this study are described in this chapter in the following sections: Selection of the Sample, Instrumentation, Collection of Data, Data Treatment and Analysis, Null Hypotheses to be Tested, Alternative Hypotheses, and Assumptions Applicable to this Study.

Selection of the Sample

The sample was comprised of two groups of superintendents drawn from the population of public school superintendents in Iowa. First, a pool of exemplary superintendents was identified through the use of a reputational survey that was conducted in each of the state's fifteen (15) Area Education Agencies (AEA) by David Haggard (18, p. 37) for his study cited earlier. In each AEA, the superintendents' group is chaired by a superintendent elected by his or her peers. Through the assistance of this group of chairpersons across the state, the reputational surveys were

distributed, collected, and returned to Haggard. The survey instrument (see Appendix C) consisted of a cover letter and a roster listing each superintendent in the AEA. The instructions asked that each superintendent identify two superintendents, in his or her respective AEA, who he or she considered to be exemplary. To avoid identifying individuals with a singular strong suit, the superintendents were asked to consider the overall performance of the individual in the areas of personnel, curriculum, collective bargaining, and planning. The two superintendents from each area agency receiving the most votes recognizing them as exemplary were then selected for the exemplary pool. Since Haggard conducted this selection process in January, 1983, this writer found, as he expected, that some of the exemplary superintendents had moved to other positions. This necessitated a reconstruction of the process Haggard had used to identify six new exemplary superintendents in three AEAs. With that revision in three AEAs, thirty (30) current superintendents were identified for the exemplary pool.

To obtain the second group--the randomly selected superintendents--for the sample, the writer first eliminated the names of the thirty (30) superintendents identified as exemplary from the population of all Iowa superintendents. A table of random numbers was then used to secure a randomly selected group, equal in size to the exemplary superintendent pool, from the remaining population. Thus, in the described manner, the two groups were drawn to comprise the sample.

Instrumentation

Two instruments which were researcher-developed were used to collect data to be processed in this study: "Demographics Page" and "Performance Assessment--Superintendent".

The first instrument, "Demographics Page" (Appendix A), was developed in consultation with the researcher's major advisor to ascertain that its content and length were adequate to secure sufficient demographic data to build profiles of the superintendent groups comprising the sample. The following information was requested: superintendent's name, age range, sex, total years of experience as a superintendent, highest degree held, institution from which highest degree was obtained, number of years since the highest degree was obtained, and the student enrollment of the district in which he or she was currently superintendent. This instrument was administered to the pool of exemplary superintendents and the pool of randomly selected superintendents participating in the study.

The second and primary instrument (Appendix B) used in the investigation was administered to two board of education members, two administrative team members, and two teachers randomly selected in the respective districts of each of the superintendents participating in the study. This instrument, entitled "Performance Assessment--Superintendent," required the respondents to rate their respective superintendents on twelve (12) dimensions of management effectiveness (management functions) and on one (1) measure of overall effectiveness. The researcher gave careful consideration to the components of the second instrument. Having conducted an extensive review of the literature on

superintendent leadership and finding no discernible pattern of traits, styles, or behaviors that has stood the test of time, the researcher chose to modify a validated instrument utilized for the assessment of strong leadership potential of prospective principals. That instrument developed for the NASSP Assessment Center Project contained the following twelve (12) dimensions of management effectiveness: Problem Analysis, Judgment, Organizational Ability, Decisiveness, Leadership, Sensitivity, Range of Interests, Personal Motivation, Stress Tolerance, Educational Values, Oral Communication, and Written Communication.

The validation study of the NASSP Assessment Center Project conducted by Neal Schmitt and his associates at Michigan State University focused heavily on content validity. As reported by Schmitt:

> An essential part of evaluating the assessment center involves determining its content validity. Content validity can be thought of as the extent to which the skills measured by the assessment center exercises are necessary for satisfactory job performance, as well as the degree to which these exercises actually tap the skills they are designed to measure. While we report criterion-related validity coefficients...we also believe the use of the NASSP center can be defended on the basis of its content validity (39, p. 50).

Although Schmitt and his colleagues described the content validity of the Assessment Center criteria as good, one dimension of management--range of interests--was found to have the lowest content validity ratio (CVR). The content validity ratio referred to a range from +1.00 to -1.00 calculated by a statistical procedure to determine content validity. The larger the CVR, the greater the extent to which the assessment center skill was indicated as necessary and essential for adequate performance (39, pp.

51-52). Knowing also that financial management was considered by many researchers to be an important skill for the superintendency, the researcher substituted "financial management" for "range of interests" as one of the twelve (12) dimensions of management effectiveness for the purposes of this study. The remaining eleven (11) dimensions were considered applicable to the superintendency and therefore retained in the researcher-developed questionnaire.

The content validity of the researcher-developed questionnaire was established through the use of an expert panel. Information including definitions of the twelve (12) dimensions of management effectiveness (Appendix G) was given to the panel to assist their review of the questionnaire. The panel was comprised of five Iowa State University professors--two are considered experts in educational administration and three are experienced researchers with established expertise. Members of the expert panel were:

Ross Engel:	Professor of Professional Studies in Education,
Trevor Howe:	Professor of Industrial Education and Technology,
Alan Kahler:	Professor of Agricultural Education and Secondary Education,
James Sweeney:	Professor of Professional Studies in Education, and
William Wolansky:	Professor of Industrial Education.

The suggestions and critiques provided by these individuals regarding the content and format of the questionnaire were incorporated into the final form of the instrument.

The questionnaire was then field-tested with three representatives of the intended target audiences: an administrator, a classroom teacher, and a member of the lay public. These individuals were consulted regarding the clarity of directions, time needed to complete the questionnaire, and the general acceptability of the instrument.

The internal reliability of the instrument was tested with the reliability program available with the revised Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSSX). The Cronbach alpha was used to represent the internal consistency of the instrument. When the 301 questionnaires were received, the responses for each of the items of the researcher-developed questionnaire were recorded. The data recorded for the questions relating to the twelve (12) dimensions of management effectiveness were then used to yield an alpha coefficient. The coefficient yielded was .93, which represents a very high degree of internal consistency.

Collection of Data

Identical packets were mailed to each of the sixty (60) superintendents identified for the study. Included in each packet were a cover letter (Appendix D) and the Demographics Page (Appendix A) described earlier. The letter of invitation asked each superintendent to acknowledge his or her willingness to participate in the study by completing and returning the Demographics Page and forwarding a school directory or school lists that included three items: school board members' names with length of tenure, administrative team members' names with respective position identified, and a list of teaching staff with an elementary (K-6) or secondary (7-12) teaching assignment identified.

In the two weeks following the initial mailing, all but twelve (12) of the superintendents had responded. Follow-up phone calls were used to encourage these remaining superintendents to complete and return the Demographics Page and to forward the directory information requested. Within the next two weeks, eleven (11) of the remaining superintendents were secured. One superintendent from the exemplary pool declined to participate; he was replaced by the person receiving the next highest number of votes in that AEA, when the exemplary superintendents were identified by their peers. Once the Demographics Pages and the appropriate directories of information were received from all sixty (60) participating superintendents, the first stage of data collection was completed.

The second stage of data collection required the involvement of two school board members, two administrative team members, and two teachers from the respective districts of the sixty (60) superintendents participating in the study. Selection of school board members was based on the longest length of service on their respective board. The administrative team members were selected alphabetically, using the beginning of the alphabet and the team members' last names. The teachers were selected alphabetically and by level--the first teacher alphabetically on the elementary (grades K-6) staff and, similarly, the first teacher on the secondary (grades 7-12) staff. Once selected, the 360 board members, administrators, and teachers were contacted by direct US Mail with a letter (Appendix E) explaining the study and requesting they rate their superintendent using the accompanying instrument,

Performance Assessment--Superintendent (Appendix B). Three weeks from the initial letter, a follow-up letter (Appendix F) was used to encourage those individuals who had not responded to do so. Within another two weeks, of the 360 questionnaires mailed, 301 had been completed and returned. The 301 responses yielded an 83.61 percent return.

Data Treatment and Analysis

The "Demographics Pages" gathered from the sixty (60) superintendents provided information on the age range, sex, training, experience, and district size regarding the superintendents, enabling the researcher to build group profiles of the exemplary superintendents and the randomly selected superintendents.

The second instrument provided information regarding the twelve dimensions of management effectiveness and one measure of overall performance on each of the sixty (60) superintendents, as perceived by significant others. The significant others were comprised of 301 school board members, administrative team members, and teachers. Using a five-point Likert-type scale, a rating or score was generated for each of the twelve (12) dimensions and the overall performance. Responses were tallied and group means were calculated for each of the twelve (12) dimensions of management effectiveness and the one measure of overall performance for the respective exemplary and randomly selected superintendent groups.

To analyze the data, a t-test of the difference between the group means at a .05 level of significance was used with each dimension of management effectiveness and the measure of overall performance to

determine if the exemplary superintendent group differed significantly from the randomly selected group of superintendents. Also, the multiple regression statistical test was employed to determine which dimensions of management effectiveness, if any, contributed to the prediction of a superintendent's overall effectiveness rating.

Null Hypotheses to be Tested

(1) There is no significant difference between exemplary superintendents and randomly selected superintendents in ratings of the superintendents on the dimension of management effectiveness entitled "Problem Analysis," as perceived by significant others.

(2) There is no significant difference between exemplary superintendents and randomly selected superintendents in ratings of the superintendents on the dimension of management effectiveness entitled "Judgment," as perceived by significant others.

(3) There is no significant difference between exemplary superintendents and randomly selected superintendents in ratings of the superintendents on the dimension of management effectiveness entitled "Organizational Ability," as perceived by significant others.

(4) There is no significant difference between exemplary superintendents and randomly selected superintendents in ratings of the superintendents on the dimension of management effectiveness entitled "Decisiveness," as perceived by significant others.

(5) There is no significant difference between exemplary superintendents and randomly selected superintendents in ratings of the superintendents on the dimension of management effectiveness entitled "Leadership," as perceived by significant others.

(6) There is no significant difference between exemplary superintendents and randomly selected superintendents in ratings of the superintendents on the dimension of management effectiveness entitled "Stress Tolerance," as perceived by significant others.

(7) There is no significant difference between exemplary superintendents and randomly selected superintendents in ratings of the superintendents on the dimension of management effectiveness entitled "Sensitivity," as perceived by significant others.

(8) There is no significant difference between exemplary superintendents and randomly selected superintendents in ratings of the superintendents on the dimension of management effectiveness entitled "Oral Communication," as perceived by significant others.

(9) There is no significant difference between exemplary superintendents and randomly selected superintendents in ratings of the superintendents on the dimension of management effectiveness entitled "Written Communication," as perceived by significant others.

(10) There is no significant difference between exemplary superintendents and randomly selected superintendents in ratings of the superintendents on the dimension of management effectiveness entitled "Financial Management," as perceived by significant others.

(11) There is no significant difference between exemplary superintendents and randomly selected superintendents in ratings of the superintendents on the dimension of management effectiveness entitled "Personal Motivation," as perceived by significant others.

(12) There is no significant difference between exemplary superintendents and randomly selected superintendents in ratings of the superintendents on the dimension of management effectiveness entitled "Educational Values," as perceived by significant others.

(13) There is no significant difference between exemplary superintendents and randomly selected superintendents in ratings of the superintendents on a measure of overall effectiveness, as perceived by significant others.

(14) The dimensions of management effectiveness--Problem Analysis, Judgment, Organizational Ability, Decisiveness, Leadership, Stress Tolerance, Sensitivity, Oral Communication, Written Communication, Financial Management, Personal Motivation, and Educational Values--do not make a significant contribution to the prediction of a superintendent's overall effectiveness rating.

Alternative Hypotheses

(1) The ratings of exemplary superintendents will not be equal to those of randomly selected superintendents on the dimension of

management effectiveness entitled "Problem Analysis," as perceived by significant others.

(2) The ratings of exemplary superintendents will not be equal to those of randomly selected superintendents on the dimension of management effectiveness entitled "Judgment," as perceived by significant others.

(3) The ratings of exemplary superintendents will not be equal to those of randomly selected superintendents on the dimension of management effectiveness entitled "Organizational Ability," as perceived by significant others.

(4) The ratings of exemplary superintendents will not be equal to those of randomly selected superintendents on the dimension of management effectiveness entitled "Decisiveness," as perceived by significant others.

(5) The ratings of exemplary superintendents will not be equal to those of randomly selected superintendents on the dimension of management effectiveness entitled "Leadership," as perceived by significant others.

(6) The ratings of exemplary superintendents will not be equal to those of randomly selected superintendents on the dimension of management effectiveness entitled "Stress Tolerance," as perceived by significant others.

(7) The ratings of exemplary superintendents will not be equal to those of randomly selected superintendents on the dimension of management effectiveness entitled "Sensitivity," as perceived by significant others.

(8) The ratings of exemplary superintendents will not be equal to those of randomly selected superintendents on the dimension of management effectiveness entitled "Oral Communication," as perceived by significant others.

(9) The ratings of exemplary superintendents will not be equal to those of randomly selected superintendents on the dimension of management effectiveness entitled "Written Communication," as perceived by significant others.

(10) The ratings of exemplary superintendents will not be equal to those of randomly selected superintendents on the dimension of management effectiveness entitled "Financial Management," as perceived by significant others.

(11) The ratings of exemplary superintendents will not be equal to those of randomly selected superintendents on the dimension of

management effectiveness entitled "Personal Motivation," as perceived by significant others.

(12) The ratings of exemplary superintendents will not be equal to those of randomly selected superintendents on the dimension of management effectiveness entitled "Educational Values," as perceived by significant others.

(13) The ratings of exemplary superintendents will not be equal to those of randomly selected superintendents on a measure of overall effectiveness, as perceived by significant others.

(14) The dimensions of management effectiveness--Problem Analysis, Judgment, Organizational Ability, Decisiveness, Leadership, Stress Tolerance, Sensitivity, Oral Communication, Written Communication, Financial Management, Personal Motivation, and Educational Values--do make a significant contribution to the prediction of a superintendent's overall effectiveness rating.

Assumptions Applicable to this Study

This study of the leadership behavior of Iowa superintendents was conducted in accordance with the following assumptions:

(1) That the methods of peer selection and random sampling of superintendents were handled in a confidential and accurate manner, thereby generating representative samples of the state's exemplary and other selected superintendents.

(2) That the dimensions of management effectiveness incorporated into the "Performance Assessment--Superintendent" questionnaire were representative of elements comprising effective leadership of superintendents.

(3) That the "Performance Assessment--Superintendent" questionnaire was a professionally developed instrument that would provide a valid appraisal of superintendent leadership behavior.

(4) That participating board members, administrative team members, and teachers gave honest appraisals of the leadership behavior they perceived in their respective superintendents in completing the "Performance Assessment--Superintendent" questionnaire.

(5) Although ancillary to the purposes of this study, the affirmation that a peer-selected group of exemplary superintendents had indeed been isolated for the study would be considered validated if a significant difference was found

between the two superintendent groups on seven (7) or more of the dimensions of management effectiveness.

Summary

This chapter delineated how the two groups which comprised the sample were drawn; described the measurement instruments utilized; related how the data were collected, treated, and analyzed; stated the null hypotheses that were tested; related the alternative hypotheses; and stated the assumptions applicable to the study.

CHAPTER IV. FINDINGS

This study of the leadership behavior of selected Iowa superintendents had two major purposes: (1) to determine in which dimensions of management effectiveness exemplary superintendents differ from randomly selected superintendents and (2) to determine if certain dimensions of management effectiveness contribute significantly to the prediction of a superintendent's overall effectiveness. When the data had been collected, the statistical analyses described in Chapter III were conducted. Each of the fourteen (14) hypotheses tested is discussed in this chapter, relating the results yielded from the statistical analyses.

Profile of the Respondents

Sixty (60) superintendents were asked to commit to participation in the study by responding to an eight-item researcher-developed questionnaire entitled "Demographics Page." All sixty (60) responded to the questionnaire. Thirty (30) of the superintendents were identified by their peers as being exemplary and are representative of the fifteen (15) Area Education Agencies (AEAs) within the state. The other thirty (30) were randomly drawn from the state's fifteen (15) AEAs. The demographic data provided by the superintendents revealed that the two groups were similar in sex, in whether their last degree was earned in state or out of state, and in recency of when their last degree was conferred. All of the respondents from both groups were male, and over 56 percent of both groups received their training in Iowa universities. Over 60 percent of all the

superintendents participating in the study received their last degree during the late sixties or during the seventies. The greatest differences between the two groups were in age, years experience as a superintendent, highest degree held, and size of school in which they currently served. The exemplary superintendents tended to be older, possess more experience as a superintendent, hold more advanced degrees, and represent the larger school districts in their Area Education Agency. Over 63 percent of the exemplary superintendents possessed sixteen (16) or more years of experience as a superintendent; 47 percent held doctorates; and 74 percent were superintendents of districts larger than 1,000 students. In contrast, the randomly selected superintendents tended to be younger than their exemplary counterparts; only 17 percent possessed more than sixteen (16) years of experience as superintendent; only 10 percent held doctorates; and only 27 percent held superintendencies in districts larger than 1,000 students. These data described are referenced in three tables--Table 1 provides a numerical representation of all sixty (60) respondents, Table 2 profiles the thirty (30) exemplary superintendents, and Table 3 profiles the randomly selected superintendents.

A second set of respondents, the significant others who rated the superintendents, was comprised of board members, administrators, and teachers from the respective districts of the sixty (60) superintendents identified for the study. Of these 360 significant others invited to participate in the study, 83.61 percent or 301 responded and provided ratings of their superintendents. Provided in Table 4 is a numerical

Table 1. Profile of superintendent respondents

Variables	Number	Percent of superintendents responding
Age range as superintendent		
30-40	6	10.00
41-50	27	45.00
51-60	23	38.33
61-70	4	6.67
Sex		
Male	60	100.00
Female	0	0.00
Years experience as superintendent		
0-5	8	13.33
6-10	15	25.00
11-15	13	21.67
16-20	7	11.67
21-25	10	16.67
26+	7	11.67
Highest degree held		
Master's	17	28.33
Specialist	26	43.33
Doctorate	17	28.33
Institution where degree obtained		
State of Iowa	37	61.67
Drake 6		
ISU 12		
SUI 13		
UNI 6		
Out of state	23	38.33
How recent was degree obtained?		
1-5 years ago	5	8.33
6-10	13	21.67
11-15	18	30.00
16-20	12	20.00
21-25	3	5.00
26+	9	15.00
District size		
<1,000 students	30	50.00
1,000-3,000	22	36.67
3,001-5,000	3	5.00
>5,000	5	8.33

Table 2. Profile of exemplary superintendent respondents

Variables	Number	Percent of superintendents responding
Age range as superintendent		
30-40	2	6.67
41-50	11	36.67
51-60	15	50.00
61-70	2	6.67
Sex		
Male	30	100.00
Female	0	0.00
Years experience as superintendent		
0-5	2	6.67
6-10	5	16.67
11-15	4	13.33
16-20	7	23.33
21-25	6	20.00
26+	6	20.00
Highest degree held		
Master's	8	26.67
Specialist	8	26.67
Doctorate	14	46.67
Institution where degree obtained		
State of Iowa	17	56.67
Drake 1		
ISU 5		
SUI 11		
UNI 0		
Out of state	13	43.33
How recent was degree obtained?		
1-5 years ago	3	10.00
6-10	5	16.67
11-15	8	26.67
16-20	6	20.00
21-25	2	6.67
26+	6	20.00
District size		
<1,000 students	8	26.67
1,000-3,000	14	46.67
3,001-5,000	3	10.00
>5,000	5	16.67

Table 3. Profile of randomly selected superintendent respondents

Variables	Number	Percent of superintendents responding
Age range as superintendent		
30-40	4	13.33
41-50	16	53.33
51-60	8	26.67
61-70	2	6.67
Sex		
Male	30	100.00
Female	0	0.00
Years experience as superintendent		
0-5	6	20.00
6-10	10	33.33
11-15	9	30.00
16-20	0	0.00
21-25	4	13.33
26+	1	3.33
Highest degree held		
Master's	9	30.00
Specialist	18	60.00
Doctorate	3	10.00
Institution where degree obtained		
State of Iowa	20	66.67
Drake 5		
ISU 7		
SUI 2		
UNI 6		
Out of state	10	33.33
How recent was degree obtained?		
1-5 years ago	2	6.67
6-10	8	26.67
11-15	10	33.33
16-20	6	20.00
21-25	1	3.33
26+	3	10.00
District size		
<1,000 students	22	73.33
1,000-3,000	8	26.67
3,001-5,000	0	0.00
>5,000	0	0.00

representation of the distribution of these respondents. As indicated in Table 4, a balanced response was received--151 respondents rating superintendents in the exemplary group and 150 respondents rating superintendents in the randomly selected group. Further analysis of the return has shown reasonably good balance existed also among the groups responding--101 board members, 104 administrators, and 96 teachers.

Table 4. Distribution of respondents rating superintendents

	Board members	Administrators	Teachers	Totals
Exemplary superintendents	50	55	46	151
Randomly selected supts.	51	49	50	150
Totals	101	104	96	301

To test the thirteen (13) hypotheses which were formulated to determine whether a significant difference existed between the exemplary and the randomly selected superintendent groups on the twelve (12) dimensions of management effectiveness and the single measure of overall effectiveness, the researcher used a t-test of the difference between the group means at a .05 level of significance. First, however, the researcher examined the variances of the scores of the two superintendent groups for each of the dimensions and the measure of overall effectiveness and found no significant difference existed in all thirteen (13) cases. Therefore, the pooled variance estimate and 2-tailed probability were utilized in conducting the thirteen t-tests. The results of the thirteen t-tests are represented in Tables 5 and 6. Each hypothesis is then

Table 5. Summary table of the means and standard deviations comparing the exemplary and randomly selected superintendent groups on the twelve dimensions of management effectiveness and the single measure of overall effectiveness

Variable	Exemplary supts.			Randomly selected supts.		
	N	Mean	S.D.	N	Mean	S.D.
Problem Analysis	30	4.28	.39	30	4.11	.43
Judgment	30	4.14	.59	30	3.99	.46
Organizational Ability	30	4.33	.51	30	4.14	.52
Decisiveness	30	4.31	.53	30	4.28	.50
Leadership	30	4.06	.60	30	3.77	.65
Stress Tolerance	30	4.04	.60	30	3.97	.76
Sensitivity	30	3.67	.70	30	3.39	.69
Oral Communication	30	4.23	.51	30	3.99	.46
Written Communication	30	4.39	.42	30	4.03	.46
Financial Management	30	4.51	.46	30	4.33	.56
Personal Motivation	30	4.55	.37	30	4.34	.42
Educational Values	30	4.16	.66	30	4.20	.53
Overall Effectiveness	30	4.28	.57	30	4.03	.54

Table 6. Summary table of the t values and 2-tail probabilities of the difference between the group means of the exemplary and randomly selected superintendent groups on the twelve dimensions of management effectiveness and the single measure of overall effectiveness (N=60)

Variable	t value	2-tail probability
Problem Analysis	-1.60	.12
Judgment	-1.14	.26
Organizational Ability	-1.44	.16
Decisiveness	-0.25	.80
Leadership	-1.81	.08
Stress Tolerance	-0.41	.68
Sensitivity	-1.54	.13
Oral Communication	-1.90	.06
Written Communication	-3.19**	.00
Financial Management	-1.37	.18
Personal Motivation	-2.08*	.04
Educational Values	0.22	.83
Overall Effectiveness	-1.78	.08

*Significant at the .05 level.

**Significant at the .01 level.

discussed relative to the results yielded through the statistical analyses.

Hypothesis Number One

> There is no significant difference between exemplary superintendents and randomly selected superintendents in ratings of the superintendents on the dimension of management effectiveness entitled "Problem Analysis," as perceived by significant others.

This hypothesis was formulated to examine if a significant difference existed between exemplary and randomly selected superintendent groups in their ability to seek out relevant data, analyze complex information, and search for information with a purpose. The results of the t-test yielded a test statistic of -1.60 and a 2-tail probability of .12. Therefore, the null hypothesis was not rejected.

Hypothesis Number Two

> There is no significant difference between exemplary superintendents and randomly selected superintendents in ratings of the superintendents on the dimension of management effectiveness entitled "Judgment," as perceived by significant others.

This hypothesis was formulated to determine if a significant difference existed between exemplary and randomly selected superintendent groups in their ability to reach logical conclusions and make high quality decisions based on available information, identify educational needs and set priorities, and critically evaluate written communication. The results of the t-test yielded a test statistic of -1.14 and a 2-tail probability of .26. Therefore, the null hypothesis was not rejected.

Hypothesis Number Three

There is no significant difference between exemplary superintendents and randomly selected superintendents in ratings of the superintendents on the dimension of management effectiveness entitled "Organizational Ability," as perceived by significant others.

This hypothesis was formulated to examine if a significant difference existed between exemplary and randomly selected superintendent groups in their ability to plan, schedule, and control the work of others; use resources in an optimal fashion; and deal with a volume of paperwork and heavy demands on one's time. The results of the t-test yielded a test statistic of -1.44 and a 2-tail probability of .16. Therefore, the null hypothesis was not rejected.

Hypothesis Number Four

There is no significant difference between exemplary superintendents and randomly selected superintendents in ratings of the superintendents on the dimension of management effectiveness entitled "Decisiveness," as perceived by significant others.

This hypothesis was formulated to determine if a significant difference existed between exemplary and randomly selected superintendent groups in their ability to recognize when a decision is required and to act quickly. The results of the t-test yielded a test statistic of -0.25 and a 2-tail probability of .80. Therefore, the null hypothesis was not rejected.

Hypothesis Number Five

There is no significant difference between exemplary superintendents and randomly selected superintendents in ratings of the superintendents on the dimension of management effectiveness entitled "Leadership," as perceived by significant others.

This hypothesis was formulated to examine if a significant difference existed between the exemplary and randomly selected superintendent groups in their ability to get others involved in solving problems, to recognize when a group requires direction, and to interact with a group effectively and guide it to the accomplishment of a task. The results of the t-test yielded a test statistic of -1.81 and a 2-tail probability of .08. Therefore, the null hypothesis was not rejected.

Hypothesis Number Six

> There is no significant difference between exemplary superintendents and randomly selected superintendents in ratings of the superintendents on the dimension of management effectiveness entitled "Stress Tolerance," as perceived by significant others.

This hypothesis was formulated to determine if a significant difference existed between the exemplary and randomly selected superintendent groups in their ability to perform under pressure and during opposition and in ability to think on one's feet. The results of the t-test yielded a test statistic of -0.41 and a 2-tail probability of .68. Therefore, the null hypothesis was not rejected.

Hypothesis Number Seven

> There is no significant difference between exemplary superintendents and randomly selected superintendents in ratings of the superintendents on the dimension of management effectiveness entitled "Sensitivity," as perceived by significant others.

This hypothesis was formulated to examine if a significant difference existed between the exemplary and randomly selected superintendent groups in their ability to perceive the needs, concerns, and personal problems of others; resolve conflicts; exercise tact in dealing with persons from

different backgrounds; and deal effectively with people concerning emotional issues. The results of the t-test yielded a test statistic of -1.54 and a 2-tail probability of .13. Therefore, the null hypothesis was not rejected.

Hypothesis Number Eight

> There is no significant difference between exemplary superintendents and randomly selected superintendents in ratings of the superintendents on the dimension of management effectiveness entitled "Oral Communication," as perceived by significant others.

This hypothesis was formulated to determine if a significant difference existed between the exemplary and randomly selected superintendent groups in their ability to make a clear oral presentation of facts or ideas. The results of the t-test yielded a test statistic of -1.90 and a 2-tail probability of .06. Therefore, the null hypothesis was not rejected.

Hypothesis Number Nine

> There is no significant difference between exemplary superintendents and randomly selected superintendents in ratings of the superintendents on the dimension of management effectiveness entitled "Written Communication," as perceived by significant others.

This hypothesis was formulated to determine if a significant difference existed between the exemplary and randomly selected superintendent groups in their ability to express ideas clearly in writing and to write appropriately for different audiences--students, teachers, parents, et al. The results of the t-test yielded a test statistic of -3.19 and a 2-tail probability of .00. Therefore, the null hypothesis was

rejected, as a highly significant difference in mean scores was found between the exemplary and randomly selected superintendent groups.

Hypothesis Number Ten

> There is no significant difference between exemplary superintendents and randomly selected superintendents in ratings of the superintendents on the dimension of management effectiveness entitled "Financial Management," as perceived by significant others.

This hypothesis was formulated to examine if a significant difference existed between the exemplary and randomly selected superintendent groups in their ability to develop a sound fiscal plan and provide direction and cost-effective management of resources. The results of the t-test yielded a test statistic of -1.37 and a 2-tail probability of .18. Therefore, the null hypothesis was not rejected.

Hypothesis Number Eleven

> There is no significant difference between exemplary superintendents and randomly selected superintendents in ratings of the superintendents on the dimension of management effectiveness entitled "Personal Motivation," as perceived by significant others.

This hypothesis was formulated to determine if a significant difference existed between the exemplary and randomly selected superintendent groups in their desire to achieve in all activities attempted, in evidence that work is important to their personal satisfaction, and in their ability to be self-policing and a self-starter. The results of the t-test yielded a test statistic of -2.08 and a 2-tail probability of .04. Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected, as a significant difference in mean scores was found between the exemplary and randomly selected superintendent groups.

Hypothesis Number Twelve

There is no significant difference between exemplary superintendents and randomly selected superintendents in ratings of the superintendents on the dimension of management effectiveness entitled "Educational Values," as perceived by significant others.

This hypothesis was formulated to examine if a significant difference existed between the exemplary and randomly selected superintendent groups in their possession of a well-reasoned educational philosophy and vision for education and in their receptiveness to new ideas and change. The results of the t-test yielded a test statistic of 0.22 and a 2-tail probability of .83. Therefore, the null hypothesis was not rejected.

Hypothesis Number Thirteen

There is no significant difference between exemplary superintendents and randomly selected superintendents in ratings of the superintendents on a measure of overall effectiveness, as perceived by significant others.

This hypothesis was formulated to determine if a significant difference existed between the exemplary and randomly selected superintendent groups in their overall effectiveness. The results of the t-test yielded a test statistic of -1.78 and a 2-tail probability of .08. Therefore, the null hypothesis was not rejected.

To test the hypothesis formulated to determine which dimensions of management effectiveness contribute significantly to the prediction of a superintendent's overall effectiveness, the researcher used a multiple regression test with stepwise entry of variables. Again, the .05 level of significance was utilized. First, however, the researcher calculated a Pearson correlation to assess how each of the twelve (12) dimensions of effectiveness correlated with Overall Effectiveness and with

each of the other eleven (11) dimensions. Displayed in the correlation matrix table (Table 7) are the Pearson correlation coefficients of the paired variables, indicating that each of the twelve dimensions correlated with Overall Effectiveness and with each of the other dimensions, but with one exception. The correlation or relationship between Financial Management and Educational Values was not significant. All other correlations were significantly different from zero at the .01 level. Interpretation of these data reported, therefore, yielded that a relationship existed between each of the twelve (12) dimensions and Overall Effectiveness and among the twelve (12) dimensions (the one exception excluded). Also, since the ratings on each of the twelve (12) dimensions were given independently and since Overall Effectiveness was an independent rating or evaluation of overall effectiveness, separate from the twelve (12) dimensions, the researcher was confident that the results were not confounded and that the dimensions provided good scales to address the concept of leadership.

As alluded earlier, the multiple regression test with stepwise entry of variables was employed to determine which dimensions of management effectiveness contribute significantly to the prediction of a superintendent's overall effectiveness. Summarized in Tables 8, 9, 10, 11, and 12 are the results of the multiple regression test. Following these tables, Hypothesis Number Fourteen is stated and discussed relative to the results yielded through these statistical analyses.

Table 7. Correlation matrix of the relationship of the twelve dimensions[a] of management effectiveness with Overall Effectiveness (N=60)

Variable	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9	Q10	Q11	Q12	Q13
Prb Anl-Q1													
Judgmnt-Q2	.70												
Org Abl-Q3	.66	.68											
Decisiv-Q4	.49	.60	.57										
Ldrship-Q5	.50	.67	.67	.57									
StrsTol-Q6	.60	.77	.65	.60	.73								
Sensitv-Q7	.47	.69	.54	.39	.85	.73							
OrlComm-Q8	.50	.70	.53	.48	.49	.62	.56						
WrtComm-Q9	.61	.72	.65	.32	.56	.62	.51	.69					
FinMgt-Q10	.63	.42	.71	.44	.37	.43	.30	.34	.34				
PrsMot-Q11	.62	.47	.62	.48	.46	.56	.33	.51	.50	.54			
EdcVal-Q12	.40	.65	.41	.45	.60	.70	.60	.49	.44	.12[b]	.43		
OvrEff-Q13	.70	.83	.79	.64	.80	.82	.76	.66	.69	.54	.59	.66	

[a]Symbols signifying the twelve (12) dimensions of effectiveness:

Q1 - Problem Analysis
Q2 - Judgment
Q3 - Organizational Ability
Q4 - Decisiveness
Q5 - Leadership
Q6 - Stress Tolerance
Q7 - Sensitivity
Q8 - Oral Communication
Q9 - Written Communication
Q10 - Financial Management
Q11 - Personal Motivation
Q12 - Educational Values
Q13 - Overall Effectiveness.

[b]All correlations were significant at .01 except the relationship of Financial Management with Educational Values. Q10 with Q12 was not significant.

Table 8. Analysis of stepwise regression with Judgment entered as the first variable[a] (N=60)

Source of variation	df	Sum of squares	Mean square	F value
Regression	1	12.84	12.84	130.05**
Residual	58	5.73	0.10	

[a]Dependent variable = Overall Effectiveness (Q13).

**Significant at the .01 level.

Table 9. Analysis of stepwise regression with Leadership entered as the second variable[a] (N=60)

Source of variation	df	Sum of squares	Mean square	F value
Regression	2	14.77	7.39	110.87**
Residual	57	3.80	0.07	

[a]Dependent variable = Overall Effectiveness (Q13).

**Significant at the .01 level.

Table 10. Analysis of stepwise regression with Organizational Ability entered as the third variable[a] (N=60)

Source of variation	df	Sum of squares	Mean square	F value
Regression	3	15.53	5.18	95.41**
Residual	56	3.04	0.05	

[a]Dependent variable = Overall Effectiveness (Q13).

**Significant at the .01 level.

Table 11. Analysis of stepwise regression with Stress Tolerance entered as the fourth variable[a] (N=60)

Source of variation	df	Sum of squares	Mean square	F value
Regression	4	15.82	3.95	79.07**
Residual	55	2.75	0.05	
Multiple R	.92	Adjusted R square		.84
R square	.85	Standard error		.22

[a]Dependent variable = Overall Effectiveness (Q13).

** Significant at the .01 level.

Table 12. Summary table of variables entered in the regression equation (N=60)

Variable	R square	b beta	t value	t probability
Judgment (Q2)	.69	.3318	3.55**	0.00
Leadership (Q5)	.10	.2114	2.92**	0.00
Organizational Ability (Q3)	.04	.2987	3.60**	0.00
Stress Tolerance (Q6)	.02	.1821	2.40*	0.02
(Constant)		-.0186	-0.07	0.94

*Significant at the .05 level.

**Significant at the .01 level.

Hypothesis Number Fourteen

The dimensions of management effectiveness--Problem Analysis, Judgment, Organizational Ability, Decisiveness, Leadership, Stress Tolerance, Sensitivity, Oral Communication, Written Communication, Financial Management, Personal Motivation, and Educational Values--do not make a significant contribution to the prediction of a superintendent's overall effectiveness rating.

This hypothesis was formulated to determine if any of the dimensions of management effectiveness made a significant contribution to the prediction of a superintendent's overall effectiveness. The results of the multiple regression test yielded that four of the dimensions--Judgment, Leadership, Organizational Ability, and Stress Tolerance--were found to make a significant contribution to the prediction of overall effectiveness. Depicted in Table 8 are the results computed when the dimension Judgment was entered on step one in the multiple regression. The test yielded an F value of 130.05, statistically significant at the .01 level. As further noted in Table 12, Judgment accounted for 69 percent of the variance. Described in Table 9 are the results from when Leadership was entered on step two in the multiple regression. The test yielded an F value of 110.87, which was also statistically significant at the .01 level. Noted in Table 12, ten (10) percent of the variance could be attributed to the dimension Leadership. Represented in Table 10 are the results from when the dimension Organizational Ability was entered on step three in the multiple regression. The test yielded an F value of 95.41, which again was statistically significant at the .01 level. As reported in Table 12, four (4) percent of the variance can be attributed to Organizational Ability. Described in Table 11 are the results from when the dimension Stress Tolerance was entered on step four in the multiple regression. The test yielded an F value of 79.07, which was statistically significant at the .05 level. As noted in Table 12, two (2) percent of the variance can be attributed to Stress Tolerance. Thus, as noted from Table 11 and

summarized in Table 12, the four dimensions cited above accounted for 85 percent of the variance and consequently were found to contribute significantly to the prediction of a superintendent's overall effectiveness. Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected and the best predictive equation is stated as follows:

$$\hat{Y} = .3318 \text{ (Judgment)} + .2114 \text{ (Leadership)} + .2987 \text{ (Organizational Ability)} + .1821 \text{ (Stress Tolerance)} - .0186 \text{ (Constant)}.$$

Although significance was found and although 69 percent of the variance was attributed to Judgment, the reader is cautioned not to place too great an emphasis on this dimension. The dimension Judgment, as defined in Appendix G, was a rather broad category covering several skills as drawing conclusions, identifying needs, setting priorities, and evaluating written communication.

Summary

Analyses of the data regarding the twelve (12) dimensions of management effectiveness, the single measure of overall effectiveness, and the prediction of a superintendent's overall effectiveness rating were described in this chapter. Conclusions for each of the fourteen (14) hypotheses were drawn and also presented. A summary and discussion of these findings will be presented in the following chapter.

CHAPTER V. SUMMARY, DISCUSSION, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The purpose of this study was to examine the leadership behavior of selected superintendents in the state of Iowa. More specifically, the study sought the following: (1) to determine in which dimensions of management effectiveness exemplary superintendents differ from other superintendents and (2) to determine if certain dimensions of management effectiveness contribute significantly to the prediction of a superintendent's overall effectiveness.

The sample for the study was comprised of two groups of superintendents drawn from the population of public school superintendents in Iowa. A pool of thirty (30) exemplary superintendents was peer-identified through the use of a reputational survey that was conducted statewide. The second group, equal in size, was randomly selected from the remaining population and served as a control and comparison group.

Two researcher-developed questionnaires were employed to gather data. First, demographic data were collected from each of the sixty (60) participating superintendents to build profiles of the two superintendent groups. A second instrument involved school board members, administrators, and teachers in the assessment of superintendent leadership behavior in reference to twelve (12) dimensions of management effectiveness. Through this second instrument, the following variables were examined: Problem Analysis, Judgment, Organizational Ability, Decisiveness, Leadership, Stress Tolerance, Sensitivity, Oral

Communication, Written Communication, Financial Management, Personal Motivation, Educational Values, and overall effectiveness. The construction and validation of the two researcher-developed questionnaires and the methods and procedures used with both instruments were discussed in Chapter III. The profiles of the two superintendent groups derived from the demographic data collected through the first instrument indicated that exemplary superintendents differed from their randomly selected counterparts in that they tended to be older, possess more experience as a superintendent, hold more advanced degrees, and represent the larger school districts in their Area Education Agency. These profiles and the results generated when the statistical tests were applied to the data collected through the second instrument utilized were delineated in Chapter IV. In summarized form, analyses of the data derived through the second instrument yielded the following findings:

(1) No significant difference was found between the exemplary and randomly selected superintendent groups on the single measure of overall effectiveness.

(2) No significant difference was found between the exemplary and randomly selected superintendent groups on the ten (10) hypotheses relating to the following respective dimensions of management effectiveness: Problem Analysis, Judgment, Organizational Ability, Decisiveness, Leadership, Stress Tolerance, Sensitivity, Oral Communication, Financial Management, and Educational Values.

(3) A highly significant difference was found between the exemplary and randomly selected superintendent groups on the dimension of management effectiveness labeled Written Communication.

(4) A significant difference was found between the exemplary and randomly selected superintendent groups on the dimension of management effectiveness labeled Personal Motivation.

(5) Four dimensions of management effectiveness--Judgment, Leadership, Organizational Ability, and Stress Tolerance--were

found to contribute significantly to the prediction of a superintendent's overall effectiveness.

Limitations

Two limitations or circumstances may have had an effect on the findings of this study. First, the superintendents peer-identified as exemplary represented larger school districts, held more advanced degrees, and possessed extensive experience. It may be speculated that, in the process of selecting the exemplary group, these superintendents' peers were influenced or impressed by size of school district, higher degrees, and long tenure. On the other hand, it may be asserted that the highly skilled school administrator constantly seeks a greater challenge, continues to pursue professional growth, and has remained in the superintendency because he is successful and enjoys administration.

The second circumstance involved the frequency and pattern of missing values in the superintendent ratings by the significant others (board members, administrators, and teachers). Twelve (12) of the sixty (60) superintendents received ratings from only three or four of their possible six respective significant others. These missing values were restored by assigning the same score of the corresponding rater on that item for that respective superintendent. In four cases, both ratings of board members or administrators or teachers were absent. Therefore, for certain statistical tests such as the multiple regression, it was necessary to delete these four (4) cases and use an N of fifty-six (56). Nevertheless, some question or concern may be raised regarding a leveling effect that may have resulted due to the process utilized in restoring values for the

missing ratings. Thus, for interpretative purposes, a cautionary note is inserted regarding the small N.

Discussion

The primary variables examined in this study were overall effectiveness and the following twelve (12) dimensions of management effectiveness: Problem Analysis, Judgment, Organizational Ability, Decisiveness, Leadership, Stress Tolerance, Sensitivity, Oral Communication, Written Communication, Financial Management, Personal Motivation, and Educational Values. As was stated earlier, a significant difference was found between the exemplary and randomly selected superintendent groups on two (2) dimensions of management effectiveness: Written Communication and Personal Motivation. And, as was noted in the chapter entitled "Findings," the difference found in both dimensions reflected much higher ratings for the exemplary group, indicating these two dimensions to be strengths common among exemplary superintendents and notably different from other superintendents. Extrapolating from these differences cited and the profile of the exemplary superintendent group, built from superintendent self-reported information, it is contended by the writer that effectiveness in these two dimensions is particularly indicative of exemplary superintendents.

Since the exemplary superintendents tended to cluster in larger school districts, the nature of their jobs and the number of their staff would not be conducive to extensive personal contact with all their employees. Consequently, greater reliance and importance would be placed upon written communication. In addition, the development of

well-formulated board policy is of critical importance to the management of staff and operation of a large district. It should have come with little surprise, then, that exemplary superintendents possessed or have cultivated exceptional written communication skills.

In like manner, it is contended by the writer that the exemplary superintendents' quest for a greater challenge and their pursuit of personal and professional growth have led them to acquire additional training, pursue more advanced degrees, and attain superintendencies in larger districts--all indicative of high personal motivation.

It should also be noted, as found in Table 6, that the difference in group means of the exemplary and randomly selected superintendent groups on two dimensions--Leadership and Oral Communication--and on Overall Effectiveness approached significance with probability levels of .08, .06, and .08, respectively. However, no firm conclusions can be drawn regarding these differences, as the evidence was insufficient for rejection.

In further analysis directed toward the prediction of a superintendent's Overall Effectiveness rating, it was indicated in this study that all twelve (12) dimensions of management effectiveness correlated with the concept of Overall Effectiveness. However, the reader is cautioned that while statistical significance was found, little practical significance may have been present. Nevertheless, it was noted that Overall Effectiveness was a mathematically independent rating or evaluation of overall effectiveness, separate from those of the dimensions. Thus, it is contended by the writer that the twelve (12)

dimensions address the concept of overall effectiveness. Furthermore, the definitions of the twelve dimensions (Appendix G) identified that the content each dimension represents differs from that of the remaining eleven (11) dimensions. Therefore, it is concluded that using the four (4) dimensions--Judgment, Leadership, Organizational Ability, and Stress Tolerance--found to be significant contributors to the prediction of Overall Effectiveness, would serve as well as using all twelve (12) for prediction purposes.

In addition, although it was not an expressed purpose of this study, an examination of the similarities and differences of the group means of the board members', administrators', and teachers' ratings of the superintendents on the twelve (12) dimensions and Overall Effectiveness in Table 13, located in Appendix H, revealed interesting information. As noted in Table 13, the superintendents as a whole received their highest marks on the dimension of Financial Management--an area in which apparently nearly all superintendents possess and exhibit substantial expertise. In contrast, the dimension rated lowest by all three groups was Sensitivity, indicating an area where it appears all superintendents can make some improvement. Furthermore, it was interesting to note that on every dimension and on Overall Effectiveness, the teachers' group consistently gave the lowest ratings. Therefore, recognizing the importance of teachers to the educational process, superintendents are advised to be sensitive to the needs and perceptions of teachers.

Although the exact mix of what constitutes effective leadership has remained largely inconclusive, and although the two superintendent groups

were not found to be significantly different overall, this study has identified certain dimensions which hold importance for all superintendents. In addition to the dimensions cited earlier, the importance of the dimension Sensitivity should again be noted. For it was on this dimension that all three groups of the significant others gave all superintendents their lowest ratings. It is believed that this additional information will have practical importance in lending assistance to the development and prediction of overall effectiveness.

Recommendations for Further Study

Although this study established a profile of the exemplary superintendent as selected by peers and identified some linkage between certain dimensions of management effectiveness and exemplary superintendents, five (5) factors became apparent which presented some difficulty during this investigation. These five factors involved the accuracy of the reputational survey, the size of the sample, potential untested dimensions of effectiveness, the internal reliability of the instrument, and the problem of missing values. All five factors have also provided potential areas for future research.

Persons interested in conducting research regarding the leadership behavior of superintendents as investigated in this study should consider the following:

(1) Investigation of the reputational survey to determine if peer selection is an accurate manner of identifying who are the exemplary superintendents.

(2) Replication of this study with the number of participating superintendents expanded to lend strength to the analyses of certain statistical tests as the multiple regression.

(3) Replication of this study with different untested dimensions of management effectiveness which may be integral to leadership effectiveness of superintendents.

(4) Replication of this study with the number of items for each dimension of effectiveness expanded to strengthen the internal reliability of the instrument.

(5) Replication of this study with the number of significant others (board members, administrators, and teachers) expanded to diminish any problem of potential missing values.

Concluding Statement

The fact that the leadership of the superintendent is critical to the effectiveness of a school and, as this study indicated, that a significant difference exists between exemplary superintendents and other superintendents in certain dimensions of management effectiveness have warranted that greater attention be given to these areas of difference if excellence in education is to be attained. The information this study yielded regarding the leadership behavior of superintendents in the dimensions of Written Communication and Personal Motivation and the four (4) dimensions--Judgment, Leadership, Organizational Ability, and Stress Tolerance--which were found to contribute significantly to the prediction of overall effectiveness could serve as a model for practicing and potential superintendents to emulate, a guide to assist universities in the training of administrators, and as an additional screening tool for boards of education in the selection of superintendents. It is also the contention of the writer that this study has moved research a small step closer to defining what constitutes effective leadership for the role of school superintendent. Therefore, it is believed that this study was a

worthy endeavor and provided a valuable contribution to the growing body of research regarding educational leadership.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Aplin, Norita D., and Daresh, John C. "The Superintendent as an Educational Leader." Planning and Changing 15, No. 4 (Winter 1984): 209-218.

2. Bailey, William. "Leadership Effectiveness Loop." The School Administrator 38, No. 11 (December 1981): 22.

3. Batchler, Merv. "The Enigma of Administrative Behavior." The Australian Administrator 2, No. 4 (August 1981): 1-4. ERIC ED 213 141.

4. Blackburn, Harold. "How to Locate Leadership: Put Down Your Buckets!" NASSP Bulletin 68, No. 471 (April 1984): 140-142.

5. Brown, Sidney E., and Sikes, J. Vann. "Morale of Directors of Curriculum and Instruction As Related To Perceptions of Leader Behavior." Education 99, No. 2 (Winter 1978): 121-126.

6. Cuban, Larry. "The Urban School Superintendency: A Century and a Half of Change." Phi Delta Kappan 77 (1976): 1-32. ERIC ED 120 912.

7. Cunningham, Luvern L. "Leaders and Leadership: 1985 and Beyond." Phi Delta Kappan 67, No. 1 (September 1985): 17-20.

8. Dolph, William E. "Superintendents: Start Your Engines." Thrust for Educational Leadership 4, No. 4 (March 1975): 7-9.

9. Edmonds, Ronald. "Effective Schools for the Urban Poor." Educational Leadership 37, No. 1 (October 1979): 15-24.

10. Engel, Ross A. "Think You Know What Makes a Great Superintendent? Guess Again." The Executive Educator 7, No. 3 (March 1985): 39-40.

11. Fiedler, Fred E., and Chemers, Martin M. Leadership and Effective Management. Glenview: Scott, Foresman and Co., 1974.

12. Getzels, Jacob, and Guba, Egon. "Social Behavior and the Administrative Process." School Review 65 (Winter 1957): 423-441.

13. Goldberg, Albert L. "An Interview With Ronald Lippitt." Educational Forum 47, No. 3 (Spring 1983): 311-319.

14. Goodlad, John I. "Educational Leadership: Toward the Third Era." Educational Leadership 35, No. 4 (January 1978): 322-331.

15. Gousha, Richard P. "What's Happening to Superintendents?" Paper presented at the American Association of School Administrators, Atlanta, GA, February 13-16, 1981. 26p. ERIC ED 204 845.

16. Grant, Carl A.; Ridgway, Marilynne B.; and Sleeter, Christine E. "Charles Cheng's Thoughts on Leadership in Education." Educational Leadership 37, No. 1 (October 1979): 68-71.

17. Griffiths, Daniel E. The School Superintendent. New York: Center for Applied Research in Education, Inc., 1966.

18. Haggard, David A. "Linkage of Decision-Making, Buffering, and Styles of Thinking in Exemplary Superintendents." Ph.D. dissertation, Iowa State University, 1984.

19. Hallinger, Philip, and Murphy, Joseph F. "School Leadership Studies: Where Do We Go From Here?" American Secondary Education 13, No. 4 (1984): 18-21.

20. Halpin, Andrew W. "A Paradigm for Research on Administrative Behavior." In Administrative Behavior in Education, pp. 155-199. Edited by Roald F. Campbell and Russell T. Gregg. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1957.

21. Halpin, Andrew W. Theory and Research in Administration. New York: Macmillan, 1966.

22. Heller, Robert W. "Do You Have What it Takes to Stand Out From the Crowd?" The Executive Educator 7, No. 6 (June 1985): 18-19.

23. Hersey, Paul W. "The NASSP Assessment Center Develops Leadership Talent." Educational Leadership 39, No. 5 (February 1982): 370.

24. Herzberg, Frederick; Mausner, Bernard; and Snyderman, Barbara B. The Motivation to Work. New York: Wiley & Sons, 1959.

25. Hoy, Wayne K., and Miskel, Cecil G. Educational Administration: Theory, Research, and Practice. New York: Random House, 1982.

26. Huckaby, William O., and Sperling, Harvey B. "Leadership Giftedness: An Idea Whose Time Has Not Yet Come." Roeper Review 3, No. 3 (February 1981): 19-22.

27. Jacobsen, Jamia J. "Where Are the Leaders to Guide the Schools?" NASSP Bulletin 64, No. 440 (December 1980): 47-51.

28. Katz, Daniel, and Kahn, Robert L. The Social Psychology of Organizations. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1978.

29. Kelley, Robert. The Gold-Collar Worker. Reading: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., Inc., 1985.

30. Leavitt, Harold J. Managerial Psychology. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1973.

31. Mann, Richard D. "A Review of the Relationships Between Personality and Performance in Small Groups." Psychological Bulletin 56, No. 4 (July 1959): 241-270.

32. Marks, Walter L. "The Superintendent as Societal Architect." Theory into Practice 20, No. 4 (Fall 1981): 255-259.

33. Marshall, Stuart A. "Leadership and Sensitivity Training." Journal of Education 153 (October 1970): 6-37.

34. McGregor, Douglas. The Human Side of Enterprise. New York: McGraw Hill, 1960.

35. Mintzberg, Henry. The Nature of Managerial Work. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall Inc., 1973.

36. Morris, G. Barry. "A Futuristic Cognitive View of Leadership." Educational Administration Quarterly 21, No. 1 (Winter 1985): 7-27.

37. National Commission on Excellence in Education. A Nation At Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1983.

38. Pitner, Nancy J., and Ogawa, Rodney T. "Organizational Leadership: The Case of the School Superintendent." Educational Administration Quarterly 17, No. 2 (Spring 1981): 45-65.

39. Schmitt, Neal; Noe, Raymond; Meritt, Ronni; Fitzgerald, Michael; Jorgensen, Cathy. Criterion-Related and Content Validity of the NASSP Assessment Center. East Lansing: Michigan State University, 1982.

40. Sergiovanni, Thomas J. "Leadership and Excellence in Schooling." Educational Leadership 41, No. 5 (February 1984): 4-13.

41. Sergiovanni, Thomas J. "Ten Principles of Quality of Leadership." Educational Leadership 39, No. 5 (February 1982): 330-336.

42. Shoemaker, Joan, and Fraser, Hugh W. "What Principals Can Do: Some Implications From Studies of Effective Schooling." Phi Delta Kappan 63, No. 3 (November 1981): 178-182.

43. Squires, David A.; Huitt, William G.; and Segars, John K. Effective Schools And Classrooms: A Research-Based Perspective. Alexandria: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1983.

44. Stevens, Clark A. "Perceptions and Expectations of the Leadership Behavior of Selected Superintendents and Their Administrative Teams in Five Midwestern States." Ph.D. dissertation, Iowa State University, 1973.

45. Stogdill, Ralph M. "Personal Factors Associated with Leadership: A Survey of the Literature." Journal of Psychology 25 (January 1948): 35-71.

46. Tannenbaum, Robert, and Schmidt, Warren H. "Management of Differences." In The Social Technology of Organization Development, pp. 127-140. Edited by W. W. Burke and H. A. Hornstein. LaJolla: University Associates, Inc., 1972.

47. Tyler, Clifford, and Coleman, Cy. "Superintendents Speak Out on Which Competencies Are Useful—and Which Aren't." Thrust for Educational Leadership 13, No. 1 (September 1983): 40-41.

48. Volp, Fred D. "Beyond the Myth of the Imperial School Superintendent." Paper presented at the Canadian School Trustees' Association Congress on Education, Toronto, Ontario, June 17-21, 1978. 17p. ERIC ED 158 373.

49. White, Paul. "Leaders for Our Schools." Thrust for Educational Leadership 14, No. 5 (February/March 1985): 25-26.

50. Yukl, Gary A. Leadership in Organizations. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall Inc., 1981.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The writer of this study is deeply indebted to the many individuals who have supported this endeavor with their guidance, encouragement, and time. First, special thanks are expressed to Dr. Ross Engel, who provided advice and expertise valuable to the planning and completion of this study. Throughout the writer's doctoral program, Dr. Engel has been an invaluable mentor and a continual source of encouragement. Thanks are also expressed to Dr. Trevor Howe for his insight and assistance with the statistical design.

Gratitude beyond words must be expressed to the writer's wife, Judy, to his son, Jason, and to his daughters, Angela and Allison, for the assistance, sacrifices, and support they gave, enabling the writer to realize this professional goal.

The Iowa State University Committee on the Use of Human Subjects in Research reviewed the proposal for this project on December 6, 1984. After examining the project's procedures and steps and ascertaining that confidentiality was insured and that the rights and welfare of human subjects were properly protected, the committee approved the project.

APPENDIX A. DEMOGRAPHICS PAGE

DEMOGRAPHICS PAGE

1. Superintendent's name _____

2. Age range--circle one: 30-40 41-50 51-60 61-70

3. Sex--circle one: male female

4. Total years of experience as a superintendent--circle one:
   0-5 6-10 11-15 16-20 21-25 26-greater

5. Highest degree held--circle one: MA EdS EdD PhD

6. Institution from which highest degree was obtained: _____

7. How long ago was the highest degree obtained?--circle one:
   1-5 years 6-10 11-15 16-20 21-25 26 or more years ago

8. Student enrollment of district in which you are now superintendent--
   circle one: less than 1000 1000-3000 3000-5000 5000-larger

Please complete and return this form along with your school directory to:

Larry Erion
502 Friendly Drive
Marshalltown, Iowa 50158

APPENDIX B. RESEARCHER-DEVELOPED QUESTIONNAIRE

PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT--SUPERINTENDENT

SUPERINTENDENT'S NAME _____ DATE _____

Please mark on the scale to the right how well you feel the superintendent named above discharges his/her responsibility in each of the twelve areas listed. PLEASE READ THE DEFINITIONS BEFORE MARKING.

AREA OF RESPONSIBILITY	ASSESSMENT Very Well 5 4 3 2 1 Poorly
1. Problem Analysis Ability to seek out relevant data and analyze complex information to determine the important elements of a problem situation; searching for information with a purpose.	|___|___|___|___|___|
2. Judgment Ability to reach logical conclusions and make high quality decisions based on available information; skill in identifying educational needs and setting priorities; ability to critically evaluate written communication.	|___|___|___|___|___|
3. Organizational Ability Ability to plan, schedule and control the work of others; skill in using resources in an optimal fashion; ability to deal with a volume of paperwork and heavy demands on one's time.	|___|___|___|___|___|
4. Decisiveness Ability to recognize when a decision is required (disregarding the quality of the decision) and to act quickly.	|___|___|___|___|___|
5. Leadership Ability to get others involved in solving problems; ability to recognize when a group requires direction, to interact with a group effectively and guide it to the accomplishment of a task.	|___|___|___|___|___|
6. Stress Tolerance Ability to perform under pressure and during opposition; ability to think on one's feet.	|___|___|___|___|___|

Continued next page

	Very Well				Poorly
7. Sensitivity Ability to perceive the needs, concerns and personal problems of others; skill in resolving conflicts; tact in dealing with persons from different backgrounds; ability to deal effectively with people concerning emotional issues; knowing what information to communicate and to whom.	5	4	3	2	1
8. Oral Communication Ability to make a clear oral presentation of facts or ideas.	5	4	3	2	1
9. Written Communication Ability to express ideas clearly in writing; to write appropriately for different audiences--students, teachers, parents, et al.	5	4	3	2	1
10. Financial Management Ability to develop a sound fiscal plan and provide direction and cost-effective management of resources.	5	4	3	2	1
11. Personal Motivation Desire to achieve in all activities attempted; evidence that work is important to personal satisfaction; ability to be self-policing; a self-starter.	5	4	3	2	1
12. Educational Values Possession of a well-reasoned educational philosophy; receptiveness to new ideas and change; has a vision for education and his/her school district.	5	4	3	2	1
PART II Please indicate how well you feel the superintendent performs overall, in light of what you have said in PART I.	5	4	3	2	1

Please check your present role from the following:

_____ Board Member _____ Administrator _____ Teacher

Please return this questionnaire in the attached postage-paid, addressed envelope by March 22, 1985. Thank you.

APPENDIX C. COVER LETTER AND ACCOMPANYING SURVEY

December 12, 1984

Dear Colleague:

In January, 1983, you participated in a research project which focused on the field of educational administration. The intent of the project was to compare the reactions of a sample of exemplary superintendents regarding certain in-basket situations with the reactions of a random sampling of superintendents. We are now in the process of verifying that procedure to ascertain its value for future research.

We need your assistance once again in identifying a pool of exemplary superintendents. Attached to this letter is a list of the superintendents in your Area Education Agency. Please select two superintendents, other than yourself, who you would consider exemplary. To avoid identifying individuals with a singular strong suit, consider the overall performance of the individual in the areas of personnel, curriculum, collective bargaining, policy-making, and planning. Also, if you know of any exemplary superintendents who are not within your AEA geographic boundaries, please list them in the space provided.

When you have identified the two exemplary superintendents in your area, place the identification sheet in the attached envelope, seal it, and forward it by January 4 to your AEA Educational Services Director via the AEA media van. The Educational Services Director has agreed to send the sealed envelopes to us. These steps will assure the confidentiality of your responses.

Thank you for assisting in the identification of exemplary superintendents and verifying this procedure.

Sincerely,

Dr. Ross Engel, Professor
Educational Administration
Iowa State University
Ames, Iowa 50011

Larry Erion
Graduate Student
Iowa State University

Enclosures

SURVEY

From the list below, select two superintendents who you would consider exemplary and write their names in the blanks at the right.

	Superintendent	District
1.	Mr. D. D. Bremer	Bedford
2.	Mr. Otis Chubick	B-F Community
3.	Mr. Loyd A. Johnson	Central Decatur
4.	Dr. Robert B. Siddens	Clarke
5.	Mr. Robert McCurdy	Clearfield
6.	Dr. Kenneth Mallas	Corning
7.	Mr. Paul Grumley	Creston
8.	Mr. Dennis Tassell	Diagonal
9.	Mr. Gary Cowell	East Union
10.	Mr. William Hullinger	Grand Valley
11.	Mr. William Sandholm	Greenfield
12.	Mr. David L. Clinefelter	Lamoni
13.	Mr. Ralph Rogers	Lenox
14.	Mr. Charles J. Helin	Mormon Trail
15.	Mr. Philip Burmeister	Mount Ayr
16.	Dr. Dan Roe	Murray
17.	Mr. David Anctil	New Market
18.	Mr. Tom Spear	O-M Community
19.	Mr. Craig Okerberg	Prescott
20.	Mr. Craig Scott	Red Oak
21.	Mr. James Poole	Stanton
22.	Mr. Richard Dexter	Villisca

Supt's Name	District
Supt's Name	District

If you wish to offer the name of an exemplary superintendent who resides outside the AEA 14 geographic boundaries, list his/her name and district below.

Supt. outside AEA 14	District

****

Please place this form in the enclosed envelope, seal it, and return it to your Educational Services Director via the AEA delivery van. Thank you.

APPENDIX D. COVER LETTER ACCOMPANYING DEMOGRAPHICS PAGE

502 Friendly Drive
Marshalltown, Iowa
January 31, 1985

Dear Colleague:

In 1983, you participated in a study regarding exemplary superintendents conducted by David Haggard. The exemplary superintendents were peer-selected. Some question has arisen as to whether school board members, administrative team members, and teachers would perceive this group as exemplary also. We believe they will. Therefore, would you assist us in confirming same? All information obtained from representatives of these groups will remain confidential.

Please acknowledge your willingness to participate in this study by completing and returning the attached demographics page and forwarding us a school directory or school lists that include three items: your board members' names with length of tenure and home addresses, administrative team members' names with respective position identified, and a list of teaching staff with an elementary (K-6) or secondary (7-12) teaching assignment identified. Please forward this information to Larry Erion's address by February 12, 1985.

When the study is completed, we will not return specific profiles or results to any member of any district. Again, all information will remain confidential. However, if you desire, a general summary of the study will be provided upon request to you (superintendents) only. Inquiries concerning procedures of the study may be directed to Larry Erion. Also, withdrawal from the study by participants may occur at any time without prejudice to the superintendent or his/her respective district's participants.

Sincerely,

Larry Erion
Graduate Student
502 Friendly Drive
Marshalltown, Iowa 50158

Dr. Ross Engel
Professor of Education
Iowa State University
Ames, Iowa 50011

APPENDIX E. COVER LETTER ACCOMPANYING QUESTIONNAIRE

502 Friendly Drive
Marshalltown, Iowa 50158
March 6, 1985

Dear School Board Member, Administrator, or Teacher:

Your superintendent has been selected, along with some sixty superintendents across the state of Iowa, to participate in a study regarding the role of the superintendent in effective schools. His/her willingness to participate also required the participation of some members of his/her district's board of education, administrative team, and teaching staff. These members were randomly-selected from your respective school district directory with the superintendent having no knowledge of who has been selected. Nor will he/she receive any specific information regarding himself/herself at the close of the study. When the study is completed, general information and conclusions drawn regarding the role of the superintendency in effective education in the state of Iowa will be made available to any superintendent of any school district who has interest in the study. However, the names of the superintendents and the school districts participating in the study will remain confidential.

When you have completed the attached questionnaire, please forward it directly to Larry Erion in the enclosed stamped envelope by March 22, 1985. Please do not sign the questionnaire. Thank you for your assistance in this study.

Sincerely,

Larry Erion
Graduate Student
502 Friendly Dr.
Marshalltown, Iowa 50158

Dr. Ross Engel
Professor of Education
Iowa State University

APPENDIX F. FOLLOW-UP LETTER

502 Friendly Dr.
Marshalltown, IA 50158
March 22, 1985

Dear School Board Member, Administrator, or Teacher:

In January, your superintendent was selected, along with some sixty superintendents across the state of Iowa, to participate in a study regarding the role of the superintendent in effective schools. His/her willingness to participate also required the participation of some members of his/her district's board of education, administrative team, and teaching staff. These members were selected from your respective school district directory with the superintendent having no knowledge of who had been selected.

On March 6, 1985, we forwarded you a short questionnaire which will help us gather information for part of this study. In you have not completed this instrument, we ask that you please do so and return it as soon as possible. (A second copy and return envelope are provided for your convenience.) If you have completed and returned the form, we thank you for your assistance in the study.

Sincerely,

Larry Erion
Graduate Student
502 Friendly Dr.
Marshalltown, IA 50158

Dr. Ross Engel
Professor of Education
Iowa State University

APPENDIX G. DIMENSIONS OF MANAGEMENT EFFECTIVENESS

DIMENSIONS OF MANAGEMENT EFFECTIVENESS

1.	Problem Analysis	Ability to seek out relevant data and analyze complex information to determine the important elements of a problem situation; searching for information with a purpose.
2.	Judgment	Ability to reach logical conclusions and make high quality decisions based on available information; skill in identifying educational needs and setting priorities; ability to critically evaluate written communication.
3.	Organizational Ability	Ability to plan, schedule and control the work of others; skill in using resources in an optimal fashion; ability to deal with a volume of paperwork and heavy demands on one's time.
4.	Decisiveness	Ability to recognize when a decision is required (disregarding the quality of the decision) and to act quickly.
5.	Leadership	Ability to get others involved in solving problems; ability to recognize when a group requires direction, to interact with a group effectively and guide it to the accomplishment of a task.
6.	Stress Tolerance	Ability to perform under pressure and during opposition; ability to think on one's feet.
7.	Sensitivity	Ability to perceive the needs, concerns, and personal problems of others; skill in resolving conflicts; tact in dealing with persons from different backgrounds; ability to deal effectively with people concerning emotional issues; knowing what information to communicate and to whom.
8.	Oral Communication	Ability to make a clear oral presentation of facts or ideas.

9.	Written Communication	Ability to express ideas clearly in writing; to write appropriately for different audiences--students, teachers, parents, et al.
10.	Financial Management	Ability to develop a sound fiscal plan and provide direction and cost-effective management of resources.
11.	Personal Motivation	Desire to achieve in all activities attempted; evidence that work is important to personal satisfaction; ability to be self-policing; a self-starter.
12.	Educational Values	Possession of a well-reasoned educational philosophy; receptiveness to new ideas and change; has a vision for education and his or her school district.

APPENDIX H.

SUMMARY TABLE OF THE GROUP MEANS OF BOARD MEMBERS, ADMINISTRATORS, AND TEACHERS' RATINGS OF SUPERINTENDENTS ON THE TWELVE DIMENSIONS OF EFFECTIVENESS AND THE SINGLE MEASURE OF OVERALL EFFECTIVENESS

Table 13. Summary table of the group means of board members, administrators, and teachers' ratings of superintendents on the twelve dimensions of effectiveness and the single measure of overall effectiveness (N=60)

Dimension	Board members		Administrators		Teachers	
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.
Problem Analysis	4.35	.56	4.36	.72	3.86	.67
Judgment	4.31	.58	4.29	.79	3.58	.93
Organizational Ability	4.42	.67	4.31	.85	3.97	.86
Decisiveness	4.44	.61	4.32	.89	4.08	.81
Leadership	4.23	.75	4.06	.89	3.43	.98
Stress Tolerance	3.98	.75	4.21	.95	3.80	1.03
Sensitivity	3.79	.75	3.78	.91	2.99	1.15
Oral Communication	4.23	.72	4.21	.70	3.87	.96
Written Communication	4.37	.58	4.27	.68	3.96	.76
Financial Management	4.50	.70	4.56	.66	4.18	.78
Personal Motivation	4.46	.59	4.59	.58	4.29	.73
Educational Values	4.44	.75	4.29	.83	3.78	1.06
Overall Effectiveness	4.39	.62	4.32	.78	3.72	.96