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ABSTRACT

Manning, Robert Lewis. A Comparative Analysis of Leadership Skills: Military, Corporate, and Educational as a Basis for Diagnostic Principal Assessment.

The purpose of this study was to examine the respondents’ perceptions pertaining to specific characteristics of effective leadership from the corporate, military, and educational domains. The superintendents who are responsible for evaluating a principal’s effectiveness were the determining factor in the development of the diagnostic principal assessment instrument.

The study explored the process of developing a diagnostic instrument that superintendents would be able to use to assess the leadership characteristics of principals. The sample included 300 superintendents located throughout the United States, in rural, suburban and urban school districts. A survey was developed, piloted, validated, and mailed to each superintendent in the sample. The total responses yielded a 75 percent return rate within a two-week period.

The findings of this research determined the significant factors that lead to effective leadership. The results supported that all predicted characteristics in the main survey were significant for effective leadership. Based on the analysis of data collected for this research project, the conclusion was drawn that there is a need for an instrument to assess the leadership characteristics of Principals.
Based on the findings of this study, the Diagnostic Principal Assessment Instrument that was developed may be considered as a viable means of assessing the effectiveness of principals. For further research, one may use more extensive analytical approaches.

Recommendations:

1. As society, climates, and culture change, so will the demands and responsibilities of the school principal. It is recommended that a replication of this study be conducted, with a similar sample population to provide an update and additional information.

2. Other research methods may provide information that is not easily obtained in a survey instrument. It is recommended that the study be replicated using data gathered through the case study method, personal interviews, and on-the-job observations.

3. After performing a Factor Analysis on all the variables, results suggest a correlation between several factors. In a follow-up investigation, a regression analysis could be performed on scored diagnostic assessment instruments, and correlated factors.
I. INTRODUCTION

Leadership may look and be different depending on whether it is experienced in a legislative setting, on a battlefield, at a rally, on a factory floor, or in a school district (Sergiovanni, 1999, p.1). Leadership has existed as long as civilization. There were individuals throughout history that led societies, governments, armies, corporations, systems of reasoning and intellectual interpretation and expression. America has had a love affair with leadership since its inception as a nation; from Washington, Lincoln, Vanderbilt, Roosevelt, Kennedy, to the present.

Whether it is the military, the corporate world, or the education arena, individuals have accepted the challenge to lead such important and vital entities. Within each field the question arises, what is leadership? The improvement potential for leadership falls into two main areas: 1) leadership skills and, 2) the changes in organizations that will allow such leadership to flourish (Creech, 1984). These changes and concepts must be based on a greater appreciation for the nature of human beings. In addition, we must also appreciate how fundamentally our organizational approaches influence the proper functioning of leadership; specifically how some approaches facilitate and others stifle the leadership process.

The Army’s field Manual FM22-100, p.1-4, states that, leadership is influencing people by providing purpose, direction, and motivation while operating to accomplish the mission and improving the organization. Army leadership consists of three (3) levels of leadership: direct, organizational, and
strategic. *Direct leadership* is face to face, first-line leadership where subordinates see their leaders at all times as: teams, squads, sections, platoons, companies, batteries, troops, and even as squadrons and battalions. The direct leader's span of influence may range from a handful to several hundreds of people (FM-22-100, p1-11). *Organizational leaders* influence several hundred to several thousand people. They do this indirectly, generally through more levels of subordinates than do direct leaders. The additional levels of subordinates can make it more difficult to see results. Organizational leaders have staffs to help them lead their people and manage their organization’s resources. They establish policies and the organizational climate that support their subordinate leaders (FM 22-100,p.1-11). *Strategic leaders* are responsible for large organizations and influence several thousand to hundreds of thousands of people. They establish force structure, allocate resources, communicate strategic vision, and prepare their commands and America's Army as a whole for future roles (FM22-100, p.1-12).

The corporate world employs various definitions of leadership such as: A leader is an individual within an organization who is able to influence the attitudes and opinions of others within an organization (Byars, 1987,p.159). According to Barach and Eckhardt, (1996), it is the package of personal qualities that focuses on the emotional side of directing organizations. Its dimensions are symbolic, charismatic, inspirational, and highly personal. Leadership can be broken down into four major segments: Leading, Empowering, Anchoring, and Doing. Leadership can be further described with 20 components as characterized in
“The Bedrock of Leadership, the Commitment to Being a Leader” (Barach and Eckhardt, 1996, p.39-40).

It appears that, trust is the essential link vital to job satisfaction and loyalty and vital to followership. Organizations seeking rapid improvement require trust in their exceptional effort and competence, particularly in organizations like schools that offer few extrinsic motivators. School leaders seeking change need to begin by thinking about attributes to inspire trust among its constituents. Qualities that are the basis of trust would include leaders who are honest, fair, competent and forward-looking (Kouzes and Posner, 1987).

Innovative leadership in any organization cannot thrive without trust, but more than trust is needed. Innovation requires trust and confidence. However we cannot have confidence in those we distrust, nor do we necessarily have confidence in all those we trust. Some people possessing qualities of sincerity and honesty beyond reproach may lack the capacity to translate goals into reality. Others may have lofty ideals and even fulfill them in their personal lives, but are unable to communicate clearly to those in the organization, or are inept at handling daily events. The transformation of schools as organizations will require that principals, superintendents, and other school leaders inspire such confidence along with trust, authenticity (Fullan, 2000).
**Statement of Problem / Purpose**

The purpose of this study is to examine and compare the overlap of effective leadership characteristics within the military, corporate, and educational domains.

In order to lead a squad, platoon, company, battalion, brigade, division, or army group and be effective and successful, that individual needs to possess certain leadership skills (characteristics) that can be attributable to the effective and successful accomplishment of the mission.

Likewise, if a corporation is going to grow, be prosperous, and maintains its drive, it needs an individual at the head who can provide the necessary leadership to ensure that the growth and prosperity of the corporation is accomplished. For schools and school districts to be effective and successful, there is a need to have effective leadership at the school and district level. The type of leadership that is provided by individuals at those levels is an integral part of the success or lack of success within a school or a school district.

**Research Question**

The overarching research question for this study is: *What makes an effective and successful leader, specifically at the school level?* How do leadership skills from the military and corporate worlds inform educational leadership? The skills or characteristics that a leader possesses and utilizes in one area may or may not lead to effectiveness in other areas. Guy (1994) reported that superintendents and corporate presidents used similar leadership
styles that were consultative and democratic. Most used a task-oriented approach and saw themselves as initiators, rather than as responders. Krasmir, et.al (1996) stated that military institutions have a comprehensive leadership curriculum, which employs many of the common practices of the business and academic world. In order to obtain information relating to this question, the responses of educational leaders will be solicited. The leadership styles, skills and expectations of principals and superintendents in education will be compared to that of generals and colonels in the military, and presidents and vice presidents of corporations. History has shown the critical roles leaders and leadership play in organizational success whether the organization is a military force, business endeavor or any other grouping of diverse individuals working toward common organizational goals (General Ronald Fogleman, 1995; Krasmir, et. al, 1999).

**Related Research Questions:**

1. What are common agreed upon characteristics and differences among military, corporate, and educational leaders?

2. How can knowledge of common agreed upon standard characteristics and differences among military, corporate, and educational leaders form the development of an educational leadership diagnostic assessment instrument?

An expected contribution from this study will be the development of an instrument to assess leadership skills, abilities and styles, for effective leadership
of successful schools. Efforts in preparing leaders imply the need to develop
diagnostic assessments and to enhance a principal's capacity for effective
leadership towards student educational success.

Definition of Terms
The following terms are defined for the purpose of this study:

1. **Emotional Intelligence**: a type of intelligence that involves the
   ability to monitor the emotions of others and the individual's own
   emotional state, to discriminate among these emotions, and to use
   this information to guide thinking and actions (Salovey and Mayer,
   1990).

2. **Leadership**: involving the five leadership practices of: (1)
   challenging the process, (2) inspiring a shared vision, (3) enabling
   others to act, (4) modeling the way, and (5) encouraging the heart
   (Kouzes and Posner, 1998).

   In this study, research data will be attained from principals and
   superintendents to examine and compare the relationship of effective leadership
   characteristics reported in the military, corporate and educational literature.
   Through the use of a questionnaire, a survey will be conducted with a preplanned
   set of questions designed to yield specific information (Key, 1997) towards the
   development of an instrument that could assess, leadership skills, abilities and
   styles for effective leadership of successful schools.

Advantages to using a questionnaire are (Key, 1997):

- Economy - Expense and time involved in training interviewers and
  sending them to interview are reduced by using questionnaires.
• Uniformity of questions - Each respondent receives the same set of questions phrased in exactly the same way. Questionnaires may, therefore, yield data more comparable than information obtained through an interview.

• Standardization - If the questions are highly structured and the conditions under which they are answered are controlled, then the questionnaire could become standardized.

Delimitations

1. The researcher recognizes the following delimitations inherent in the use of a survey that was designed as a mail questionnaire.

A. Disadvantages (Key, 1997):
   • Respondent's motivation is difficult to assess and may affect the validity of response.
   • Unless a random sampling of returns is sought, those returned completed may represent biased samples.

B. Factors affecting the percentage of returned questionnaires (Key, 1997):
   • Length of the questionnaire.
   • Reputation of the sponsoring agency.
   • Complexity of the questions asked.
   • Relative importance of the study to the potential respondent.
   • Extent to which the respondent believes that his responses are important.
   • Quality and design of the questionnaire.
   • Time of year the questionnaires are sent out.

C. There is a lack of flexibility due to the lack of personal exchange between the researchers and the subjects. The opportunity for a direct face-to-face attempt to obtain verbal responses from one or
more respondents is not available to allow the researcher to ask clarifying questions. Collecting quantified, comparable data from all subjects in a uniform manner introduces rigidity into the investigative procedures that may prevent the researcher from probing in sufficient depth (Key, 1997).

D. The use of a mail questionnaire does not allow the researcher to observe verbal and non-verbal behavior of the respondents.

E. Delimitations of inferring attitude from expressed opinion (Key, 1997):
   - Individuals may hide their real attitudes and express socially acceptable opinions.
   - Individuals may not really know how they feel about a social issue.
   - Individuals may never have considered the idea seriously.
   - Individuals may not know their attitude about a situation in the abstract and may be unable to predict their reaction or behavior until confronted with a real situation.
**Methodology**

The methodology chosen for this study will be a quantitative design. Studies aimed at quantifying relationships are of two types: descriptive and experimental (Hopkins, 2000). The research design for this study will be a descriptive study to determine the relationships that exist between effective educational, military and corporate leadership. In a descriptive study, no attempt is made to change behavior or conditions, things are measured as they are, to establish only associations between variables (Hopkins, 2000). Through a pilot study survey of principals using purposive sampling, and the overall study of a random sample of superintendents using a baseline survey, this study will examine and compare the overlap of effective leadership skills within the military, corporate, and educational domains. The primary method of data collection will be a survey designed to ascertain the relationship of effective leadership by leaders in the military, corporate and educational domain. Procedures used to gather the data for this study will be presented in Chapter Three.
II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

History has shown the critical roles leaders and leadership play in organizational success, whether the organization is a military force, business endeavor, the educational arena or any other grouping of diverse individuals, working toward common organizational goals. When organizations have a widely shared vision, employees better understand their own roles and “are transformed from robots blindly following instructions to human beings engaged in creative and purposeful venture” (Bennis, 1991). Effective leaders with a vision are able to attract commitment and energize people; create meaning in worker's lives; establish a standard of excellence, and bridge the present and the future.

This review of the literature will explore dimensions of effective leadership and commonly accepted principles categorized according to personal attributes, leader behaviors and organizational outcomes. Corporate leadership will be examined for comparative managerial, administrative and leadership styles between school leaders and corporate presidents. Military leadership will be analyzed to better understand leadership as it influences people by providing purpose, direction and motivation, while operating to accomplish the mission and improving the organization.

Perspectives of leadership with regard to the respective roles played by the leader and follower has changed dramatically in this century. In the nineteenth century, the industrial revolution pulled many Americans out of rural areas into the city where industry was producing unprecedented wealth at the
expense of the worker. Working conditions were appalling as management ruled, tyrannically enjoying enormous power to hire, fire, and generally dictate working conditions for the worker. We began the twentieth century focused almost exclusively on a leader-dominant theory of leadership that assumed a low opinion of the followers' motivation, maturity, and abilities. In the early part of the twentieth century, child labor laws and unions helped improve working conditions of America workers but also exacerbated the divisive relationship between management and labor, leader and follower. The military, long a bastion for authoritarian leaders, also maintained a predominantly authoritarian leadership style. Almost all leadership theory is based on the relative importance assigned to the leader versus the follower in mission accomplishment. Those who believe that leaders are sufficiently enlightened or heroic (Janowitz, 1964) cite examples of bold leaders such as Napoleon, Alexander, and Frederick the Great, and favor the authoritarian model of leadership. Those who have greater confidence in the followers' maturity, capability, and insights favor the democratic model (Waddell, 1994).

General W.L. Creech (1984) stated that leadership at all levels can flourish only if it is not strangled by misguided organizational concepts and approaches that leave little or no room for true and effective leadership, creativity and innovation at the levels where the organization either thrives or flounders. Recognizing that we manage and lead very well indeed in the United States Air Force, and every bit as well as the norm in US industry, there is considerable improvement that can occur (Creech, 1984). The improvement potential falls into
two main areas: leadership and the changes in organization that will allow such leadership to flourish. As we look to the future, changes and concepts of leadership must be based on a new appreciation for the nature of human beings, and on a greater understanding of the central and critical role played by leadership. Any organization, whatever its nature or orientation must create focus and commitment on the part of its members (Creech, 1984). Effective leadership begins with people and is a fundamental truth in all walks of life, public and private. One should always consider the people first, treat them well, and place paramount importance on their welfare, morale and the opportunity to grow and excel (Creech, 1984).

**Effective Leadership**

Leadership effectiveness is summarized in the major findings of significant research studies dealing with different leadership behaviors and strategies for increasing leadership effectiveness. Fiedler's Contingency Theory of Leadership Effectiveness (1967) emphasizes that a leader's effectiveness is determined by how well his leadership style fits the specific situation. Fiedler uses this theory to analyze the impact of training and experience on leadership effectiveness. Kunz and Hoy (1976) focused on the leadership behaviors of “initiating structure” and “consideration” and examine which behavior is more influential on teachers. Piper (1978) compares the quality of problem-solving decisions made by individuals with the decisions made by groups and concludes that groups did consistently better than individuals. By comparing group members’ reactions to
three types of participative decision-making, Lowell (1978) demonstrated that
the success of participative decision-making depends on the method of
governance used. The implications of these studies are that principals can do
any of several things to increase their effectiveness as leaders, but insofar as
leadership needs vary with different situations, there are no absolute guidelines
for effective leadership (Research Action Brief, 1978).

Thomas and Ogletree (1986) analyzed trends over the past 25 years in
research on evaluation of school administrative leadership and found that
administrator evaluation became a concern as the principal's influence on the
performance and attitudes of faculty and staff was realized. Research on
organizational psychology demonstrated the relationship between leadership
effectiveness and subordinates' confidence. Recent research in school
improvement stresses teacher attitudes toward the role of principal. Although
surveys show that teachers and administrators believe they should make
decisions about teaching and evaluation procedures together, findings also
indicate teachers have a lack of knowledge about the issues involved in teacher
evaluation. Early research on principals tended to focus on leadership traits
which were described as either “authoritarian” or “democratic” in nature.
Mintzberg (1973) established an undisputed administrative model based on the
finding that leadership style had more influence on managers’ work behavior than
did situational variables. More recent research has investigated the relationship
between the perceived leadership style of principals and the acceptance of
teachers in professional matters. Attitude surveys attempt to balance the
variables of a leader’s personality characteristics, the type of situation, and subordinates’ personality characteristics as determinants of the most effective leadership practices. Investigators can now state that leadership research cannot specify the proper practices for all situations.

Chand (1987) stated that administrators who have been trained in the sciences may be more effective than those who have been trained in the humanities. Chand asserted that the effectiveness of superintendents is a function both of their specific preparation for administration and of their educational backgrounds. Their effectiveness can be assessed in the areas of planning, organizing, staffing, directing, coordinating, reporting, and budgeting through scientific management techniques. Those with scientific training better handle the scientific aspects of management, but the humanistic aspects are better handled as well.

Chand (1988) further argued that excellence in American education requires increased superintendent effectiveness and productivity, which includes more effective selection procedures, better working conditions, greater job satisfaction, and national certification. However, Duttweiler and Hord (1987) emphasized that the bureaucratic structure of most schools is not conducive to educational excellence. Policymakers should include “leadership for change” as a competency needed to redesign school organizational structure.

Seasoned professionals in education, all in leadership roles presented their approach to leadership by identifying three commonalities. Their approaches revealed that: (1) leaders must be empowered in order to be
effective; (2) the study of leadership is based on the perspective of the work each leader performs professionally; and, (3) a professional dialogue, sharing discontinuities and continuities, prevails in the exercise of leadership (Empowered Leadership: Effective Schools, 1989).

Sashkin and Sashkin (1990) stated that understanding effective school leadership, as a function of culture building requires quantitative and qualitative research analyses. The two-part quantitative phase of their research focused on statistical measures of culture and leadership behavior directed toward culture building in the school. Quantitative findings indicated that leadership and culture are significantly interrelated. Overall, visionary leadership behavior relates most strongly to teamwork, and effective leadership characteristics are consistent with visionary leadership theory. The qualitative phase of the study applied Deal and Peterson’s (1990) five themes of effective culture building to in-depth case analyses of five exceptional principals. Qualitative findings indicate that all five strategies are major tools of effective school leaders in the culture building process.

Amey (1991) determined that the helpfulness of constructive and developmental theory in studying effective leadership grounded in social science research conducted by Piaget, Kohlberg, Perry, and others, has four stages. In the imperial stage, the individual's frames of reference are personal goals and agendas. At the interpersonal stage, individuals can reflect on others' interests, experience, trust, commitment, and mutuality. Persons in the institutional stage have developed a subjective frame of reference allowing for self-definition in
terms of internal values and standards, not merely connections to others. In the *interindividual stage*, end values have become the object and a “global” worldview becomes the organizing process. The constructive and developmental model was used to analyze transcripts from interviews across five institutional settings (small, private liberal arts colleges) to determine the leader's developmental level, the organization's developmental level, and the leader's perceived effectiveness. Regarding the relationship of effective leadership to leader/constituent developmental congruence, results confirm that constituents can only perceive leadership effectiveness within a particular frame of reference determined by their cognitive development level. Similarly, a leader will only be able to enact leadership within his/her particular frame of reference, again a function of cognitive development. Leaders who are more cognitively developed than the organization can also be perceived as ineffective if they are not employing appropriate leadership strategies based on their constituents' development.

According to O'Toole (1999) leaders need to create high-performing, self-renewing organizations where the emphasis is on action rather than theory. O'Toole emphasizes the notion that most elements of leadership can be learned; and that the only inherent character trait needed for effective leadership is ambition.

Asserting that in order to determine the effectiveness of those in leadership positions accurately and fairly, Rosser, Johnsrud, and Heck (2000) state that an understanding of how individuals and groups of individuals construct
their notions of effective leadership within complex organizations must be
developed. Findings indicated that unit size and external dollars generated are
positively related to perceptions of leadership effectiveness; that women are
viewed as better leaders than men; and that the respondent's place in the
organization affects his or her perception of leadership effectiveness.

Throughout the twentieth century, theoreticians have dissected and
debated the role of school leaders. In one decade, principals are urged to be
“bureaucratic executives”; ten years later the ideal is “humanistic facilitator,”
followed by “instructional leader” (Beck and Murphy, 1993). Until recent years,
these debates occurred at high levels, surfacing mostly in journals, conferences,
and administrator-training programs; meanwhile, the day-to-day life of
administrators proceeded in much the same way that it always had. Today,
however, the role changes are more than theoretical, as rapidly changing school
systems forces leaders to take on unfamiliar tasks, master new skills, and spend
many additional hours on top of their normal schedules (Williams and Portin,
1997).

States are moving toward standards-driven accountability systems, in
which the bottom line is student performance rather than spacious facilities,
qualified teachers, or adequate budgets. Perhaps the most visible indicator of
changed expectations for school leaders is the emergence of new standards for
administrators. The Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium, an
umbrella group for a number of professional organizations, has highlighted six
key administrator responsibilities: facilitating shared vision; sustaining a school
culture conducive to student and staff learning; managing the organization for a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment; collaborating with families and community members; acting with integrity, fairness, and in ethical manner; and influencing the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context.

Two decades ago, few of these responsibilities would have been defined as critical skills, much less embodied in a licensure test, as several states have already done (Murphy, 1997). In the face of these changes, it seems inevitable that the next decade will see further evolution–perhaps revolution–in the role of school leaders.

One major role shift is already apparent: school leaders are increasingly defining themselves as change agents. Encouraging innovation has always been a part of the job description, but until recently the goal was modest incremental change that could be integrated into the existing system. Today the system itself is the target of reform. The task is formidable. Systemic change is not well understood, even by experts, and school leaders have had little training to prepare them for this challenge. Moreover, the reform movement does not present leaders with clear, coherent goals. Widespread dissatisfaction with the status quo has not led to agreement on what should replace it, and different constituencies may envision very different kinds of reform. Somehow a consensus must be created from conflicting visions. In the meantime, schools remain highly regulated institutions, with state regulations, district policy, and union contracts placing severe limits on flexibility and inventiveness.
Uncertainty about the direction of reform is matched by uncertainty over leadership strategies. Restructuring has been accompanied by the emergence of new leadership paradigms, but without replacing the old models. Currently, principals and superintendents can choose at least three major models to guide their actions (Lashway, 1997):

- hierarchical (using rules, policies, and directives to govern from the top down)
- transformational (using moral authority to create commitment to shared ideals)
- facilitative (using teamwork to create participation in collective decision-making).

These three approaches, while offering different ways to look at leadership, and requiring different skills, are not mutually exclusive. Each model offers a useful perspective, calling attention to certain critical attributes of leadership. Each has advantages and disadvantages, and effective school reform may require a “multidimensional” approach. However, we know relatively little about how leaders achieve an integrated strategy, and some analysts have concluded that the answer can only be expressed in terms of “paradox” (Deal and Peterson, 1994).

Perhaps the greatest paradox in current restructuring efforts is the tension between heroic leadership and empowering leadership. The staggering demands of reform seem to call for energetic take-charge strategies; success stories typically focus on principals and superintendents who came in and “turned things around.” Yet most reform efforts envision some form of “distributed leadership,” with leaders urged to disperse decision making throughout the school
community. Superintendents are being asked to decentralize their districts, redistributing authority to the school sites; site leaders are expected to invite teachers and parents into the decision-making process. Early experience indicates that this kind of power redistribution is not easy but effective.

Decentralization efforts are often based on a deep faith in the ability of people to exercise leadership, and are often accompanied by highly optimistic rhetoric. While people are capable of rising to the challenge, they do not necessarily do so immediately or automatically. Administrators must accompany commitment to change with realistic expectations. Shared decision making does not automatically eliminate narrow self-interest or make people more willing to take risks, and transforming attitudes requires continual effort and attention. (Patterson 1998).

Shared power also creates ambiguity. Many principals, while supporting decentralization, report that the parameters of their authority have not been clearly established (Williams and Portin, 1997). The ambiguity runs in two directions. As “leaders in the middle,” principals must know what the district and state will allow them to do. In addition, they must determine when and how they can share decision-making authority with others at their site. At times they describe their task as “oxymoronic”: implementing top-down mandates in a collaborative manner (Cascadden, 1997).

Even when schools are not actively engaged in reform projects, principals and superintendents find themselves continually confronting issues for which they have not been trained, and for which there are no clear answers. The list
includes sexual harassment of students; guns in school, demographic shifts; more rigorous academic standards; and integration of special-needs students into regular classrooms.

No area better illustrates the challenges of unfamiliar ground than technology. Administrators who have never even done word processing find themselves being called upon to decide complex human and technical issues (Trotter 1997). Increasingly, leaders are defining themselves as learners, not just doers, constantly scanning the environment for new ideas, tools, and solutions. To do so, they must overcome numerous barriers: lack of time, insufficient rewards, fear that visibly engaging in learning is an admission of imperfection, and negative attitudes from previous poorly conceived professional development activities (Barth, 1997). School systems can help overcome these obstacles by creating learning opportunities that are reflective, collegial, unconventional, and principal-centered.

At the same time, the complexities of change require learning that is more than a solo activity aimed at individual mastery. Instead, leaders must work to create “learning communities” in which the entire school works together to solve the problems confronting it (Hord, 1997). Leaders create and sustain learning communities by sharing decisions, nurturing a common vision, and providing support for staff learning. They operate collegially, “leading from the center,” placing themselves physically and psychologically among the faculty, stimulating discussion of teaching and learning at every opportunity.
Administrative Leadership

Local school administration first began in the cities of the United States. The first cities to establish the office of the Superintendent of Schools were Buffalo, New York, and Louisville, Kentucky in the year 1837. Soon, other cities followed, and local school administration spread throughout the country (Campbell, Corbally, and Ramseyer, 1966).

During the nineteenth century (especially in cities), school boards hired superintendents, and were often not sure what the job should entail. Many superintendents, before 1890, shifted back and forth from Educational Administration to other occupational careers, such as the Ministry, Law, Business, or Politics (Tyack, 1976). The duties of superintendents usually depended on the expectations of school boards and the motivation and personality of other school officials. Superintendents compared their managerial duties with those of supervisors of factories, but the analogies were nothing more than superficial.

Superintendents of the nineteenth century had to deal with corrupt school boards and different cultures of people who resented forced change. The character and role of the superintendent changed towards the end of the nineteenth century, to include the language of Science and Business during the twentieth century, to justify “Educational Leadership” (Tyack, 1976).
Superintendent Leadership

Predicated on the two basic dimensions of leadership; concern for performance of the organization and for relationships among individuals, Barnett (1982) investigated differences in leadership style effectiveness of elected and appointed superintendents as perceived by principals, school board presidents, the superintendents themselves, and all three together. The findings suggest that appointed superintendents have a greater consensus among superiors and subordinates on their leadership style effectiveness, whereas no conclusive evidence was found to support the contention that a difference exists in leadership style effectiveness of elected and appointed superintendents. Significant differences were observed, however, between superintendents’ self-perceptions and the perceptions of their superiors and subordinates. The implication of these findings is that educational administrators need to cultivate self-awareness by means of communication and feedback with superiors and subordinates (Barnett, 1982).

Behavioral scientists maintain that a board-superintendent relationship thrives only within a total organization that is sound and healthy (Brodinsky, 1983). To develop such an organization, agreement should be reached at the onset on what exactly is board policy and prerogative, and what is in the administrative domain. A board must develop its goals with the superintendent, and both must know and accept their duties and responsibilities and value the roles and contributions of each. The superintendent supplies the board information from many sources without being asked, and the board disseminates
policy statements to the staff and community. A healthy group develops ways to resolve conflict, or continually searches for the ways to do it.

Nottingham (1985) outlined the professional expectations for a superintendent, and organized them under three sets of skills: (a) technical skills, including (1) having language skills, (2) understanding teaching and being a teacher, (3) being current on learning theory, (4) being familiar with a variety of curricula, and (5) acting as a liaison between the board and the staff; (b) conceptual skills including (1) being a visionary, (2) clarifying goals, (3) understanding organizational systems, (4) having good judgment, and (5) understanding community power structures; (c) human skills, including (1) negotiation abilities, (2) catalytic leadership, (3) empathy, (4) high expectations, (5) loyalty, (6) maturity, and (7) a sense of humor.

The concept of the superintendency has changed from that of manager to that of the leader of a school district's quality and effectiveness. The superintendent must understand organizational dynamics in order to balance chief executive leadership with empowerment reform (Crowson and Glass, 1991).

Like the corporate president’s role, the role of the superintendent is changing. Some observers see signs that school leadership is losing its following. Administrators certainly seem to get less respect than once was the case; political attacks are becoming more common, and tenure is short (Newman, 1998). Moreover, critics argue that traditional public support of education is eroding, and that the public is “halfway out the schoolhouse door.”
Whereas school leaders once inherited moral authority, today they have to earn it (Mathews, 1996).

In part, moral authority comes from adherence to basic ethical principles such as honesty, fairness, and compassion. For example, periodic reports of “irregularities” in conducting high-stakes testing have raised questions about administrative ethics (Keller, 1998); even when unproved, allegations undermine public faith in education. While there is no evidence that school leaders are less ethical than other professionals, there is also no reason for complacency.

In a survey of superintendents, Fenstermaker (1996) found that when given an ethical dilemma with a number of proposed solutions, over half chose a response that would be considered unethical by the AASA’s code of ethics. Fenstermaker concluded that many administrators were either unaware of the ethical issues involved or did not care. However, moral authority requires more than individual ethical excellence.

Leaders must create a consensus on purpose and practice that serves as a moral standard for everyone in the school (Sergiovanni, 1996). By continually raising questions about purpose, institutionalizing shared value and motivating others by example, school leaders establish a “moral voice” that infuses the school community. Sergiovanni argues that principals go astray when they treat their schools as formal organizations rather than as living communities.

Johnson (1998) likewise suggested that educational leadership is built on virtues such as honesty and respect. She found that new superintendents established their credibility by initially listening and learning before making
judgments or imposing solution. However, they were also firm in communicating what they saw as strengths and weaknesses of the district and establishing an agenda for action. Both staff and community were able to accept messages delivered in such a respectful and straightforward manner.

After recognizing the accomplishments of Paul B. Salmon and other great U.S. superintendents, Hoyle (1988) describes the current media image of school superintendents. Superintendents are frequently stereotyped as insensitive, uncreative bureaucrats who are totally isolated—until more tax monies are needed or the latest school riot needs to be explained. Despite the superintendence’s importance in the effective schools movement, only a few research studies have analyzed the superintendent's influence on schooling and student performance. Existing literature addresses three general areas: (1) the profile of the superintendent as a white, male, middle-aged, well-educated conservative who retains the job for seven years; (2) the identification and validity of the administrative skills needed for success; and (3) growing evidence that the superintendent's role should involve tighter instructional controls. The inadequacy of university preparation programs and professional development efforts has spurred a nationwide effort to reform institutions and improve administrator qualifications. Hoyle outlines a professional studies model featuring strengthened admissions criteria and residency requirements, new interdisciplinary partnerships among faculty, a revised faculty reward system, creative and intuitive mentors, and increased funding to support the model. The 21st century
superintendent must be a creative, dynamic pathfinder possessing appropriate human, technical, and conceptual skills.

Crowson and Glass (1991) examined the changing role of the local school district superintendent, which focuses on the link between the local education executive officers and school effectiveness. It is argued that the concept of the superintendency has changed from that of a manager to that of the leader of school district quality and effectiveness. Four directions of emerging research support this conclusion: (1) executive leadership has an impact on school effectiveness; (2) superintendency success stories are worth noting and replicating; (3) superintendents must understand organizational dynamics in order to balance chief executive officer (CEO) leadership with empowerment reform; and (4) the political and environmental contexts affect the superintendency. Evidence of the new role is found in the current press toward improved CEO training. It is concluded that whatever reforms transpire in CEO training, there will surely be a renewed emphasis on the practical realities of leading schools toward quality improvement in the workplace.

Myers (1992) discussed superintendency expectations and effective schools, and indicated that superintendents must have effective administrative management and supervision skills plus the ability to evaluate principals’ instructional leadership. Though there is increased emphasis on instruction, research does not suggest the superintendent’s position is any more vulnerable. Tracy (1994) compared the managerial, administrative, and leadership styles of public-school superintendents and presidents of public corporations. Findings
show that superintendents and corporate presidents used similar leadership styles—consultative and democratic. Most used a task-oriented approach and saw themselves as initiators, rather than as responders. However, superintendents are subject to more pressure from community interest groups and may need to be more flexible. Superintendents and corporate presidents can learn from each other about human relations, employee motivation, and empowerment. Both groups relied on a managerial cabinet to help make decisions. Finally, most superintendents and presidents disagreed that their leadership styles were interchangeable, citing the differences in the organizations they represent (i.e., education versus goods and services). It is recommended that superintendents: (1) identify the leadership styles appropriate to their organizations, but maintain flexibility; (2) continue to rely on subordinate input and use a team orientation; (3) utilize their instructional leadership role; and (4) inform the community of district concerns.

Bogue (1994) outlined qualities of higher education institutional leadership and discussed how college administrators may bring about effective leadership based on honor, dignity, curiosity, candor, compassion, courage, excellence, and service. He was able to link the conceptual and the moral elements of leadership to a set of design ideals whose power and effectiveness can be demonstrated both philosophically and empirically. It is argued that leaders are designers who have a special freedom and responsibility to apply their ideals in the practice and tactics of leadership. Further, effective leadership is a conceptual, moral, and performing art form in which ideas and ideals are tested integrated, and utilized
in the performance. More specifically, Bogue's major goals was to aid leaders who have contended with moral issues of difficult demarcation, who have agonized over the guidance of their own conscience and the judgment of an opposing majority, and who have struggled to know what it means to answer the call of honor.

School leaders seem to be responding to new challenges by simply working harder. New responsibilities are “layered” atop old ones, sometimes in contradictory ways (Williams and Portin, 1997). The result may be declining morale and diminished enthusiasm. Even for those who avoid despair, working harder has limits. Principals become enslaved to the job's daily demands, responding to each crisis it occurs, kept off balance by “the constant bombardment of new tasks and the continual interruptions” (Fullan, 1998). Leaders in this situation become dependent on the latest method for success being marketed by the reigning gurus. Fullan argued that the only way to break the gridlock is “giving up the futile search for the silver bullet.” Instead, school leaders should seek answers closer to home, and accept that there are no clear solutions.

Leaders also seem to be searching for the right balance between managing (handling the routine, technical functions of school operation) and leading (setting directions and creating purpose). Cascadden (1997) found that principals recognized and accepted both functions as essential but reported that the reform movement was squeezing them between contradictory demands. On the one hand, restructuring has pushed more management decisions to the
school site; on the other hand, the current wave of reform has emphasized the importance of empowering leadership. This creates an obvious time crunch, as well as the challenge of being both efficient and collaborative—in a system that retains a top-down orientation.

Other studies have suggested that management, with its more immediate demands, may crowd out leadership (Williams and Portin, 1997. In an age of reform, with abundant signs that public schools are on the brink of a major transformation, finding time for leadership may be the most critical challenge facing school leaders. Even in normal times, successful organizations are the ones that continually examine their “theory of the business,” raising blunt questions about the assumptions behind their strategies. If those assumptions are attuned to reality, the organization thrives; if not, it declines (Drucker, 1998).

While the old assumptions about public schools are clearly in doubt, the shape of things to come is not yet in focus. Unless path finding leadership is defined—and supported—as a priority task for school leaders, schools may find that they have created for them rather than the future. Survey data reveal few significant differences between superintendents and business managers suggesting that business managers often perceive correctly to what extent superintendents involve others in decision making entailing school facility acquisition (Ross, 1995). Superintendents were more often collaborative than autocratic in decision-making, particularly, during the “selling” and “occupation” phases of facilities’ planning. “Selling” involved justification to the public for the new school and presentations made in the public arena to persuade members of
the community of the need for the new school. During the “occupation” phase decisions were made to involve parents and other community members in the opening of the new facility through open houses, etc. Superintendents also tended to be highly collaborative when the time came to develop educational specifications for the new building. Business managers’ perceptions for superintendents’ decision processes did not significantly differ.

Leithwood, et.al, (1995) described the results of a study that investigated the nature and consequences of a unique set of university-sponsored school leadership preparation programs. Begun in 1987, the Danforth Foundation Program for the Preparation of School Principals (DPPSP) was part of a two-pronged effort to more fully develop the potential of school leaders to contribute to school reform. Findings indicate that formal school-leadership preparation makes a significant difference in leadership effectiveness and that good theory is of considerable value to school leaders. Regarding the forms of instruction used in the program, the graduates assigned highest ratings to participation in seminars, reflection, and problems-based learning. Colleagues generally perceived program graduates as demonstrating effective leadership. While there was very little variation in respondents’ ratings of program characteristics, these small amounts of variation had important consequences for leader effectiveness. Finally, effective leadership programs provide authentic experiences, stimulate the development of “situated cognition,” and foster real-life problem-solving skills.

The pool of candidates for urban superintendence’s is dwindling, and those who take the jobs are likely to serve for only 2 or 3 years (Kowalski, 1995).
Kowalski explored contemporary conditions surrounding the urban superintendency and looked at the lives of 17 superintendents who were in office in large cities at the start of 1993. All were members of the Council of Great City Schools (CGCS). African Americans and Hispanic Americans occupy over 50 percent of the superintendence’s in CGCS schools, and women fill 15 to 20 percent of the positions. Kowalski revealed that the community environment, organizational climate and culture, controversial school reform policies, and politics affect the overall administrative behavior and the decision-making and effectiveness of the superintendent. This factor is essential for the improvement of urban schools in removing the revolving door, and retaining superintendents long enough for them to be effective. Where power was once the key element to effective leadership, it is now believed that vision, commitment, communication, and shared decision-making are the cornerstones of effective leadership. A more collaborative model of leadership is evolving (Nisivoccia, 1997).

Leslie and Van Velsor (1998) compared the responses of leaders from six European Union countries and the United States about their perceptions of the work-related values of effective leaders and team members. The results not only yield a profile of effective leadership for those working in cross-national teams in the European Union, they also provide a framework for thinking about how to develop effective cross-national alliances everywhere. The findings focus on comparisons and perceptions of effective leadership, effective leaders as team members, effective membership, and effective leadership when working across Europe. The similarities and difference among effective leaders are likewise
detailed, along with leader-member differences and potential conflicts on cross-
national teams. A striking consensus emerged on what will be required of leaders
and members of cross-national teams, such as a balance of approachable, 
democratic, and moderately dominant leadership that blend stability with 
creativity.

In a report, examining the nature and practice of effective leadership in
schools in England and Wales in the 1990s, Day, Harris and Hadfield (1999)
explored how existing theories of effective leadership—purposeful leadership,
transformational leadership, or moral leadership—compared to the practices of 
successful head teachers in times of change. The methodology recognized that
effective leadership was a highly contextualized and relational construct. Analysis
revealed that the various stakeholders shared a broadly similar social
construction of leadership that did not wholly endorse existing theories of
leadership. The heads themselves operated on the basis of both internally and
externally determined measures of quality control; their quality-assurance criteria
had a broader agenda in keeping with a holistic moral vision of a good school
and good teachers. Their leadership approaches did not neatly adhere to existing
leadership theories, in part because the complexity of the role they faced meant
that no one theory could explain existing practices.

Julius, Baldridge, and Pfeffer (1999) wrote a report that focused on the
structural, personal, and situational attributes of effective leadership, including
among the structural attributes rank/position, being in the right unit, one’s location
in a communication network, one’s reporting relationship, control over resource
allocation, and organizational culture. Personal attributes are defined as including vision, ethos, and integrity; intellectual and socialization skills; one’s appearance and social activities; and a willingness to influence. Among situational attributes is the ability to manage external problems and effectively manage external clients. Finally, they discussed how effective administrators enhance their potential for effectiveness, by identifying the following behaviors: exercising influence and persuasion in strategic ways; setting priorities, using structured decision-making processes; establishing policy convergences; building a team; and managing conflict.

Sharp, Malone, Walter, and Supley (2000) investigated female school superintendents’ perceptions about help they received from professional organizations, university programs, or informal networks; the superintendency as a male field; the effect of superintendency on family life; and barriers to the superintendency for women. Surveys indicated that half of the respondents had been assistant or associate superintendents, and the rest had been K-12 principals. Respondents tended to believe that the superintendency was not a man’s territory. Most did not feel that power meant dominance for men and collaboration for women. About three-quarters did not feel restricted by their family situations in applying for superintendent jobs. Half believed that women with families put them before their careers. Barriers to superintendency included lack of: professional networks, encouragement, formal and informal training, membership in the good old boys’ network, and influential sponsors. Most respondents said they would seek the superintendency again.
Thomas (2001) examined research on public school leadership effectiveness, focusing specifically on the superintendent. It begins with a discussion of the historical mission to define leadership effectiveness, followed by a review of existing research on effective school districts and superintendents. The report also analyzes how superintendent effectiveness is defined and measured, concluding that this is one of the major shortcomings in the knowledge base. The report then details the obstacles that superintendents face in effectively managing a school system, including stability, the politicization of the profession, and superintendent and school board relations. Finally, the report presents suggestions for further research, which include addressing concerns regarding various operational definitions of effective leadership, examining the roles of the superintendent in their specific contexts, studying superintendent and school board relations, and providing information for preparing and recruiting effective educational leaders.

**Nontraditional Superintendent Leadership**

Several education reform movements of the last decade or so have targeted “the education establishment” as the enemy of change, and ignored or gotten around, rather than as school leaders whose support would be absolutely crucial to the implementation of any school reform proposal. Certainly without school boards’ and superintendents’ active support, most reforms will end in failure. Yet in both the governors’ summit (led by President Bush) and the business leaders summit (organized by IBM) involving education reform, the key
players in schools were conspicuous by their absence (Hodgkinson, 1999). Even as devolution allows more action at the school building level, the ultimate accountability for the school system rest with the superintendent and board. The largest school systems run operations larger than many corporations- food and transportation services, library/information, equipment purchasing, counseling, school construction/renovation, finance management, community and public relations, athletics, arts, health services, personnel- the list is long. Regardless of devolution, if something goes wrong with any of these areas, the responsibility always stops at the superintendent’s desk (Hodgkinson, 1999).

In virtually every city and country in the nation, education is the largest item in the local budget. For these and other reasons, we need the most highly qualified and skilled people in the superintendency to confront the host of urgent problems besieging American education. Foundation presidents, military and religious leaders, mayors and governors – thousands of leaders of every conceivable kind of organization are available on an updated basis from some reliable source-except superintendents of schools. There are many descriptive studies of the problems of superintendents, the skills they need, their relationships with boards, their changing roles, etc. (e.g. Carter and Cunningham, 1997). However, these are mainly descriptions of the superintendency, not the superintendents.

Benzel, cited by Mathews (2001), remembers John Stanford as one of the earliest and most notable of America's new breed of nontraditional school superintendents, rather than the mechanics of Stanford's success. Stanford, a
former U.S. Army major general took charge in 1995, and changed the public’s perception of the Seattle school system. He brought hope and energy to the system with his charismatic presence, which was demonstrated by a positive, 'can-do' attitude. Stanford's enthusiasm and energy, characteristic of the many new superintendents from the fields of business, law and the military, focused on one thing- results. Stanford wanted a clear accounting of the district's financial health and the achievement of its students so he knew exactly what needed to be done, just as he had to do when he managed all transportation plans and programs for Operation Desert Storm.

In Chicago, New York, San Diego and Oklahoma City, wherever a school board eager for a change had hired a nontraditional superintendent, the first administrative changes have pushed school staff toward making frequent and accurate measurements of what was going on. The word "customers" was not so popular in schools before the nontraditional superintendents arrived, but they used it without embarrassment in their message that the people being served must be satisfied (Mathews, 2001).

Benzel, now the chief operating officer in the Seattle system, says Stanford "brought a rigorous focus on customer service. He created a unit in the district that still exists to coordinate and respond to the public: parents, citizens, and businesses. He proclaimed that the system would be student-focused and rallied the public, educators, support staff and students to that cause. This is the direction most school districts are now going, some with more success than others. The focus on students and parents places emphasis on standards and
testing to attain new levels of achievement required for promotion or graduation. Districts are looking for a self-confident new superintendent like Stanford with a wide experience in another profession, and new ways to make schools work (Mathews, 2001).

Usdan, president of the Washington-based Institute for Educational Leadership, cited by Mathews (2001) stated that the new emphasis is on results that mean student achievement, which is what they were brought in to do. The insistence on school achievement rather than administrative comfort goes back to Fuller, an early nontraditional superintendent. He was the Milwaukee County health and human services director in 1991 when he switched jobs and became school superintendent by eliminating area superintendents, flattening bureaucracy, and getting rid of a number of associate and assistant superintendents with no raises for anyone in the district to keep from cutting programs for kids” in the economic downturn of the early 1990s.

In each district with a new nontraditional superintendent, the approach was slightly different, depending on customs, finances and personalities. In most cases, outsider methodology includes some of what Fuller and Stanford did, getting more money to where it would do the most good (Mathew, 2001).

The same has happened in other big cities that have brought in nontraditional superintendents. Vallas, appointed CEO of the Chicago school system, was even more drastic in his cleansing and restructuring of his school system’s broken administrative structure. Vallas replaced every department head and program director, not only at the top spot but even went two or three
deep in some places. Vallas was put in charge of the state-ordered overhaul of
the Chicago system by Mayor Richard Daley after he spent five years as the city
budget director and director of revenue. He taught public finance at Sangamon
State University and was a revenue analyst in the state senate. Financial
accountability was vital to his plans as superintendent, and in the course of a few
weeks he consolidated operations along corporate lines with many budgeting
experts like himself in key positions (Mathews, 2001).

In New York, nontraditional schools chancellor Levy was distinguished by
similar efforts to reduce fat and improve analysis at his headquarters in Brooklyn.
He left most matters of curricular reform to deputy chancellor for instruction,
Judith A. Rizzo. Levy, an attorney who formerly worked for Citigroup, cut away a
thick outer layer of regulations and hired a half dozen senior executives with
business and political backgrounds to get a better handle on how to measure and
motivate school progress for quality control. Levy, cited by Mathews (2001),
stated that when he first convened the senior cabinet there was basically no
professional development person, no training person, no management systems
person, no quality control person and not much of an internal audit function.
Faced with a fractured administrative setup, Levy obliterated the line between the
operational and the instructional sectors and established cross-cutting task
forces to make the place run in a tighter fashion in the development of a data
–driven institution (Mathews, 2001).

In San Diego, Bersin, another lawyer and former federal prosecutor-
turned-superintendent, reorganized his central office to achieve a 20 percent
reduction in staff, using the savings for teaching and learning. In the first two years of his leadership more emphasis was placed on the 145,000-student system in raising achievement rather than restructuring supervision. Bersin improved the quality of principals and vice principals by looking for people who focused on student achievement and used money wisely. He ordered principals to spend at least two hours a day helping teachers improve their techniques. Having succeeded in raising scores significantly in most of the city schools, Bersin began looking at the business side of the -district office to continue reducing expenditures without harming vital services (Mathews, 2001).

Weitzel, a managerial consultant and former business professor at University of Oklahoma, was named CEO of the Oklahoma City Public Schools emphasized, as Bersin did, the quality and working styles of principals (Mathews 2001). Weitzel established a site-based management system that gave principals more authority but could not go as far as he wanted because information systems were not adequate to tell which principals were effective, and which were not. Weitzel pursued Stanford’s approach giving new life to the idea of customer service. He had advised companies for 30 years on how to increase profits, which proved to be a meaningful dimension to making schools work. More than 35 meetings were held throughout the city to provide citizens with the opportunity to tell what they thought about their schools, service to children, and to the communities in which the schools were located. Weitzel addressed difficulties related to the aged transportation system and buildings that
averaged more than 47 years of age, which had not been maintained due to lack of bond money (Mathews, 2001)

One other nontraditional superintendent, former Air Force Maj. Gen. John C. Fryer Jr., made many of the same moves in June 1998 when he took over schools in Duval County, Fla., which included Jacksonville. He reached out to parents, worked on the leadership style of principals, tried to reduce inefficiencies and improved the quality of information and purposely refrained from making severe changes in his senior staff. Over time, he hired replacements that were hand picked, and occasionally fired someone. However, he learned that the key to successful leadership is not necessarily in assembling the dream team, but in making a dream team of the one you have. Instead, he asked questions that forced headquarters staff to reconsider ways of doing business (Mathews, 2001). Fryer arranged for his staff and principals to learn the Kepner-Tregoe decision analysis system in which tough work is put into defining the problem, the decision needed, the alternatives, the weights given to those alternatives and the risks associated with any chosen alternative. He discontinued the practice of gathering principals monthly for long updates on policies and programs. Fryer ordered that information be sent out by memo and turned the monthly meetings into training sessions, led by invited experts, to immerse principals in the latest curricular advances to become strong instructional leaders. On Florida’s new school rating system, Fryer, principals, and teachers managed to increase the number of schools with the top grades of A or B from 18 to 31 and reduced the number of F schools from five to one. SAT scores have gone up, the Advanced Placement
and International Baccalaureate programs have received national recognition
and the chief researcher of the Third International Math and Science Study has
called the district's curriculum "world class" (Mathews, 2001).

The emphasis on getting the best information on schools, making
improvements and letting everyone know about them has been adopted by
nontraditional superintendents in smaller school districts as well. Wank, formerly
vice president of enrollment services for St. Francis College in Fort Wayne, Ind.,
stated that his career as a college admissions officer was very customer
oriented, and customer-driven. Wank, as superintendent of the Seneca East
Local Schools in Seneca, Ohio, looked at students and parents as customers
who are actively involved in the product we offer. Wank gave principals and
teachers more decision-making power, by having principals take more control
over the operations of their buildings, which was more of a management model
than typically used in education. He opened up the school decision-making
process to the community on a broader scale and as a result, the community
noticed more opportunities to get involved, and the staff was held accountable,
but given authority to utilize their expertise. This made some uncomfortable, but it
was crucial if he was to have a well-run system that utilized everyone's talents
(Mathews, 2001).

Coolican, a retired Marine colonel runs the 9,200-student Peninsula School
District in Gig Harbor, Wash., also emphasized student learning, demonstrating
his commitment with an unusual allocation of his time. Coolican devoted one-
third of his time to the central office, one-third to the community, one-third to the
classroom, and spent two days of every week in classes. When he took the job in July 1999, there were three assistant superintendents. He made one of them deputy superintendent for support and operations.

Once a district has taken on a nontraditional superintendent, can it ever go back to a boss with only educational credentials? There hasn't been enough time for this to happen very often, although the D.C. schools seemed to encounter few problems when veteran educator Arlene Ackerman replaced former Army Gen. Julius W. Becton Jr. as head of the system in 1998. Ackerman, however, was a special case. She had worked with Stanford in Seattle and had a keen appreciation of the need for modern business techniques in large urban school districts.

As New York City's chancellor, Levy says mega-districts like his always are going to need leaders who have been supervisors in other fields. It is clear to me that the person who sits in this job needs to have experience either running or being intimately involved with large complex organizations that are well run," he says. "The skill set of the superintendent of a large district needs to be radically different from the skill set of someone who runs a high school." "That is not to say that instructional knowledge is not important," Levy adds. But it is necessary, he says, to have at least one of the top two people be comfortable with the requirements of results-oriented, quick-reacting corporate management.

In most cases, nontraditional superintendents have not been in office long enough to assess their results in any scientific way. Those few nontraditional superintendents who have been in the job for several years or finished their tours
look back with some satisfaction that they helped bring the right changes. They appreciate the freedom they enjoyed from having established their reputations in another field and being willing to risk failure in what was, for them, an adventure and not a job that would define their careers. "The basic thing was my willingness to radically change the system," says Fuller, who led the Milwaukee system in the early 1990s. "Because I came in from the outside, I was not married to the system."

In Seattle, Stanford's successor, Joseph Olchefske, continued to make administrative changes. Like his mentor and predecessor, Olchefske qualifies as a nontraditional superintendent. Before going to work for Stanford, he was the organizing executive of the Seattle office of Piper Jaffray, a brokerage and investment firm. He helped Stanford shift resources and balanced the budget with a weighted student formula system. They turned the deputy superintendent positions in the district into a chief academic officer to oversee schools and a chief operating officer to deal with their consolidated support services, as well as finance, human resources, technology, capital facilities, communications and government affairs.

The newest plan in Seattle was to make the administrative system support the goal of altering instruction to fit the new state learning standards as Stanford intended it, a matter of customer service. The district developed a logo and a slogan for the effort, "Delivering the Dream." Seattle is a school district that adopted modern management techniques and made poor customer service a firing offense has seen the desired result, higher achievement. "Notable in the
increases," Benzel says, "is the reality that students of color are improving the fastest. The district still has much growth and learning to achieve, but it is making steady and dramatic progress (Mathews, 2001).

The School Administrator Web Edition (2001) published a comprehensive list of nontraditional educators appointed to the superintendency. It includes those who serve as of 2001, (this is the most current) and those who previously served as presented in Table 1.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CURRENT - NONTRADITIONAL SUPERINTENDENTS</th>
<th>PAST - NONTRADITIONAL SUPERINTENDENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A.G. Davis</strong>: chief executive officer, New Orleans Public Schools, appointed July 1999; previously U.S. Marine Corps colonel</td>
<td><strong>Benjamin Demps Jr.</strong>: superintendent, Kansas City, Mo., appointed August 1999 to April 2001; previously an attorney and director of the Oklahoma Department of Health and Human Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>John C. Fryer Jr.</strong>: superintendent, Duval County Public Schools, Jacksonville, Fla., appointed June 1998; previously U.S. Air Force major general</td>
<td><strong>Howard Fuller</strong>: superintendent, Milwaukee Public Schools, June 1991 to June 1995; previously director, Milwaukee County Health and Human Services Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Don Gaetz</strong>: superintendent, Okaloosa County Public Schools, Ft. Walton Beach, Fla., elected November 2000; currently, owner of Vitas Health Care Corp. in Miami and president, Caregivers Inc.</td>
<td><strong>Philip R. Goldsmith</strong>: interim chief executive officer, Philadelphia Public Schools, appointed November 2000; previously a bank executive and managing principal, Right Management Consultants, a career development firm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>William Harner</strong>: superintendent, Greenville County, S.C., appointed July 2000; previously a U.S. Army lieutenant colonel</td>
<td><strong>David Hornbeck</strong>: superintendent, Philadelphia Public Schools, August 1994 to August 2000; previously attorney, Hogan and Hartson, Washington, D.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adam Miller</strong>: superintendent, Madison Plains Local Schools, London, Ohio, appointed July 2000; previously an attorney with the Ohio School Boards Association, Columbus, Ohio</td>
<td><strong>Peter Hutchinson</strong>: superintendent, Minneapolis Public Schools, December 1993 to June 1997; previously vice president, Dayton Hudson Corp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Joseph Olcheske</strong>: superintendent, Seattle, Wash., Public Schools, appointed February 1999; previously investment banker, Piper Jaffray</td>
<td><strong>Harold O. Levy</strong>: chancellor, New York City Public Schools, appointed January 2000; previously an executive with Citigroup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CURRENT - NONTRADITIONAL SUPERINTENDENTS</td>
<td>PAST - NONTRADITIONAL SUPERINTENDENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Joseph J. Redden</strong>: superintendent, Cobb County, Ga., appointed November 2000; previously U.S. Air Force general</td>
<td><strong>Thomas G. Seigel</strong>: superintendent, Boulder Valley, Colo., July 1997 to June 2000; previously U.S. Navy commander</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Roy Romer</strong>: superintendent, Los Angeles Unified School District, appointed July 2000; previously Colorado governor</td>
<td><strong>John H. Stanford</strong>: superintendent, Seattle Public Schools, October 1995 to November 1998; previously U.S. Army major general and manager of Fulton County, GA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Paul Vallas</strong>: chief executive officer, Chicago Public Schools, appoint July 1995; previously budget director, Chicago</td>
<td><strong>Thomas Vander Ark</strong>: superintendent, Federal Way, Wash., September 1994 to June 1999; previously vice president, PACE Membership Warehouse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Michael Wank</strong>: superintendent, Seneca East Local Schools, Attica, Ohio, appointed August 1998; previously vice president of enrollment services, St. Francis College, Fort Wayne, Ind.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bill Weitzel</strong>: chief executive officer, Oklahoma City, Okla., appointed July 2000; previously professor of business administration, University of Oklahoma</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted from School Administrator, June 2001

Hurwitz (2001) further states that a number of urban districts are looking outside the ranks of traditional educators for results-oriented leaders who can revitalize ailing schools. Political pressures for tougher standards, higher test scores, and greater accountability, have forced school boards to tap business, government, law, and the military for superintendents to simultaneously upgrade academic performance for all students, and tame the school bureaucracy. The choice of outsiders signals a growing dissatisfaction with the practice of drawing leaders from a narrow pool of trained educators. The selection of outsiders suggests a hunger for the talents of politicians, negotiators, and financial managers as evidenced by Boards in Seattle, New Orleans, Jacksonville, and Philadelphia that chose superintendents from sectors outside education.
According to Hurwitz (2001), these leaders are the exception and most urban school boards are sticking with trained educators, while some have decided to return to more conventional choices after taking the nontraditional route. The Washington, D.C., and Baltimore systems, replaced an Army general and a fiscal expert, respectively, with professional educators who had extensive experience managing teachers and administrators.

Gutherie and Sanders, cited by Hurwitz (2001, stated that the remedy for troubled big-city school districts was more complicated than engaging high-profile leaders from other spheres. Unconventional leaders may find themselves struggling with conventional educational issues to elevate academic excellence while brokering budgets and dampening discord. Then the question arises as to whether generals, corporate executives, and governors would have more success than conventional superintendents they replaced (Hurwitz, 2001).

Nontraditional superintendents often delegate responsibility for improving instruction to traditional educators appointed to the No. 2 position. But experts say it is a mistake for noneducators to take a hands-off attitude toward their core function. "It's like taking over a company that makes widgets and saying you don't know much about widgets, so you're going to leave that to someone else," an authority on urban schools argues. The urban school systems of the nontraditional superintendents include the nation's three largest (New York, Los Angeles, and Chicago, respectively) and the seventh largest (San Diego). Some chief executives are managing more successfully than others, and are facing difficult obstacles on the road to improvement (Hurwitz, 2001).
According to Hodgkinson (1999), efforts to increase and diversify the pool of superintendents require broader support from influential non-education sectors of society. Business and political leaders, as well as major foundations, should emphasize the need to support higher academic standards, and the concomitant need to develop educational leadership essential to the implementation of reform in the next millennium. Creative efforts to identify, train and place non-traditional candidates should be encouraged. Usdan, cited by Hodgkinson (1999), stated that unless the business and political leadership recognized the leadership crisis in the role of the superintendent, education’s CEO, efforts to improve student achievement cannot be sustained.

**Principal Leadership**

Effective leadership by school principals requires the ability to plan, organize, motivate, control, anticipate, orient, coordinate, implement, staff, make decisions and program (Lemon, 1986). These abilities can be exercised in different ways, however, and several different directions, purposes, and the leader can emphasize attitudes. These differences determine leadership style. Principals who understand their own leadership styles and who are able to fit their leadership styles to their particular situations (or their situations to their styles) are more likely to be effective leaders. Among the factors that must be considered are the extent to which human relationships are stressed, the extent to which technical tasks and their completion are stressed, and the extent to which the leader can diagnose the situation in which leadership must be
exercised. When making such a diagnosis, the leader must assess the knowledge of those doing the work, their ability and willingness to accept responsibility, and the leader’s own expertise in the work situation in question.

A national commission report, cited by Bjork (1993), confirmed the importance of instructional leadership in educational reform. Although the principal’s role was initially emphasized, research indicates that superintendents use their bureaucratic positions in the formal organization to improve instruction through staff selection, principal supervision, instructional goal-setting and monitoring, financial planning, and consultative management practices (Bjork, 1993).

Sergiovanni (1999) stated that schools with character have unique cultures and are committed to developing academic and social capital. The principal’s greatest challenge and primary responsibility is to develop a caring school community, a place where strong character emerges from shared purpose that encourages students to be successful learners.

No matter what standards they follow, principals must be skilled team builders, instructional leaders, and visionary risk-takers. There are five emerging roles: historian, cheerleader, lightning rod, landscaper (environmental scanner), and anthropologist. To succeed, principals must be empowered by districts, become authentic leaders, and make time for reflection (Terry, 1999). Principals can effectively manage their workday by prioritizing paperwork, creating tickler and flyer files, postponing missed phone calls, stashing supplies, structuring agendas, scheduling meetings, recording phone numbers on calendars, avoiding
procrastination, delegating responsibility, deputizing delegates, making a faculty suggestion board, and tackling unpleasant tasks promptly.

The increasing complexity of the principal’s job makes distributing leadership (among teachers, coaches, and literacy specialists) a survival tactic and a sound organizational strategy. Distributive leadership benefits principals who generally lack time to commit to particular initiatives and the content/instructional expertise to implement complex reforms (Supovitz, 2000).

State and federal policymakers have recently upgraded accountability rules, thrusting school leaders into uncharted, uncomfortable territory. In this scenario, principals must adopt flexible, facilitative leadership styles, model core school values, develop organizational capacity, accept heightened public scrutiny, and represent the school’s mission and accomplishments (Lashway, 2000).

Recent school improvement trends, notably the emphasis on accountability and academic standards, are changing the school principal’s role. Developing a school vision for teaching and learning is becoming the top priority for principals. Leadership skills that help accomplish this include collaboration, participative decision-making, and listening. Sidebars discuss changing one’s perception of power and resources on school leadership (Sherman, 2000).

A survey of over 30 “expert” Southwest principals revealed several characteristics of effective principals: possessing technical skill influenced by human relations and legal mandates, creating an inviting culture, building community, being ethical practitioners, and understanding relationships.
Respondents also identified 28 components of an effective administrator preparation program (Daresh, Gantner, Dunlap and Hvizdak, 2000).

Because principals are respected, they are in a unique position to affect policy and legislation at all levels. It is time for principals to influence state-level legislative priorities and policies. Principals should establish political contacts, keep informed via state associations, and seize opportunities to advocate for students (Kennedy, 2000).

Principals deal with a range of people, issues, and forces represented by individuals, factions, and special-interest groups. Principals must develop a framework; analyze problems quickly, develop alternative plans, make sound decisions, and communicate resolutions clearly and sensitively to all parties (Howe, Townsend, 2000).

Both leadership and management play important roles in school administration, but there are problems with the way educational organizations are being both led and managed. A discussion of those problems, along with some possible solutions, is presented in this paper. It opens with an examination of the principal’s role and how such persons must combine instructional leadership with managerial skills. To help in combining these demands, a model for the practice of managing an educational organization is presented. The model is based upon the three operational dimensions of management, and it outlines the administrator’s role regarding all the tasks and functions of management. It is argued that many educational administrators are confused over their role in the organization and are unclear as to what management-related tasks and functions
they should be conducting. The confusion results, it is claimed, in an overemphasis on the tasks and functions required of their positions, such as leadership, and an under emphasis on other requisite duties. The model can be used as a checklist for the tasks and functions of management that every administrator should be addressing (Dembowski, 1998).

Most of the current debate over the principalship has been led by scholars, analysts, and policymakers. A new report from Public Agenda provides some clues on how principals themselves feel about their jobs. The nationwide survey found that principals were confident of their ability to deal with the challenges at hand, but were hampered by politics, bureaucratic regulations, and the sheer volume of tasks. Only 30 percent felt that the system supported them well; the others saw it, at best, as a barrier that they could work around to accomplish their goals. Principals were generally supportive of standards and accountability, but nervous about inappropriate use of standardized tests.

Interestingly, neither the principals nor the superintendents surveyed saw a severe shortage of principals in their districts, though superintendents expressed some concerns about the quality of the candidates they were seeing. Asked to indicate the qualities of a good leader, more than 90 percent of principals thought it was “absolutely essential” to be able to make tough decisions, to put the interests of children above all else, and to communicate a clear educational vision and priorities. They assigned the least importance to nurturing prospective administrators, making effective use of technology, and having good speaking skills.
Overall, the report identifies some key concerns and issues for efforts to redefine the principalship. However, it also suggests that in most districts the principalship is a long way from being in crisis. A common theme in all these documents is the growing recognition that while principals play a critical role in school success, they cannot do it alone. Merely strengthening their skills, as individuals will not be enough to accomplish today's ambitious reform agenda. The current debate over their role will help no one if it merely piles more expectations on top of already overburdened and under-supported school administrators.

**Teacher Perception’s of Leadership**

Quitugua (1990) conducted a study that focused on the differences between elementary and secondary teachers' perceptions of their principal's leadership styles and gender differences in such perceptions. Findings indicate that no significant difference existed between principals' and teachers' perceptions of leadership styles in both elementary and secondary schools. Primary leadership styles were "selling" and "participating," followed by "telling" and "delegating." Secondary principals scored higher than elementary principals in "participating." The primary leadership styles perceived by both principals and teachers were "participating" followed by "selling," and those of elementary principals included "selling" followed by "participating." Female and male principals perceived their leadership styles differently from their female and male teachers, respectively.
Jantzi and Leithwood (1995) examined teachers' perceptions of how their principals performed on six individual leadership dimensions: identifying and articulating a vision; fostering the acceptance of group goals; providing individualized support; providing intellectual stimulation; serving as an exemplary model; and demonstrating expectations for high performance. The study's conceptual framework was based on an information-processing model of leader perceptions influenced by the work of Lord and Maher (1993). Findings indicate that in-school conditions most powerfully influenced teachers' perceptions of their principals' leadership behavior. These conditions included the school's mission, vision, and goals; culture; programs and instruction; policies and organization; decision-making structures; and resources.

Shaw (1980) surveyed 423 teachers to determine how unexpected teacher absenteeism could be explained by teacher morale, selected teacher and school characteristics, and teacher perceptions of the leadership behavior of principals. The research found that teacher perceptions of principal leadership were significantly different in schools with high absenteeism than in schools with average or low absenteeism; teacher morale differed significantly in schools with high, average, and low absenteeism; significant differences existed in teacher perceptions of principal leadership in high and low morale schools; and independent demographic variables accounted for 18 percent of the variance in teacher absenteeism.

Mertler, Steyer and Petersen (1997) examined whether 67 elementary and secondary school teachers understood the role and importance of followership in
influencing school leadership. Results indicated that teachers fell into one of three styles of followership: exemplary followers (with high levels of active engagement and independent thinking), pragmatist followers (who perform required tasks well but seldom venture beyond them), or conformist followers (with high active engagement but low independent thinking). None of the teachers were classified as alienated (independent thinking only) or passive (neither independent thinking nor actively engaged) followers.

Newton; Fiene; and Wagner (1999) reported on a study in which classroom teachers were asked to describe their perceptions of the principalship and to identify factors that influenced the development of their perceptions. The results show teachers used hierarchical terms to describe the power vested in building principals. Teachers expected principals to manage the school, to foster a culture conducive to learning, to improve student learning, to promote the school's image to the community, and to influence the larger community. Few teachers reported having opportunities to engage in dialogue with principals and some reported that they formed their impressions of principals at an early age.

Gougeon; and Others (1990) compared principals' self-perceptions of social control communication with teacher perceptions, and the characterization of principals' communication patterns. Findings indicate that teachers rated their principals lower than principals rated themselves in the use of all types of social control communications. Teacher perceptions of principals' communication patterns were strongly correlated to three situational factors: (1) the degree of closeness teachers felt to the principal; (2) the teachers' perceived frequency of
teacher-principal interaction; and (3) the teachers' perceptions of the principals' visibility.

Hutton and Gougeon (1993) presented findings of a study that determined relative differences in male and female teachers' perceptions of male and female principals' intentions in the communication process. Data were derived from administration of the Leadership as Social Control (LASC) Model to 397 teachers. They reported perceptions of 20 principals (10 male and 10 female). Three orientations (personal, official, and structural) and three motivations (authority, positive power, and negative power) of leader communication by gender were examined. Findings indicate that male and female teachers perceived female principals as communicating their authentic values and verbal expressions of expectations more than male principals. Principal gender affected teachers' perceptions more than teacher gender. All teachers perceived that female principals paid more attention to their teachers' work, whether positive or negative attention. A link was found to exist among teachers' perception of principal effectiveness, a feeling of closeness to the principal, and the degree of attention that principals give teachers. It is recommended that male principals communicate interest in teachers' lives.

Grafton (1987) examined whether teacher efficacy affects the relationship between the teachers' perceptions of the school principal and the perceived communication conflict strategies teachers use when they disagree with the principal. To test this relationship, 830 questionnaires were distributed to public school teachers in six school districts; 306 questionnaires were returned. The
teacher efficacy factors—"personal efficacy" and "general efficacy"—and the respective perceptions of the principal—communication openness, perceived credibility, management communication style, and team-building—were canonically correlated with the communication conflict strategies: "non-confrontation," "solution orientation," and "control." It was found that the teacher efficacy factors and perceptions of the principal were negatively related to non-confrontation and positively related to solution-orientation conflict message strategies. The most important determinant of the conflict message strategy chosen was the teachers' perceptions of the principal. However, teacher efficacy was an influential factor affecting the female teachers' tendency to use solution orientation strategies. It was found that when teacher efficacy was included in the canonical structure with perceptions of the principal, females were as likely as males to choose a given conflict message.

Vickers and Sistrunk (1989) stated that to influence teaching in a way that enhances and improves student learning is the school principal's responsibility. Because perceptions are more important than actual behavior, it is essential for principals to know if their perception of their supervisory actions is in agreement with the way their teachers perceive the same supervisory behaviors; the greater this perceptual agreement, the more favorable the attitude toward work and the greater the possibility for instructional improvement. Vickers and Sistrunk investigated the relationship between Mississippi public elementary school principals' and teachers' perceptions of supervisory behavior. The Supervisory Behavior Description Questionnaire (form 1) was mailed to all elementary school
principals and teachers in the state and the responses from 115 principals and 475 teachers were analyzed. The results indicated that principals perceived their supervision methods as more collaborative and directive, whereas the teachers perceived the supervision as less collaborative and directive, and more nondirective. Perceptive discrepancies also existed in the areas of: curriculum development; special student services; staff development; providing materials and facilities; and evaluation of instruction, where principals perceived themselves as more collaborative than the teachers perceived them to be.

However, in another study, Chittom and Sistrunk (1990) examined whether or not there were significant differences in Mississippi public secondary school teachers' perceptions of school climate (SC) and their levels of job satisfaction (JS). Data revealed a significant relationship between respondents' perceptions of SC and JS. Teachers with high levels of JS indicated a more favorable impression of SC than did teachers with low levels of JS. The results support the findings of P. D. Sistrunk (1982), which indicated that the levels of satisfaction were related to perception of supervisory behavior, and the subject taught made no difference in the relationship between perception of SC and supervisory behavior. There was a significant positive correlation between teacher satisfaction with the SC and teacher perception of the principal's leadership behavior. Teachers dissatisfied with the SC, were dissatisfied with the principal's leadership behavior.

Johnson (1992) examined the relationship among three variables of principal leadership--principal vision, environmental robustness, and teacher
sense of autonomy--to school leadership. Findings indicate that: (1) teachers' perceptions of their principals' effectiveness in advancing a school vision are positively correlated with their perceptions of a robust school climate; (2) a positive relationship exists between teachers' perceptions of their principals' effectiveness in advancing a school vision and their sense of autonomy; and (3) a significant positive relationship exists between teachers' sense of autonomy and their perceptions of a robust school climate. The initial purpose of the study was to view the principal's vision as the catalyst for leadership in the high school. However, robustness, which implies less routinization and monotony in the school structure, may play an essential role.

Martin (1990) viewed the concept of teacher empowerment in terms of recognizing and respecting teachers as equal partners in making educational decisions. He surveyed teachers' perceptions of principals' and supervisors' demonstrated behaviors toward pedagogical efficacy attainments. The three efficacy measures interfaced into the questionnaire were: (1) the teacher's belief that he/she has the knowledge and skills to affect student learning when power is entrusted; (2) the teacher's perception that he/she has the ability to function as leader when responsibility is entrusted; and (3) the teacher's perception of his/her ability to make instructional decisions in relation to expected outcomes. Respondents felt that principals should be instructional leaders, and they were moderately satisfied with principals' instructional leadership behaviors with regard to teacher empowerment measures. What significantly influenced this confidence was supervisors taking time to work with teachers. The more supervisors
demonstrated a collegial relationship, the more teachers perceived them as professional mentors. These and other findings indicate that schools will need leaders who can recognize people's potential worth and contributions in the organization. School leaders need strong interpersonal communication skills, to demonstrate confidence in teachers' ability to plan professional programs and make appropriate instructional decisions.

Pavan and Reid (1991) studied the dominant theoretical espoused by elementary school principals; and compared the platforms with data previously collected on leadership behaviors and time usage. Data for 5 principals and 151 teachers in 5 elementary schools in Philadelphia (Pennsylvania) on the Principal Instructional Management Rating Scale (PIMRS) was used to determine the teachers' perceptions of their principals' instructional management behaviors and perceptions of the principals. The results show that one principal used a structural frame, three principals used a human resources frame, and one principal used a combination of structural, human resources, political, and symbolic frames. The principal who espoused the greatest number of theoretical frames had the most relevant and recent training. However, as indicated by the teachers, all principals had internalized the norm of high expectations for students and teachers, and used this concept to drive their own leadership behaviors..

Although the literature points to principals' central role in enhancing school effectiveness, the demonstration of a causal relationship between their instructional leadership and student achievement is difficult. Short and Spencer
(1989) suggested that instructional leadership can influence teaching and classroom practices through the establishment of belief structures and school policies promoting an "academic press." Based on current research findings, they hypothesized a tie between student perception of classroom environment, principal instructional leadership as perceived by teachers, and student performance. Short and Spencer (1989) determined that teacher perceptions of principals' instructional leadership strength relate to differences in student perceptions of classroom environment variables associated with effective teaching characteristics. The results supported the hypothesized relationship between classroom environment and principal instructional leadership. Teachers in classrooms where students perceived high cooperation levels see their principals as highly involved in supervising and evaluating instruction and communicating school goals. Surprisingly, students in schools whose principals are judged to be instructional leaders perceived their teachers as aloof and formal.

Giannangelo and Malone (1987) surveyed 143 teachers from a large metropolitan area to gain insight into teachers' perceptions of the role and responsibilities of school principals. They were asked the following four questions: (1) What do you believe are the most important functions of the principal?; (2) What do principals say to teachers are the principals’ important functions?; (3) What do principals demonstrate are their important functions?; and (4) What could principals do to make the teachers' job better? An overwhelming majority of teachers responded that the principal's chief role was
that of instructional leader. Other important functions included that of building manager, public relations with parents and the community at large, and setting the tone or climate for the school. Administrators communicated to staff that they see their role as one of instructional leader but also reported that most of their day is spent in administrative and discipline tasks. There appears to be a dichotomy between what principals say are important functions and what they demonstrate, with teachers reporting that administrators are overly concerned with nonacademic matters almost to the point of neglecting the real purpose of the school, that of educating students. The suggestions made by the teachers include more visibility on the part of the principal, more concern with academic matters, more visits in the classroom, and more support in other related matters.

Art and Willower (1994) examined the hypotheses on principals' organizational commitment of secondary teachers and principals and found that teacher perceptions of principals' commitment were positively related to school robustness, but principals' self-reports did not. Teachers were lower than principals in estimates of commitment and robustness. However, teachers' perceptions of principal commitment and principals' self-reported commitment related significantly.

Andrews, et al (1986) investigated the relationship between teachers' perceptions of the principal as instructional leader and average gain scores of students in 67 elementary schools in Seattle. Data pertaining to teacher perceptions of the principal as instructional leader were obtained through the Staff Assessment Questionnaire, and specific attention was given to four general
aspects of principal behavior: (1) mobilizing resources, (2) communicating, (3) serving as instructional resource, and (4) being a visible presence. Findings suggest that teachers' perceptions of the principal as instructional leader are critical to the reading and mathematics achievement of students, particularly among historically low-achieving groups of students.

**Corporate Leadership**

The office of chief executive or corporate president evolved over the past century in response to the growing and developing management needs of modern business. The concept of the corporate president began in response to the increasing size, complexity, and change of character of the modern corporation, as the business entity was transformed from a Proprietorship (one owner), or Partnership (more than one owner), into a large, enduring corporation. The president or chief executive was transformed from an autocratic officer (responsible to no one), into a ‘Chief Executive Officer” responsible to a board of directors, and is the presiding officer of the corporate officers (Glover, 1976).

Concepts and theories, associated with the nature of the corporation, progressed with the development of earlier organizations: Monasteries, Convents, Hospitals, and Colleges (Glover, 19976). The concept and theories of these institutions were applied in the development of the business corporation. Principles used in the development of the executive officers of a business corporation advanced from a complex body of thought and governance, to other institutions during that time. Bishops, Cannons, Wardens, Principals, and
Presidents were heads of these institutions that helped to develop business administration, as we know it today (Glover, 1976).

The development of the chief executive officer as chief owner, to chief executive officer as chief administrator is not of an old process. A century ago, most businesses were small and nearly all were partnerships. Modern corporations continued to evolve in the United States between 1890 and 1910, the result of two approaches. One, through growth based on a company’s increased production and sales, and the other was by merger. These two different approaches to increased size led to quite different “styles of management” and types of corporate headquarters (Glover, 1976).

As stock ownerships of corporations became popular, there was an increased need to create new top management, and build effective corporate headquarters. Many corporate department heads formed executive committees to run these businesses. Department heads, some times called “Vice Presidents,” negotiated policy rather than using objective analysis to make decisions. These “Vice Presidents” put the interest of their departments and division ahead of that of the company as whole, thus creating a problem (Glover, 1976). “Group Management” did not work, proving instead, the need to give someone in the top management group, final authority and responsibility for group decisions. Someone had to be able to make decisions when the group could not agree, and communicate these decisions to workers, stockholders, customers, and the outside world. Most companies divided such duties between the president and the chairman of the board. Eventually, a manager holding one
of these positions was also given the title of Chief Executive Officer, as the formal and official company leader (Glover, 1976).

Recent Corporate Leadership research indicates that most companies now, both in the United States and abroad, are experiencing some sort of “leadership gap” within their executive ranks. As companies struggle to identify and develop individuals who can adequately fill that gap, most are looking for individuals who possess competencies beyond technical skills. Throughout the corporate world, most companies now face some form of a “leadership gap” in their executive ranks, with current leadership benches deemed inadequate either in number or in qualifications. The cost of inadequate executive talent is perhaps one of the most serious forms of opportunity cost faced by organizations today; its manifestations include failed reorganizations, postponed new product offerings, or delayed market expansions.

In 1977, the Corporate Leadership Council, partnered with Boston, Massachusetts-based Cambria Consulting, and analyzed leadership competency models from over 50 companies, revealing similar leadership competency models, which stressed non-technical competencies for leaders. Based on this analysis, they identified the following top ten corporate leadership competencies:

- Drive for Results
- People Development
- Conceptual Grasp/Big Picture Awareness
- Team Player
- Flexibility
- Integrity/Honesty
- Learning Orientation
- Strategic Thinking
- Setting of Vision and Direction
○ Creation of High-Performance Climate

Companies, such as the American Express Financial Advisors, are using the practice of emotional intelligence (emotional competency) assessments as part of its leadership development program. The company assesses all of its executive level employees’ leadership potential by using three indicators of success, of which, two of the three are based upon emotional competency. They are: Professional and technical knowledge; Interpersonal relationships, and Self-awareness.

According to American Express, emotional competence is the capacity to create alignment between goals, actions, and values, achieved through development of self leadership and interpersonal effectiveness, and results in business and personal success (Financial Services, 1994). American Express further identified emotional competency as a set of proficiencies as presented in Table 2:
Table 2. COMPONENTS OF EMOTIONAL COMPETENCE

| AMERICAN EXPRESS FINANCIAL ADVISORS, INC. COMPONENTS OF EMOTIONAL COMPETENCE |
| --- | --- |
| Self-Leadership | Interpersonal Effectiveness |
| **Personal efficacy** | **Ability to develop relationships** |
| • Acting courageously | • Act with integrity |
| • Being assertive | • Be empathetic |
| • Being resilient | • Be open to others |
| • Coping effectively | • Develop and maintain trust |
| • Creating balance | • Keep confidence |
| • Creating physical health | • Listen attentively |
| • Knowing how to play | Ability to sustain relationships |
| • Maintaining a sense of humor | • Acknowledging and valuing others’ points of view |
| • Managing one’s career | • Identifying and managing implicit contracts |
| • Managing resources | • Matching style to others |
| • Nurturing spiritual health | • Providing support to others |
| • Setting goals | • Resolving conflict effectively |
| • Solving problems effectively | Additional leadership competencies |
| • Thinking critically | • Emotional competence coaching skills |
| **Self-awareness** | • Managing change |
| • Acknowledging personal responsibility | • Modeling emotionally-competent behavior |
| • Affirming one’s self worth | |
| • Being aware of one’s emotional experience | |
| • Identifying and acting one’s values | |
| • Learning from experience and one’s own history | |
| • Maintaining perspective | |
| • Managing internal conflict | |
| • Managing stress | |
| • Seeking social support | |
| • Understanding and modifying self-talk | |

Adapted from IDS Financial Services, 1994

Although many companies turn to mergers and acquisitions as an avenue for growth and increased competitive advantage, a 1995 Business Week thirty-year study of mergers and acquisitions concluded that there is a negative correlation between merger activity and profitability (Carleton, 1997). The British Institute of Management, in a 1996 study, concluded, “the major factor in failure
was the underestimation of difficulties of merging two cultures” (Carleton, 1997).

Evidence regarding the significant impact of cultural fits in the success of mergers and acquisitions; have turned some companies to employment testing to identify employees who possess the competencies needed to make the new organization a success.

Issues that persistently remain at the top of the executive agenda are leadership, and leadership development. Irrespective of company, industry and country, and regardless of cyclical fluctuations between economic expansion and contraction, organizations require effective leaders to move forward. Unfortunately, the agreement concerning the importance of leadership development is not matched by a universal understanding of how to develop leaders. Throughout the Council’s one-year review of the academic and professional literature, and across scores of research interviews with its members, the Council was struck by both the salience of leadership development and the lack of consensus around how to effectively achieve it. The challenge facing organizations in designing and implementing a leadership development program is not a lack of viable ideas, but the converse: an overwhelming number of plausible ideas and approaches, and little systematic evidence with which to make decisions, to help organizations allocate (or reallocate) leadership development resources to their optimal use (Corporate Leadership Council, 1996).

The Corporate Leadership Council conducted research based on five simple premises. First, the systematic analysis of the views and needs of
thousands of leaders will heighten the understanding of effective leadership and leadership development. Second, a logical precondition is to formulate a preferred profile of what effective leadership might look like. Third, to develop leaders, we must understand the strengths and weaknesses of today’s leadership. Fourth, due to limited budgets and resources, organizations must make the right choices in resource allocation to develop leaders, optimally allocating scarce time, effort and monetary resources to the point of greatest return. Finally, and perhaps most importantly, these decisions should not be based on guesswork, anecdotes or hunches, but on empirical evidence. Research findings highlight the need for rigorous analysis of the elements of effective corporate leadership and leadership development. Firms that conduct a systematic analysis of the needs of their leaders, and reallocate resources to meet them, will build a lasting advantage in the marketplace (Corporate Leadership Council, 1996).

Practices for accelerating the development of senior management talent, in time frames considerably more aggressive than those of traditional development systems, represent a new approach to executive development. Individualized planning, and analysis of job assignments for development content, as well as accelerated movement of future talent in order to acquire key leadership competencies, briefly describes some of these practices. One other practice is that of executive development, which involves engaging future talent in the corporation’s strategic agenda-exposing rising leaders to the concerns of the senior most corporate leaders, and often, exposing rising leaders to the
senior most executives. These practices facilitate learning by combining the consideration of “live” corporate issues with exposure to senior executive leaders of the corporation.

Strategic leadership development begins with a clear vision of the type of leader an organization seeks to develop. In order to identify the necessary ingredients of effective leadership—and to see if these vary throughout an organization—the Council asked more than 8,000 leaders what made them successful in their positions, and organizations. The following sections present these results, mapping the characteristics and skills that drive effective leadership throughout an organization (Corporate Leadership Council, 1997).

Perhaps no other issue unites CEOs and senior HR executives more than leadership and leadership development. The salience of this issue crosses the traditional boundaries of organization, industry and country and is equally important in times of economic growth and contraction. Concerns commonly fall into one of six categories:

- Too few leaders within the organization
- The uncertainty surrounding the requirements of effective leaders
- The ability of leaders to meet those requirements
- The selection of an effective leadership development strategy
- The challenge of executive succession, and
- The challenges associated with securing the necessary resources for leadership development (Corporate Leadership Council, 1997).

More than 8,000 leaders report that people-management skills are the most important attributes of effective leadership, outranking strategic management, personal characteristics, or day-to-day business management (Corporate
Leadership Council, 1997). Companies are beginning to realize the importance that personality can play in one’s ability to succeed. According to a study conducted by the Center for Creative Leadership, “derailed executives” failed most often due to “an interpersonal flaw” rather than a technical ability (Gibbs, 1996). These flaws included the following: being “authoritarian”; being “too ambitious”; conflict with upper management; and poor working relations.

The predominance of people-management and strategic planning skills raises questions about organizations’ traditional assessments of employee performance. Traditional assessments, focused predominantly on individual performance against business and financial metrics. However, they may not go far enough in offering organization’s insight into leaders’ aptitude, and past achievement records in these most critical—and difficult to evaluate—areas. As companies struggle to find individuals capable of leading organizations in the changing business world, they are turning to employment test to help identify and develop leaders (Gibbs, 1966).

The imperative for effective corporate leadership development requires identifying future leaders earlier in their careers, and “deeper” within the organization. Having understood the importance of clearly defining required soft and hard skills for the current leadership for specific leadership positions, organizations must ensure that they are considering future leadership needs. This requires not only evaluation of how leadership profiles may develop over time, but also the identification and development of leaders early in their careers.
The *Business Career Interest Inventory* (BCII), developed by Waldroop Bultler Associates (1998), identified eight core sets of activities used by jobs in the business world. Scoring is based on the activity combinations that an individual prefers as compared with the firms database of 650 business professionals tracked over a twelve-year period. The Career Interest Inventory includes the following core activities placed in Table 3.

### Table 3. CAREER INTEREST INVENTORY CORE ACTIVITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application of technology</th>
<th>Counseling and mentoring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quantitative analysis</td>
<td>Managing people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theory development and conceptual thinking</td>
<td>Enterprise control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative production</td>
<td>Influence through language and ideas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Leading organizations are developing programs focused on the specific needs of individuals who compose the organization’s leadership “pipelines,” including individuals far down in the organization and early in their careers that are likely to become future leaders. The challenge of developing future leaders is threefold:

- Enabling visibility—systematizing leader identification at all levels within the organization.
- Accommodating different development needs.
- Understanding the specific preferences of young leaders and designing leadership program brands that will appeal to and therefore attract participation by young leaders.

The second imperative, targeting future leadership needs, examines how organizations are rethinking their approach to leader identification and development in order to ensure that they have developed high-quality leaders for
both today and tomorrow. Increasingly, organizations are placing greater emphasis on teamwork, both as a standard work system, and for handling specific projects. Some organizations combine behavioral interviews and work simulations to select potential team members, while others evaluate individuals based upon previously determined “team performance areas.” One widely used system, designed by Belbin cited in Fowler (1995), is the Interplace assessment system, which centers upon the premise that “it is a serious mistake to assume that there is a single type of team person. What is needed is a mix of types.” Belhin’s model differs from other approaches in the focus it places upon the importance of different team roles, which enables organizations to select individuals and from effective teams by combining the appropriate mix of candidates. Belhin’s nine “team personality types” presented in Table 4 include:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>CHARACTERISTICS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coordinator</td>
<td>Mature, confident, balanced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant</td>
<td>Creative, imaginative, unorthodox</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Investigator</td>
<td>Extrovert, enthusiastic, exploratory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaper</td>
<td>Dynamic, challenging, outgoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitor-Evaluator</td>
<td>Serious, strategic, discerning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teamwork</td>
<td>Mild, perceptive, accommodating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementer</td>
<td>Practical, tolerant, conservative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completer</td>
<td>Painstaking, careful, conscientious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist</td>
<td>Single-minded, self-starter, dedicated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: This does not imply that the ideal team size is nine as most individuals will have one or two team roles to which they are ideally suited.

The advantages of Team Interface Assessments are:
Focuses upon individual’s strengths which often has a significant positive effect on an individual’s self-esteem

• Enables organizations to evaluate the strengths and weaknesses in the pool of available talent
• Increases understanding of team roles, thereby reducing conflict
• Enables organization to select teams which make the most effective use of available talent; and
• Augments the teams’ ability to allocate tasks effectively.

Source: (http://www.aslgroup.com/aslmgt/interplace/interplace.htm)

Luke (199) presented evidence that the catalytic leader brings to leading diverse individuals from multiple agencies to address intractable public problems. Strategies for promoting catalytic leadership are explored through a review of the problems facing public leaders, emphasizing the complexity and interconnectedness of problems in the public sphere. Luke highlighted the differences among contemporary forms of corporate leadership, showing how public leadership is different from traditional organizational leadership. He then introduced four catalytic tasks, arguing that together the four tasks can amplify their catalytic impact when addressing public problems. The focus of each task is to: (1) focus attention by elevating the issue to the public and policy agendas; (2) engage people in the effort by convening the diverse set of people, agencies, and interests needed to address the issue; (3) stimulate multiple strategies and options for action; and (4) sustain action and maintain momentum by managing the interconnections through appropriate institutionalization and rapid information sharing and feedback. Foundational skills for catalytic leaders include: thinking and acting strategically, facilitating productive working groups, and tapping into personal passion and strength of character.
Military Leadership

The Army’s ultimate responsibility is to win the nation’s wars. Leadership in combat is the primary mission, and most important challenge. You must develop character and competence while achieving excellence to meet this challenge. The Army’s manual, FM 22-100, “Army Leadership Be, Know, Do,” is about leadership that focuses on character, competence, and excellence. Army leadership is about accomplishing the mission; taking care of people; living up to your ultimate responsibility, leading your soldiers in combat; and, winning our nation’s wars (FM 22-100, Army Field Manual, 1999, p.1).

Leadership in the Army starts at the top, with the character of the leader. What is required is a remarkable person to move from memorizing a creed to actually living that creed; a true leader is that remarkable person. Army leadership begins with what the values and attributes that shape a leader’s character. These attributes define who you are and give you a reliable understanding of the Army as an organization. These values and attributes are for all leaders, regardless of position, although your understanding is advanced as you become more experienced, and assume positions of greater responsibility (FM 22-100, Army Field Manual, 1999, p.1).

Competence in everything from the technical side of the job, to the people skills is required, and applies to all leaders. However, as you assume positions of greater responsibility, you master additional skills in each category. Army leadership positions fall into three levels: direct, organizational, and strategic. While absolutely necessary, character and knowledge are not enough. You
cannot be an effective leader, until you apply what you know, until you act and DO what you must. As with skills, you will learn more leadership actions as you serve in different positions. One’s actions are the essence of leadership (FM 22-100, Army Field Manual, 1999, p.2)

According to the Army Manual, Leadership is influencing people—by providing purpose, direction, and motivation—while operating to accomplish the mission and improving the organization. Influencing means, getting people to do what you want them to do. It is the means or method to achieve two ends: operating and improving. But there’s more to influencing than simply passing along orders. The example you set is just as important as the words you speak, good or bad, with every action you take and word you utter, on or off duty. Through your words and example, you must communicate purpose, direction, and motivation (FM 22-100, Army Field Manual, 1999, p.3).

Trust is a basic bond of leadership, and must be developed over time. When providing direction, you communicate the way you want the mission accomplished by prioritizing tasks, assigning responsibility for completing them, and making sure people understand the standard. To get the work done right with the available people, time, and other resources you communicate that information to your subordinates. People want direction and want to be given challenging tasks and training in how to accomplish them, and the resources necessary to do them well. Then they want to be left alone to do the job (FM 22-100, Army Field Manual, 1999).
Motivation gives subordinates the will to accomplish a mission on their own initiative when they see something needs to be done. Army leaders motivate their people by more than words. The example you set is at least as important as what you say, and how well you manage the work. The best leaders lead from the front, understanding the importance of being where the action is (FM 22-100, Army Field Manual, 1999).

Actions taken to influence others serve to accomplish operating actions to achieve the short-term goal of accomplishing the mission. Direct leaders perform operating actions, through planning, preparing, executing, and assessing how to work smarter next time. These actions become more complex as they assume positions of increasing responsibility. Army leaders strive to improve everything entrusted to them: their people, facilities, equipment, training, and resources. There will always be a new mission, but part of finishing the old one is improving the organization (FM 22-100, Army Field Manual, 1999).

The Army leader is self-confident enough to ask subordinates for their ideas on how to make things work better. Soldiers see their leader and looks at his own organization’s performance, evaluate it, identify strong areas to sustain as well as mistakes and shortcomings, and commit to a better way of doing things. These actions are more powerful than any lecture on leadership (FM 22-100, Army Field Manual, 1999).

Only by self-development will a leader become a confident and competent leader of character. Being an Army leader is not easy. There are no pre-determined solutions to leadership challenges, or shortcuts to success. However,
the tools are available to every leader to master and use (FM 22-100, Army Field Manual, 1999).

A leader must have a certain level of knowledge to be competent. That knowledge is spread across four skill domains. You must develop interpersonal skills, knowledge of your people and how to work with them. You must have conceptual skills, the ability to understand and apply the doctrine and other ideas required to do your job. You must learn technical skills, how to use your equipment. Finally, warrior leaders must master tactical skills, the ability to make the right decisions concerning employment of units in combat. Tactical skills include mastery of the art of tactics appropriate to the leader’s level of responsibility and unit type. They are amplified by the other skills—interpersonal, conceptual, and technical—and are the most important skills for war fighters (FM 22-100, Army Field Manual, 1999).

Good leaders add to their knowledge and skills every day. True leaders seek out opportunities, and are always looking for ways to increase their professional knowledge and skills. Dedicated leaders learn as much from their mistakes as from their successes (FM 22-100, Army Field Manual, 1999).

According to the Army Field Manual (1999), Leader actions include:

- **Influencing**: making decisions, communicating those decisions, and motivating people.
- **Operating**: the things you do to accomplish your organization’s immediate mission.
- **Improving**: the things you do to increase the organization’s capability to accomplish current or future missions.
Dimensions of the Army leadership framework: values, attributes, skills, and actions contain components that are interrelated; none stands alone. The Army leadership framework applies to all Army leaders. However, as you assume positions of increasing responsibility, you develop additional attributes, and master more skills and actions. Part of this knowledge includes understanding what your bosses are doing, factors that affect their decisions, and the environment in which they work. Army leadership positions are divided into three Levels, to help you achieve this: direct, organizational, and strategic (FM 22-100, Army Field Manual, 1999).

**Levels of Leadership**

Factors that determine a position’s leadership level can include the position’s span of control, its headquarters level, and the extent of the influence the leader holding the position exerts. Other factors include the size of the unit or organization, the type of operations it conducts, the number of people assigned, and its planning horizon. Sometimes the rank or grade of the leader holding a position does not indicate the position’s leadership level. In fact, most leadership positions are direct leadership positions, and every leader at every level acts as a direct leader when dealing with immediate subordinates (FM 22-100, Army Field Manual, 1999).

The headquarters echelon alone doesn’t determine a position’s leadership level. Soldiers and DA civilians of all ranks and grades serve in strategic-level headquarters, but they are not all strategic-level leaders. The responsibilities of a
duty position, together with the other factors determine its leadership level. Most NCOs, company grade officers, field grade officers, and DA civilian leaders serve at the direct leadership level. Some senior NCOs, field grade officers, and higher-grade DA civilians serve at the organizational leadership level. Most general officers and equivalent Senior Executive Service DA civilians serve at the organizational or strategic leadership levels (FM 22-100, Army Field Manual, 1999).

Direct leadership is face-to-face, first-line leadership. It takes place in those organizations where subordinates are used to seeing their leaders all the time: teams and squads, sections and platoons, companies, batteries, and troops—even squadrons and battalions. Direct leaders develop their subordinates one-on-one; however, they also influence their organization through their subordinates. There is more certainty and less complexity for direct leaders than for organizational and strategic leaders. Direct leaders are close enough to see, very quickly, how things work, or don’t work, and how to address any problems.

Organizational leaders influence several hundred to several thousand people indirectly, through more levels of subordinates than do direct leaders. Although the skill domains are the same, organizational leaders must deal with more complexity, more people, greater uncertainty, and a greater number of unintended consequences. They find themselves influencing people more through policymaking and systems integration than through face-to-face contact.
Strategic leaders concern themselves with the total environment in which
the Army functions; their decisions take into account such things as
congressional hearings, Army budgetary constraints, new systems acquisition,
civilian programs, research, development, and interservice cooperation—just to
name a few. Strategic leaders, like direct and organizational leaders, process
information quickly, assess alternatives based on incomplete data, make
decisions, and generate support. However, strategic leaders’ decisions affect
more people, commit more resources, and have wider-ranging consequences in
both space and time than do decisions of organizational and direct leaders. Often
strategic leaders do not see their ideas come to fruition during their “watch”; their
initiatives may take years to plan, prepare, and execute. In-process reviews
(IPRs) might not even begin until after the leader has left the job, which has
important implications for long-range planning. On the other hand, some strategic
decisions may become a front-page headline the next morning. Strategic leaders
have fewer opportunities to visit the lowest-level organizations of their
commands; thus, their sense of when and where to visit is crucial. Because they
exert influence primarily through subordinates, strategic leaders must develop
strong skills in picking and developing good ones.

More than anything else, I had confidence in my soldiers, junior leaders, and staff.
They were trained, and I knew they would carry the fight to the enemy. I trusted them,
and they knew I trusted them. I think in Just Cause, which was a company commander’s
war, being a decentralized commander paid big dividends because I wasn’t in the
knickers of my company commanders all the time. I gave them the mission and let them
do it. I couldn’t do it for them.

A Battalion Commander, Operation Just Cause
Panama, 1989
A person responsible for supervising or accomplishing a mission, at any level, that involves other people is a leader. Anyone who influences others, motivating them to action or influencing their thinking or decision-making, is a leader. It’s not a function only of position; it’s also a function of role. Everyone in the Army, including every leader, fits somewhere in a chain of command, and is a follower or subordinate. There are many leaders in an organization, and it’s important even at the lowest level, to understand that you don’t just lead subordinates, you lead other leaders. At each level, the leader must let subordinate leaders do their jobs. Practicing this kind of decentralized execution based on mission orders in peacetime trains subordinates who will, in battle, exercise disciplined initiative in the absence of orders (FM 22-100, Army Field Manual, 1999).

Good leaders see excellence wherever and whenever it happens. Excellent leaders make certain all subordinates know the important roles they play. They look for everyday examples that occur under ordinary circumstances: the way a soldier digs a fighting position, prepares for guard duty, fixes a radio, lays an artillery battery; the way a DA civilian handles an action, takes care of customers, meets a deadline on short notice. Good leaders know that each of these people is contributing in a small but important way to the business of the Army. An excellent Army is the collection of small tasks done to standard, day in and day out. At the end of the day, at the end of a career, those leaders, soldiers and DA civilians, the ones whose excellent work created an excellent Army, can look back confidently and know they did the job well and made a difference (FM 22-100, Army Field Manual, 1999).
Excellence in leadership does not mean perfection; on the contrary, an excellent leader allows subordinates room to learn from their mistakes as well as their successes. In such a climate, people work to improve and take the risks necessary to learn. They know that when they fall short, their leader will pick them up, give them new or more detailed instructions, and send them on their way again. This is the only way to improve the force, and the only way to train leaders (FM 22-100, Army Field Manual, 1999).

A leader who sets a standard of “zero defects, no mistakes” is also saying “Don’t take any chances. Don’t try anything you can’t already do perfectly, and for heaven’s sake, don’t try anything new.” That organization will not improve; in fact, its ability to perform the mission will deteriorate rapidly. Accomplishing the Army’s mission requires leaders who are imaginative, flexible, and daring. Improving the Army for future missions requires leaders who are thoughtful and reflective. These qualities are incompatible with a “zero-defects” attitude. Competent, confident leaders tolerate honest mistakes that do not result from negligence. The pursuit of excellence is not a game to achieve perfection; it involves trying, learning, trying again, and getting better each time, which in no way justifies or excuses failure. Even the best efforts and good intentions cannot take away an individual’s responsibility for his actions (FM 22-100, Army Field Manual, 1999).

Strategic leaders understand, embody, and execute values-based leadership. The political and long-term nature of their decisions doesn’t release strategic leaders from the current demands of training, readiness, and
unforeseen crises; they are responsible to continue to work toward the ultimate goals of the force, despite the burden of those events. Army values provide the constant reference for actions in the stressful environment of strategic leaders. Strategic leaders understand, embody, and execute leadership based on Army values.

Interpersonal Skills

Strategic leaders continue to use interpersonal skills developed as direct and organizational leaders, but the scope, responsibilities, and authority of strategic positions require leaders with unusually sophisticated interpersonal skills. Internally, there are more levels of people to deal with; externally, there are more interactions with outside agencies, with the media, even with foreign governments. Knowing the Army’s needs and goals, strategic leaders patiently but tenaciously labor to convince the proper people about what the Army must have, and become. Through penetrating assessments, these leaders seek to understand the personal strengths and weaknesses of all the main players on a particular issue. Strategic leaders are adept at reading other people, and they work to completely control their own actions and reactions. Armed with improved knowledge of others, self-control, and established networks, strategic leaders influence external events by providing leadership, timely and relevant information, and access to the right people and agencies.

Communication at the strategic level is complicated by the wide array of staff, functional, and operational components interacting with each other and with
external agencies. These complex relationships require strategic leaders to employ comprehensive communications skills as they represent their organizations. One of the most prominent differences between strategic leaders and leaders at other levels is the greater importance of symbolic communication. The example strategic leaders set, their decisions, and their actions have meaning beyond their immediate consequences to a much greater extent than those of direct and organizational leaders.

Thus, strategic leaders identify those actions that send messages. Then they use their positions to send the desired messages to their organizations and ensure that the right audiences hear them. The messages strategic leaders send set the example in the largest sense. They communicate not only to the organization but also to a large external audience that includes the political leadership, media, and the American people. To influence those audiences, strategic leaders seek to convey integrity and win trust. As GA Marshall noted, they become expert in “the art of persuasion.”

Strategic leaders commit to a few common, powerful, and consistent messages and repeat them over and over in different forms and settings. They devise a communications campaign plan, written or conceptual, that outlines how to deal with each target group. When preparing to address a specific audience, they determine its composition and agenda so they know how best to reach its members. Finding some apparent success with the medium, frequency, and words of the message, strategic leaders determine the best way to measure the
message’s effectiveness and continually scan and assess the environment to make sure that the message is going to all the right groups.

One of the forms of communication that strategic leaders use to persuade individuals, rather than groups, is dialogue. Dialogue is a conversation between two or more people. It requires not only active listening, but carefully considering what’s said (and not said), logically assessing it without personal bias, and specifying issues that are not understood or don’t make sense within the strategic leader’s frame of reference. Often, strategic leaders rely heavily on negotiating skills to obtain the cooperation and support necessary to accomplish mission or meet the command’s needs. For example, commanders of the national contingents that made up the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) implementation force (IFOR) sent to Bosnia to support the 1995 Dayton peace accords all had limitations imposed on the extent of their participation. In addition, they all had direct lines to their home governments, which they used when they believed IFOR commanders exceeded those limits. NATO strategic leaders had to negotiate some actions that ordinarily would have required only issuing orders. They often had to interpret a requirement to the satisfaction of one or more foreign governments. Successful negotiation requires a range of interpersonal skills. Good negotiators are able to visualize several possible end states, while maintaining a clear idea of the best end state from the command’s perspective.

One of the most important skills is the ability to stand firm on nonnegotiable points while simultaneously communicating respect for other
participants and their negotiating limits. In international forums, firmness and respect demonstrate that the negotiator knows and understands US interests. That understanding can help the negotiator persuade others of the validity of US interests and convince others that the United States understands and respects the interests of other states.

A good negotiator is particularly skilled in active listening, and other essential personal characteristics, which include perceptiveness and objectivity. Negotiators must be able to diagnose unspoken agendas and detach themselves from the negotiation process. Successful negotiating involves communicating a clear position on all issues while still conveying willingness to bargain on negotiable issues, recognizing what’s acceptable to all concerned, and achieving a compromise that meets the needs of all participants to the greatest extent possible. Sometimes strategic leaders, to put out a proposal early so the interchange and ultimate solution revolve around factors important to the Army. Their understanding of selfless service allows them to subordinate personal recognition to negotiated settlements that produce the greatest good for their establishment, the Army, and the nation or coalition.

**Achieving Consensus**

Strategic leaders are skilled at reaching consensus building and sustaining coalitions. They may apply these skills to tasks as diverse as designing combatant commands, JTFs, and policy working groups or determining the direction of a major command or the Army as an institution. Strategic leaders routinely weld people together for missions lasting from months to years, using
peer leadership rather than strict positional authority. They oversee progress toward their visualized end state and monitor the health of the relationships necessary to achieve it. Interpersonal contact sets the tone for professional relations: strategic leaders are tactful and discreet (FM 22-100, Army Field Manual, 1999).

Strategic leaders, more than direct and organizational leaders, draw on their conceptual skills to comprehend national, national security, and theater strategies, operate in the strategic and theater contexts, and improve their vast, complex organizations. The variety and scope of their concerns demand the application of more sophisticated concepts (FM 22-100, Army Field Manual, 1999).

Strategic leaders need wisdom to routinely deal with diversity, complexity, ambiguity, change, uncertainty, and conflicting policies. They are responsible for developing well-reasoned positions and providing their views and advice to our nation’s highest leaders. For the good of the Army and the nation, strategic leaders seek to determine what’s important now and what will be important in the future. They develop the necessary wisdom by freeing themselves to stay in touch with the force and spending time thinking, simply thinking (FM 22-100, Army Field Manual, 1999).

**Envisioning**

It is in the minds of the commanders that the issue of battle is really decided.

Sir Basil H. Liddell Hart
Strategic leaders design compelling visions for their organizations and inspire a collaborative effort to articulate the vision in detail, and communicate that vision clearly to create a plan, gain support, and focus subordinates’ work. Strategic leaders have the further responsibility of defining for diverse organizations what counts as success in achieving the vision. They monitor progress by drawing on personal observations, review and analysis, strategic management plans, and informal discussions with soldiers and DA civilians.

Strategic leaders look realistically at what the future may hold. They consider things they know and things they can anticipate. They incorporate new ideas, new technologies, and new capabilities. The National Security Strategy and National Military Strategy guide strategic leaders as they develop visions for their organizations. Once strategic leaders have developed a vision, they create a plan to reach that end state. They consider objectives, courses of action to take the organization there, and resources needed to do the job. The word “vision” implies that strategic leaders create a conceptual model of what they want. Subordinates will be more involved in moving the organization forward if they can “see” what the leader has in mind. And because moving a large organization is often a long haul, subordinates need some sign that they’re making progress. Strategic leaders therefore provide intermediate objectives that act as milestones for their subordinates in checking their direction and measuring their progress.

The strategic leader’s vision provides the ultimate sense of purpose, direction, and motivation for everyone in the organization. It is at once the starting point for developing specific goals and plans, a yardstick for measuring
what the organization accomplishes, and a check on organizational values. Ordinarily, a strategic leader’s vision for the organization may have a time horizon of years, or even decades. In combat, the horizon is much closer, but strategic leaders still focus far beyond the immediate actions. The strategic leader’s vision is a goal, something the organization strives for (even though some goals may always be just out of reach). When members understand the vision, they can see it as clearly as the strategic leader. When they see it as worthwhile and accept it, the vision creates energy, inspiration, commitment, and a sense of belonging.

Strategic leaders set the vision for their entire organization. They seek to keep the vision consistent with the external environment, alliance or coalition goals, the National Security Strategy, and the National Military Strategy. Subordinate leaders align their visions and intent with their strategic leader’s vision. A strategic leader’s vision may be expressed in everything from small acts to formal, written policy statements.

Joint Vision 2010 and Army Vision 2010, which is derived from it, are not based on formal organizations; rather they array future technologies and force structure against emerging threats. While no one can yet see exactly what that force will look like, the concepts themselves provide an azimuth and a point on the horizon. Achieving well-publicized milepost initiatives shows that the Army as an institution is progressing toward the end state visualized by its strategic leaders.
Much like intelligence analysts, strategic leaders look at events and see patterns that others often miss. These leaders are likely to identify and understand a strategic situation and, more important, infer the outcome of interventions or the absence of interventions. A strategic leader’s frame of reference helps identify the information most relevant to a strategic situation so that the leader can go to the heart of a matter without being distracted. In the new information environment, that talent is more important than ever. Cosmopolitan strategic leaders, those with comprehensive frames of reference and the wisdom that comes from thought and reflection, are well equipped to deal with events having complex causes and to envision creative solutions. A well-developed frame of reference also gives strategic leaders a thorough understanding of organizational subsystems and their interacting processes. Cognizant of the relationships among systems, strategic leaders foresee the possible effects on one system of actions in others. Their vision helps them anticipate and avoid problems.

True genius resides in the capacity for evaluation of uncertain, hazardous, and conflicting information.

Sir Winston Churchill
Prime Minister of Great Britain, World War II

Strategic leaders operate in an environment of increased volatility, uncertainty, complexity, and ambiguity. Change at this level may arrive suddenly and unannounced. As they plan for contingencies, strategic leaders prepare intellectually for a range of uncertain threats and scenarios. Since great planning
and foresight can’t predict or influence all future events, strategic leaders work to shape the future on terms they can control, using diplomatic, informational, military, and economic instruments of national power (FM 22-100, Army Field Manual, 1999).

Strategic leaders fight complexity by encompassing it. They must be more complex than the situations they face. This means they’re able to expand their frame of reference to fit a situation rather than reducing a situation to fit their preconceptions. They don’t lose sight of Army values and force capabilities as they focus on national policy. Because of their maturity and wisdom, they tolerate ambiguity, knowing they will never have all the information they want. Instead, they carefully analyze events and decide when to make a decision, realizing that they must innovate and accept some risk. Once they make decisions, strategic leaders then explain them to the Army and the nation, in the process imposing order on the uncertainty and ambiguity of the situation. Strategic leaders not only understand the environment themselves; they also translate their understanding to others (FM 22-100, Army Field Manual, 1999).

In addition to demonstrating the flexibility required to handle competing demands, strategic leaders understand complex cause-and-effect relationships and anticipate the second- and third-order effects of their decisions throughout the organization. The highly volatile nature of the strategic environment may tempt them to concentrate on the short term, but strategic leaders don’t allow the crisis of the moment absorb them completely. They remain focused on their responsibility to shape an organization or policies that will perform successfully
over the next 10 to 20 years. Some second- and third-order effects are desirable; leaders can design and pursue actions to achieve them. For example, strategic leaders who continually send—through their actions—messages of trust to subordinates inspire trust in themselves. The third-order effect may be to enhance subordinates’ initiative (FM 22-100, Army Field Manual, 1999).

The skillful formulation, coordination, and application of ends, ways, and means to promote and defend the national interest, are broadly defined as strategic art. Masters of the strategic art competently integrate the three roles performed by the complete strategist: strategic leader, strategic practitioner, and strategic theorist. Using their understanding of the systems within their own organizations, strategic leaders work through the complexity and uncertainty of the strategic environment and translate abstract concepts into concrete actions. Proficiency in the science of leadership can bring direct or organizational leaders success. However, the intangible qualities of leadership for strategic leaders draw on their long and varied experience to produce a rare art (FM 22-100, Army Field Manual, 1999).

Strategic leaders do more than imagine and accurately predict the future; they shape it by moving out of the conceptual realm into practical execution. Although strategic leaders never lose touch with soldiers and their technical skills, some practical activities are unique to this level. By reconciling political and economic constraints with the Army’s needs, strategic leaders navigate to move the force forward using strategy and budget processes. They spend a great deal of time obtaining and allocating resources and determining conceptual directions,
judged critical for future strategic positioning and necessary to prevent readiness shortfalls. They are also charged with overseeing of the Army’s responsibilities under Title 10.

**Leveraging Technology**


Applying technological capabilities to obtain a decisive military advantage has given strategic leaders advantages in force projection, command and control, and in the generation of overwhelming combat power. Leveraging technology has also increased the tempo of operations, the speed of maneuver, the precision of firepower, and the pace at which information is processed. Ideally, information technology enhances not only communications, but also situational understanding. With these advantages, comes increasing complexity: it’s harder to control large organizations that are moving quickly. Strategic leaders seek to understand emerging military technologies and apply that understanding to resourcing, allocating, and exploiting the many systems under their control (FM 22-100, Army Field Manual, 1999).

Technological change allows organizations to do the things they do now better and faster, but it also enables them to do things that were not possible before. Another aspect of leveraging technology is envisioning the future capability that could be exploited by developing a technology. One other aspect is rethinking the configuration the organization ought to take in order to exploit
new processes, which is why strategic leaders take time to think “out of the box” (FM 22-100, Army Field Manual, 1999).

Leveraging technology takes more than understanding; it takes money. Strategic leaders call on their understanding and knowledge of the budgetary process to determine which combat, combat support, and combat service support technologies will provide the leap-ahead capability commensurate with the cost. However, strategic leaders are always in the position of balancing budget constraints, technological improvements, and current force readiness against potential threats as they shape the force for the future (FM 22-100, Army Field Manual, 1999).

Strategic leaders identify military conditions necessary to satisfy political ends desired by America’s civilian leadership. They must synchronize the efforts of the Army with those of the other services and government agencies to attain those conditions, and achieve the end state envisioned by America’s political leaders. Often in conjunction with allies, strategic leaders call on their international perspective and relationships with policy makers in other countries to operate on the world stage. Since the end of the Cold War, the international stage has become more confused. Threats to US national security come from a number of quarters: regional instability, insurgencies, terrorism, and proliferation of weapons of mass destruction to name a few. International drug traffickers and other transnational groups are also potential adversaries. The nation needs a force flexible enough to execute a wide array of missions, to counter such threats, from war fighting to peace operations to humanitarian assistance.
Strategic leaders with the sound perspective that allows them to understand the nation’s political goals in a complex international environment are needed to shape military objectives appropriate to the various threats (FM 22-100, Army Field Manual, 1999).

Leadership is understanding people and involving them to help you do a job. That takes all of the good characteristics, like integrity, dedication of purpose, selflessness, knowledge, skill, implacability, as well as determination not to accept failure.

Admiral Arleigh A. Burke
Naval Leadership: Voices of Experience

Operating at the highest levels of the Army, the DOD, and the national security establishment, military and DA civilian strategic leaders face highly complex demands from inside and outside the Army. Constantly changing global conditions challenge their decision-making abilities. Strategic leaders tell the Army story, make long-range decisions, and shape the Army culture to influence the force and its partners inside and outside the United States. They plan for contingencies across the range of military operations and allocate resources to prepare for them, all the while assessing the threat and the force’s readiness. Steadily improving the Army, strategic leaders develop their successors, lead changes in the force, and optimize systems and operations. Strategic leaders meet this challenge by becoming masters of information, influence, and vision (FM 22-100, Army Field Manual, 1999).

Moving our Army into the next century is a journey, not a destination; we know where we are going and we are moving out.

General Gordon R. Sullivan
Former Army Chief of Staff
Over time, an institution’s culture becomes so embedded in its members that they may not even notice how it affects their attitudes. The institutional culture becomes second nature and influences the way people think, the way they act in relation to each other and outside agencies, and the way they approach the mission. Institutional culture helps define the boundaries of acceptable behavior, ranging from how to wear the uniform to how to interact with foreign nationals. It helps determine how people approach problems, make judgments, determine right from wrong, and establish priorities. Culture shapes Army customs and traditions through doctrine, policies and regulations, and the philosophy that guides the institution. Professional journals, historical works, ceremonies—even the folklore of the organization—all contain evidence of the Army’s institutional culture.

A healthy culture is a powerful leadership tool strategic leaders use to help guide their large diverse organizations. Strategic leaders seek to shape the culture to support their vision, accomplish the mission, and improve the organization. A cohesive culture molds the organization’s morale, reinforcing an ethical climate built on Army values, especially respect. As leaders initiate changes for long-range improvements, soldiers and DA civilians must feel that they’re valued as persons, not just as workers or program supporters.

One-way the Army’s institutional culture affirms the importance of individuals is through its commitment to leader development: in essence, this commitment declares that people are the Army’s future. By committing to broad-based leader development, the Army has redefined what it means to be a soldier.
In fact, Army leaders have even changed the appearance of American soldiers and the way they perform. Introducing height and weight standards, raising PT standards, emphasizing training and education, and deglamorizing alcohol have all fundamentally changed the Army’s institutional culture.

George C. Marshall learned leadership from John J. Pershing, and Marshall’s followers became great captains themselves: Dwight D. Eisenhower, Omar N. Bradley…among them. Pershing and Marshall each taught their subordinates their profession; and, more importantly, they gave them room to grow.

General Gordon R. Sullivan
Former Army Chief of Staff

Strategic leaders develop subordinates by sharing the benefit of their perspective and experience. People arriving at the Pentagon know how the Army works in the field, but regardless of what they may have read, they don’t really know how the institutional Army works. Strategic leaders act as a kind of sponsor by introducing them to the important players and pointing out the important places and activities. But strategic leaders actually become mentors as they, in effect, underwrite the learning, efforts, projects, and ideas of rising leaders. The moral responsibility associated with mentoring is compelling for all leaders; for strategic leaders, the potential significance is enormous. Mentoring by strategic leaders means giving the right people an intellectual boost so that they make the leap to operations and thinking at the highest levels. Because those being groomed for strategic leadership positions are among the most talented Army leaders, the manner in which leaders and subordinates interact also changes. Strategic leaders aim not only to pass on knowledge but
also to grow wisdom in those they mentor (FM 22-100, Army Field Manual, 1999).

Since few formal leader development programs exist beyond the senior service colleges, strategic leaders pay special attention to their subordinates’ self-development, showing them what to study, where to focus, whom to watch, and how to proceed. They speak to audiences at service schools about what goes on “at the top” and spend time-sharing their perspectives with those who haven’t yet reached the highest levels of Army leadership. Today’s subordinates will, after all, become the next generation of strategic leaders. Strategic leaders are continually concerned that the Army institutional culture and the climates in subordinate organizations encourage mentoring by others so that growth opportunities are available from the earliest days of a soldier or DA civilian’s careers (FM 22-100, Army Field Manual, 1999).

The higher up the chain of command, the greater is the need for boldness to be supported by a reflective mind so that boldness does not degenerate into purposeless bursts of blind passion.

Carl von Clausewitz

**Building Amid Change**

The Army has no choice but to face change. It's in a nearly constant state of flux, with new people, new missions, new technologies, new equipment, and new information. At the same time, the Army, inspired by strategic leaders, must innovate and create change. The Army’s customs, procedures, hierarchical
structure, and sheer size make change especially daunting and stressful. Nonetheless, the Army must be flexible enough to produce and respond to change, even as it preserves the core of traditions that tie it to the nation, its heritage and its values (FM 22-100, Army Field Manual, 1999).

Strategic leaders deal with change by being proactive, not reactive. They anticipate change even as they shield their organizations from unimportant and bothersome influences; they use the “change-drivers” of technology, education, doctrine, equipment, and organization to control the direction and pace of change. Many agencies and corporations have “futures” groups charged with thinking about tomorrow; strategic leaders and their advisory teams are the Army’s “futures people” (FM 22-100, Army Field Manual, 1999). Strategic leaders lead change by—

- Identifying the force capabilities necessary to accomplish the National Military Strategy.
- Assigning strategic and operational missions, including priorities for allocating resources.
- Preparing plans for using military forces across the spectrum of operations.
- Creating, resourcing, and sustaining organizational systems, including—
  - Force modernization programs. Requisite personnel and equipment.
  - Essential command, control, communications, computers, and intelligence systems.
  - Developing and improving doctrine and the training methods to support it.
  - Planning for the second- and third-order effects of change.
  - Maintaining an effective leader development program and other human resource initiatives.
Strategic leaders must guide their organizations through eight stages if their initiatives for change are to make lasting progress. Skipping a step or moving forward prematurely subverts the process and compromises success. Strategic leaders (1) demonstrate a sense of urgency by showing not only the benefits of but also the necessity for change. They (2) form guiding coalitions to work the process all the way from concept through implementation. With those groups they (3) develop a vision of the future and strategy for achieving it. Because change is most effective when members embrace it, strategic leaders (4) communicate the vision throughout the institution or organization, and then (5) empower subordinates at all levels for widespread, parallel efforts. They (6) plan for short-term successes to validate the programs and keep the vision credible and (7) consolidate those wins and produce further change. Finally, the leader (8) preserves the change culturally. The result is an institution that constantly prepares for and even shapes the future environment. Strategic leaders seek to sustain the Army as that kind of institution (FM 22-100, Army Field Manual, 1999).

A good soldier, whether he leads a platoon or an army, is expected to look backward as well as forward; but he must think only forward.

General of the Army Douglas MacArthur

The nation expects military professionals as individuals, and the Army as an institution, to learn from the experience of others and apply that learning to
understanding the present and preparing for the future. Such learning requires both individual self-development, part of which is studying military history and other disciplines related to military operations. The Army as an institution must be committed to conducting technical research, monitoring emerging threats, and developing leaders for the next generation. Strategic leaders, by their example and resourcing decisions, sustain the culture and policies that encourage both the individual and the Army to learn. Strategic leaders promote learning by emplacing systems for studying the force and the future. Strategic leaders must resource a structure that constantly reflects on how the Army fights and what victory may cost. All that means constantly assessing the culture and deliberately encouraging creativity and learning, (FM 22-100, Army Field Manual, 1999).

Efficient and effective operations require aligning various initiatives so that different factions are not working at cross-purposes. Strategic leaders focus research and development efforts on achieving combined arms success. Strategic leaders coordinate time lines and budgets so that compatible systems are fielded together. However, they are also concerned that the force have optimal capability across time; therefore, they prepare plans that integrate new equipment and concepts into the force as they're developed, rather than waiting for all elements of a system to be ready before fielding it. Finally, learning what the force should be means developing the structure, training, and leaders those future systems will support and studying the variety of threats they may face (FM 22-100, Army Field Manual, 1999).
To lead change personally and move the Army establishment toward their concept of the future, strategic leaders transform political and conceptual programs into practical and concrete initiatives. That process increasingly involves leveraging technology and shaping the culture. By knowing themselves, the strategic players the operational requirements, the geopolitical situation, and the American public, strategic leaders position the force and the nation for success. Because there may be no time for a World War II or Desert Storm sort of buildup, success for Army strategic leaders means being ready to win a variety of conflicts now and remaining ready in the uncertain years ahead. Strategic leaders prepare the Army for the future through their leadership. That means influencing people—members of the Army, members of other government agencies, and the people of the nation the Army serves—by providing purpose, direction, and motivation. It means operating to accomplish today’s missions, foreign and domestic, and improving the institution—making sure its people are trained and that its equipment and organizations are ready for tomorrow’s missions, anytime, anywhere (FM 22-100, Army Field Manual, 1999).

**Leadership Styles: Educational, Corporate and Military**

Working within the historical background of educational and corporate leadership as the foundation for the development of CEO and the Superintendent of schools, these two high-profile positions became the birth of administrative, managerial and leadership styles that were required to run both professions in an efficient and organized manner for the well being of the general public. By
definition, an administrative or leadership style is the way that a leader leads. Although most authors on leadership styles concur that it is an important part of leadership, and that it is something leaders ought to be more aware of, there is very little more on the subject that about which they agree. Many experts on leadership do not totally agree about the major elements of different styles; about whether the leader can change his or her style; or whether leader personality traits have an effect on style (Tracy, 1999).

One of the most important components in leadership styles is decision making. According to some research on leadership styles, the amount of input provided by subordinates in decisions making process really determines, for the most part, the leadership style used by the CEO.

Tannebaum and Schmidt (1968) proposed one way of looking at dimensions of leadership styles by viewing leadership styles on a wide spectrum ranging from a “subordinate centered” style to a “boss centered” style. The most subordinate centered leadership allows giving subordinates great freedom in making decisions within very flexible limits or parameters. In the most boss-centered leadership, CEO’s make the decisions by themselves and announce or try to “sell” their ideas to subordinates. Tannenbaum and Schmidt make it clear that sometimes the more boss-centered leadership style is best, but they clearly concur that the subordinate-centered leadership-style is the most effective and gives subordinates the challenge of freedom.

Leaders differ somewhat on who should make decisions in an organization. Leaders also vary in the way they view employees. Many authors
and researchers agree, on the topic of leadership styles, with the writing of Douglas McGregor and his famous concept of Theory X and Theory Y (Piele and Smith, 1989). McGregor believed that people possess one of two types of human behavior. Theory X states that people are basically lazy and need to be motivated by either material or other rewards or punishment. Theory Y states that people enjoy a sense of accomplishment, are basically self-motivated, and have a desire to make an impact or contribution to their organization. McGregor classified leaders as following either Theory X or Y, with Theory Y being more modern, humanitarian, and successful of the two. According to McGregor, if leaders treat people as being responsible and self-motivated, they will be. However, if they treat them as being irresponsible and lazy, or without motivation, they will be that, too.

Another way of classifying leadership styles is how the leader conducts human relations with his subordinates. This includes establishing ways of doing things, channels of communication, and organizational patterns. In research conducted by Andrew Halpin and Ralph Stogdill at Ohio State University, a study involving fifty Ohio superintendents, it was concluded that leaders place a lot of importance on initiating structure and relationships with people (Piele and Smith, 1989). Effective leaders showed behavior indicative of friendship, mutual trust, respect, and warmth.

Research conducted by Fiedler, cited by Piele and Smith (1989), described leadership styles as being either task-oriented or relationship-oriented. They represented the two extremes of the spectrum. Fiedler concluded that
leaders who described their: “least-preferred co-workers” in positive terms were
“human-relations oriented, “ whereas those who described their “least-preferred
co-worker” in negative terms were “task oriented” (Piele and Smith, 1989). Both
styles, however, were believed to be effective styles for leadership.

Still one other way of classifying leadership styles deals with the way that
CEO’s implement changes within their organizations. Research conducted by
Shirley Hord and Gene Hall at the Research and Development Center for
Teacher Education in Austin, Texas discussed leadership styles used by
superintendents and principals in implementing new curriculum programs and
policies (Piele and Smith, 1989). School

Presently there are four broad and basic leadership styles that CEO’s use
in their organizations. Research on this topic discusses how CEO’s must adapt to
a leadership style to fit the situation(s) that they are dealing with. Corporate
presidents and superintendents need to be flexible within their organization in
order to be effective and successful leaders in today’s society.

According to modern research, corporate “CEO’s must move their
companies away from the hierarchical command-and control management style
that has long characterized American business and move towards a model
based on teamwork, communication, flexibility, and employee empowerment”
(Hockaday Jr., p. 30-31, 1993). Hockaday thinks that the only real edge in
corporation is its people and in order for corporations to develop a shared vision
of strategy, an open and honest dialogue among employees is necessary. The
author also states that corporate CEO’s must provide vision, motivate all employees (McGregor’s Theory Y), develop leaders, and embrace change.

Zaleznik, cited by Frey, Waldron, and Donion (1993), states that corporate CEO turnover is at an all-time high. He presents five precepts for business leaders today: “1) Leaders should have a high degree of self-knowledge; 2) Leaders should think in terms of substance, not process; 3) Leaders should be intelligent; 4) Leaders must have compassion for other people and workers; 5) Leaders must communicate constantly with shareholders, boards, and the outside world” (Frey, Waldron, Donion, 1993). Leadership styles are ever changing and so must CEOs.

The new style of the corporate CEO is becoming less and less boss-centered and more and more subordinate-centered in the sense of first among equals (Heller, 1992). CEO’s must be able to identify their leadership style first, and then be flexible enough to change styles to meet the situation it calls for.

In a very important study, Truskie (1991) surveyed 735 Vice-presidents of corporations listed in the Corporate 1, 000 to determine what makes a great corporate leader. The study targeted five criteria on which to rate their chief executive officer:

1. Leadership Performance
2. Leadership Skills
3. Leadership Behaviors
4. Personal Characteristics, and

Truskie found that in order to command the respect of workers, a CEO should thoroughly understand the company and its industry (This is also true for school superintendents). The typical CEO of the study has a leadership style described as that of a benevolent autocrat – an effective leadership style that is task-oriented but lacks relationship. Corporate CEO’s of today must practice bringing out the best in people’s leadership styles. The traditional “take-charge” president will have to become an innovator, a team builder, and a mentor in order to survive (McManus, 1990).

According to the Army’s Manual FM22-100, Who you are determines the way you work with other people. Although Army leadership doctrine describes how you should interact with your subordinates, and how you must strive to learn and improve your leadership skills, the Army recognizes that you must always be yourself; anything else comes across as fake and insincere (FM 22-100, Army Field Manual, 1999).

Effective military leaders are flexible enough to adjust their leadership style and techniques to the people they lead. Some subordinates respond best to coaxing, suggestions, or gentle prodding; others need, and even want at times, the verbal equivalent of a kick in the pants. Treating people fairly doesn’t mean treating people as if they were clones of one another. In fact, if you treat everyone the same way, you’re probably being unfair, because different people need different things from you. You must fit the training to the experience of those being trained. In the same way, you must adjust your leadership style and
techniques to the experience of your people and characteristics of your organization (FM 22-100, Army Field Manual, 1999).

Obviously, you don’t lead senior NCOs the same way you lead privates. But the easiest distinctions to make are those of rank and experience. You must also take into account personalities, self-confidence, self-esteem—all the elements of the complex mix of character traits that makes dealing with people difficult and rewarding. One of the many things that makes a leader’s job tough is that, in order to get their best performance, you must figure out what your subordinates need and what they’re able to do, even when they don’t know themselves (FM 22-100, Army Field Manual, 1999).

When discussing leadership styles, many people focus on the extremes: autocratic and democratic. Autocratic leaders tell people what to do with no explanation. Democratic leaders use their personalities to persuade subordinates. There are many shades in between; however, bear in mind that competent leaders mix elements of all these styles to match to the place, task, and people involved. Using different leadership styles in different situations or elements of different styles in the same situation isn’t inconsistent. The opposite is true: if you can use only one leadership style, you’re inflexible and will have difficulty operating in situations where that style doesn’t fit (FM 22-100, Army Field Manual, 1999).

The directing style is leader-centered. Leaders using the directing style don’t solicit input from subordinates, and give detailed instructions on how, when, and where they want a task performed. They then supervise its execution very
closely. The directing style may be appropriate when time is short and leaders
don’t have a chance to explain things. They may simply give orders: Do this. Go
there. Move. In fast-paced operations or in combat, leaders may revert to the
directing style, even with experienced subordinates. If the leader has created a
climate of trust, subordinates will assume the leader has switched to the directing
style because of the circumstances. The directing style is also appropriate when
leading inexperienced teams or individuals who are not yet trained to operate on
their own. In this kind of situation, the leader will probably remain close to the
action to make sure things go smoothly. People mistakenly believe the directing
style means using abusive or demeaning language or includes threats and
intimidation (FM 22-100, Army Field Manual, 1999). If you’re ever tempted to be
abusive, whether because of pressure or stress, or what seems like improper
behavior by a subordinate, ask yourself these questions: Would I want to work
for someone like me? Would I want my boss to see and hear me treat
subordinates this way? Would I want to be treated this way?

The participating style centers on both the leader and the team. Given a
mission, leaders ask subordinates for input, information, and recommendations
but make the final decision on what to do. This style is especially appropriate for
leaders who have time for such consultations or who are dealing with
experienced subordinates. The team-building approach lies behind the
participating leadership style. When subordinates help create a plan, it becomes,
at least in part, their plan. Ownership creates a strong incentive to invest the
effort necessary to make the plan work. Asking for this kind of input is a sign of a
leader’s strength and self-confidence. However, asking for advice doesn’t mean the leader is obligated to follow it; the leader alone is always responsible for the quality of decisions and plans (FM 22-100, Army Field Manual, 1999).

The delegating style involves giving subordinates the authority to solve problems and make decisions without clearing them through the leader. Leaders with mature and experienced subordinates or who want to create a learning experience for subordinates often need only to give them authority to make decisions, the necessary resources, and a clear understanding of the mission’s purpose. As always, the leader is ultimately responsible for what does or does not happen, but in the delegating leadership style, the leader holds subordinate leaders accountable for their actions. This is the style most often used by officers dealing with senior NCOs, and by organizational and strategic leaders (FM 22-100, Army Field Manual, 1999).

A man does not have himself killed for a few halfpence a day or for a petty distinction. You must speak to the soul in order to electrify the man.

Napoleon Bonaparte

These words of a distinguished military leader capture the distinction between the transformational leadership style, which focuses on inspiration and change, and the transactional leadership style, which focuses on rewards and punishments. As suggested, the transformational style “transforms” subordinates by challenging them to rise above their immediate needs and self-interests. The transformational style is developmental: it emphasizes individual growth (both professional and personal) and organizational enhancement. Key features of the transformational style include empowering and mentally stimulating subordinates: you consider and motivate them first as individuals, and then, as a group. To use
the transformational style, you must have the courage to communicate your intent and then step back and let your subordinates’ work, aware that immediate benefits are often delayed until the mission is accomplished (FM 22-100, Army Field Manual, 1999).

The transformational style allows you to take advantage of the skills and knowledge of experienced subordinates who may have better ideas on how to accomplish a mission. Leaders who use this style communicate reasons for their decisions or actions and, in the process, build in subordinates a broader understanding and ability to exercise initiative and operate effectively. However, not all situations lend themselves to the transformational leadership style. The transformational style is most effective during periods that call for change or present new opportunities. It also works well when organizations face a crisis, instability, mediocrity, or disenchantment. It may not be effective when subordinates are inexperienced, when the mission allows little deviation from accepted procedures, or when subordinates are not motivated. Leaders who use only the transformational leadership style limit their ability to influence individuals in these and similar situations (FM 22-100, Army Field Manual, 1999).

In contrast, some leaders employ only the transactional leadership style. This style includes such techniques as:

- Motivating subordinates to work by offering rewards or threatening punishment.
- Prescribing task assignments in writing.
- Outlining all the conditions of task completion, the applicable rules and regulations, the benefits of success, and the
consequences—to include possible disciplinary actions—of failure.

- "Management —by- exception, “where leaders focus on their subordinates’ failures, showing up only where something goes wrong.

The leader, who relies exclusively on the transactional style, rather than combining it with the transformational style, evokes only short-term commitment from his subordinates and discourages risk-taking and innovation. There are situations where the transactional style is acceptable, if not preferred. However, using only the transactional style can make the leader’s efforts appear self-serving. Such perceptions can destroy the trust subordinates have in the leader. Using the transactional style alone can also deprive subordinates of opportunities to grow, because it leaves no room for honest mistakes.

The most effective leaders combine techniques from the transformational and transactional leadership styles to fit the situation. A strong base of transactional understanding supplemented by charisma, inspiration and individualized concern for each subordinate, produces the most enthusiastic and genuine response. Subordinates will be more committed, creative, and innovative. They will also be more likely to take calculated risks to accomplish their mission.

Actions you take as a leader will most likely have unintended as well as intended consequences. Some decisions set off a chain of events; as far as possible, leaders must anticipate the second- and third-order effects of their actions. Even lower-level leaders’ actions may have effects well beyond what
they expect. Leaders who have thought through the consequences of possible actions, talked with their own leaders about the commander’s intent and mission priorities, and trust their chain of command to support them are less likely to be paralyzed by pressure. Intended consequences are the anticipated results of a leader’s decisions and actions. When leaders streamline procedures, help people work smarter, and get the resources to the right place at the right time, the intended consequences are good. Unintended consequences are the results of things a leader does that have an unplanned impact on the organization or accomplishment of the mission. Unintended consequences are often more lasting and harder to anticipate than intended consequences. Organizational and strategic leaders spend a good deal of energy considering possible unintended consequences of their actions. Their organizations are complex, so figuring out the effects today’s decisions will have a few years in the future is difficult.

III. DESIGN AND METHOD OF THE STUDY

There are two main purposes of this study. First, examine and compare the relationship of effective leadership characteristics within the military, corporate, and educational domains. Second, to develop a diagnostic assessment designed for superintendents to evaluate principals that will emerge from the leadership characteristics data. By researching this topic,
superintendents as Chief Executive Officers, will have an instrument to use as a model for providing corrective feedback. The central question that will guide this study is: What makes an effective and successful leader, specifically at the school level. In addition, two related questions that will direct the focus of this study are:

1. What are common agreed upon characteristics and differences among military, corporate, and educational leaders?
2. How can knowledge of common agreed upon standard characteristics and differences among military, corporate, and educational leaders form the development of an educational leadership assessment instrument?

The nature of the topic and the research questions selected dictate the use of a quantitative research methodology. Data will be collected by means of a survey with a purposive sampling (Kerlinger, 1989) of participants within the educational domain, at the principal and superintendent leadership levels of the organization.

In this study, research data will be attained from principals and superintendents to examine and compare the relationship of effective leadership characteristics reported in the military and corporate literature. Through the use of a questionnaire, a survey will be conducted with a preplanned set of questions designed to yield specific information (Key, 1997) towards the development of an instrument that could assess, leadership skills, abilities and styles for effective leadership of successful schools.
Advantages to using a questionnaire are (Key, 1997):

• Economy - Expense and time involved in training interviewers and sending them to interview are reduced by using questionnaires.

• Uniformity of questions - Each respondent receives the same set of questions phrased in exactly the same way. Questionnaires may, therefore, yield data more comparable than information obtained through an interview.

• Standardization - If the questions are highly structured and the conditions under which they are answered are controlled, then the survey could become standardized.

In this study the questions are all observable verbs.

Quantitative Research Methodology

Quantitative research has its roots in positivism and is closely related to the scientific method wherein the emphasis is on facts, relationships, and causes. Quantitative researchers place great value on outcomes and product (Reese, 1980). Quantitative research looks for more context-free generalizations, and is more willing to focus on individual variables and factors, rather than concentrate on a holistic interpretation (Wiersma, 2000).
Smith (1983) explains that quantitative research attempts to gather and investigate data via objective methods to provide information about relations, comparisons, effects and causes, and predictions. Quantitative research methodology emphasizes and attempts to remove the investigator from the investigation (Smith, 1983).

Each participant will respond to a survey in which selected variables are studied. Leadership characteristics of the military, corporate and educational domains will be examined. A lot of survey research is considered quantitative but some procedures commonly associated with surveys, such as interviewing, may be involved in an ethnographic or historical study's classification system in terms of its own definitions and criteria. However, as the name implies, quantitative research typically is to a large extent expressed as numbers, and research design is directed to enabling the researcher to make valid interpretations through comparisons and partitioning of those numbers (Wiersma, 2000).

A major goal of this quantitative study is to develop a valid diagnostic instrument for assessing leadership skills in principals. Explaining or controlling variance is an important part of quantitative research and this research design will address this issue by being able to explain or account for variance caused by variables being studied. When the variance of one variable is considered, it may be influenced by any number of factors. Variance takes on quantitative meaning, and at least to some extent, will be partitioned as attributable to variables included in this research study (Wiersma, 2000).
There are basically four ways by which variance is controlled (Wiersma, 2000):

1. **Randomization.** Spreads an effect of a variable evenly across the groups of the study.
2. **Building conditions or factors into the design as independent variables.** Enables the researcher to determine the effects of those factors. Too many independent variables, however, can unnecessarily complicate the research design.
3. **Holding conditions or factors constant.** When a factor is constant, a potential variable is reduced to a constant, which eliminates, or at least substantially reduces, any effect the factor may have on the dependent variable.
4. **Statistical adjustments.** Statistical control, in essence consists of adjusting the dependent variable scores to remove the effect of the control variable.

The purpose of controlling variance is to enhance the interpretation of results so that the researcher can tell what effects, if any, the variables are having. Carefully designing the research design for this study will enhance the validity of the research; failing to do so may well lead to uninterpretable or nongeneralizable results.

Characteristics of a good research design include: freedom from bias, freedom from confounding, control of extraneous variables, and statistical precision for testing hypotheses. Bias in the data may be eliminated by random assignment of individuals or random sampling. Selecting a design does not complete the task of obtaining an adequate research design. The pilot results will be used to develop the main instrument.
SITE AND SAMPLE SELECTION

Site Selection

The participants of this study will include the responses of teachers, principals, and regional superintendents to compare their perceptions of effective leadership traits. A comparison will be made of their responses through a survey to improve the quality of their leadership styles, skills, and expectations of the organization towards effective and successful educational leadership. A pilot study survey will be conducted with a sample of effective teachers, principals, and Regional Superintendents in the School District of Philadelphia through purposive sampling who are the equivalents of suburban superintendents. Principals, teachers, and Regional Superintendents who participate in the pilot study will be those selected through purposive sampling representative of the School District of Philadelphia. The Regional Superintendents will identify principals as participants for the pilot study.

The overall sampling will be developed from the pilot study and will comprise a survey of a random sample of superintendents, throughout the United States, as listed in the American Association of School Administrators directory.

Selection of Participants

The participants will be those Teachers, Principals and Regional Superintendents under the overall leadership within the educational domain. Participant's responses to leadership styles, skills and expectations of organizations will be examined including a pilot study of thirty effective teachers, principals and Regional Superintendents. This overall sample will allow the
researcher to examine a full range of leadership styles, skills, and expectations, in the development of the overall instrument to be used by superintendents in assessing effective leadership skills of principals.

The dissertation will involve a random sampling of three hundred (300) superintendents across the nation with a fifty percent (50%) expectation return, as participants that are representative of the urban, rural and suburban educational domains, (Kerlinger, 1989).

**COLLECTION OF DATA: PILOT STUDY**

**Surveys**

Surveys in the pilot study were conducted with a purposive sampling of teachers, principals and a random sample of Regional Superintendents (Kerlinger, 1989). The survey comprised a questionnaire developed by the researcher and reviewed by a panel of experts. The questionnaire includes
questions about effective leadership styles, skills, and expectations drawn from
the military, corporate and educational literature. The pilot study survey has
questions interspersed from the military, corporate and educational organizations
and was distributed to teachers, principals and Regional Superintendents for
their responses. Each participant received instructions with a timeline for the
completion and return of each questionnaire. A stamped, self-addressed
envelope was included in each respondent’s package to facilitate the return of
each survey.

Data from the pilot study was used in the development of the main
instrument sent to a random sampling of Superintendents nationally. Items from
each domain of leadership in the pilot study was intermingled, while a master
listing will be maintained to identify from which specific domain the questions
were derived. Items in the main instrument will extract responses, which will
serve to prioritize identified leadership skills. The objective was to develop a
diagnostic assessment that emerged from the leadership characteristics data
designed for superintendents to evaluate principals.

The survey was utilized as a data collecting instrument because it allows
the researcher to ask appropriate questions to find out what the researcher
needs to learn or understand, while giving the participant leeway in responding to
suggested lines of questioning or issues raised that the researcher may pursue.
The purpose of the surveys was to collect descriptive data, to gain an insight into
the participant’s leadership style, skills, and expectations.
A survey and letter of transmittal was mailed to each superintendent in the sample. The letter of transmittal conveyed the purpose of the study, as well as the directions for completing the surveys. A stamped, self-addressed envelope was included in each respondent’s package to facilitate the return of each survey.

**Analysis and Treatment of Pilot Data**

The pilot survey was conducted during Spring 2003 and the dissertation study during Summer 2003. The researcher gained access to each participant following established procedure for human subject research. Each participant was guaranteed anonymity for his or her responses as participants in this study.

The utilization of factor analysis uncovered the latent structure (dimensions) of variables within this study of teachers, principals and superintendents to examine and compare the relationship of effective leadership characteristics within the military, corporate, and educational domains. Factor analysis reduces attribute space from a larger number of variables to a smaller number of factors and as such is a "non-dependent" procedure (Garson, 2001).

In this study a series of Chi-Square analyses was conducted to determine whether any differences and expected frequencies of responses to the variables were statistically significant as identified in the research questions to examine and compare the relationship of effective leadership characteristics within the military, corporate, and educational domains.
Garson (2001) states that factor analysis could be used for any of the following purposes:

- To reduce a large number of variables to a smaller number of factors for modeling purposes, where the large number of variables precludes modeling all the measures individually. As such, factor analysis is integrated in structural equation modeling (SEM), helping create the latent variables modeled by SEM. However, factor analysis can be and is often used on a stand-alone basis for similar purposes;

- To select a subset of variables from a larger set based on which original variables have the highest correlations with the principal component factors;

- To create a set of factors to be treated as uncorrelated variables as one approach to handling multicollinearity in such procedures as multiple regression;

- To validate a scale or index by demonstrating that its constituent items load on the same factor, and to drop proposed scale items which cross-load on more than one factor;

- To establish that multiple tests measure the same factor, thereby giving justification for administering fewer tests;

- To identify clusters of cases and/or outliers; and,

- To determine network groups by determining which sets of people cluster together.

Factor analysis is part of the multiple general linear hypothesis (MLGH) family of procedures and makes many of the same assumptions as multiple regression. Factor analysis generates a table in which the rows are the observed raw indicator variables. This study of teachers, principals and Regional Superintendents will examine and compare the overlap of effective leadership characteristics within the military, corporate, and educational domains. The columns are the factors or latent variables that explain as much of the variance as possible in this study of effective leadership skills in the military, corporate and educational domains.
In this study, the cells in this table are factor loadings and the meaning of the factors must be deduced from seeing which variables that examine and compare effective characteristics of leadership, are loaded on which factors when compared to the baseline data survey (Garson, 2001). Thus, data collected will be summarized and reported in tables and graphs as appropriate. Observed and expected frequencies will be calculated for each cell and the resulting Chi-Square and p-value will be tabulated and reported, and areas where the data is statistically significant will be indicated. A significance level of p > .05 will be used.

Data collected from the survey will be described and discussed in a “findings” section of Chapter Four of this research project. A final analysis, summary, recommendations and reflections will comprise Chapter Five.

IV. FINDINGS

There were two main purposes for this research. First was to examine and compare the relationship of effective leadership characteristics across the
military, corporate, and educational domains. Second was to develop a
diagnostic assessment focusing on leadership characteristics that emerged from
the survey data on leadership characteristics. The resulting instrument is
designed for superintendents to evaluate principals. By researching this topic,
superintendents as Chief Executive Officers, are provided a short valid
instrument that also may be used for providing corrective feedback. The central
question that guided the study was: What makes an effective and successful
leader specifically at the school level. There were two related questions that
directed the focus of the study:

1. What were common agreed upon standard characteristics of
   leaders among military, corporate, and educational leaders?

2. How did knowledge of common agreed upon standard
   characteristics and differences among military, corporate, and educational
   leaders form the development of an educational leadership assessment
   instrument?

The following investigation was preformed in an attempt to quantify the
effective leadership characteristics across the military, corporate, and
educational domains. The end result of this investigation was the development
of an instrument that will be used to assess the leadership skills, abilities and
styles of individuals who have management positions within the educational
systems. The instrument will examine if an individual has the essential
leadership skills needed for successful management of a school, through the use of a Diagnostic Principal Assessment.

**Pilot**

The purpose of the pilot study was the surveying of effective teachers, principals and regional superintendents to compare their perceptions of effective leadership traits in reference to principals. The pilot consisted of 10 teachers, 10 principals, and 10 regional superintendents.

Thirty pilot surveys were distributed and returned. The SPSS package 11.5 applications were used to perform a Chi Square on the frequency count. Additionally, a Factor analysis was conducted to determine which variables were grouped.

**Chi Square**

Chi-square of statistical significance is a non-parametric test. The Chi-square examines if the frequencies of the response from the samples being tested are statistically different from one another. To use a Chi-square several inferences must be met. First, each observation must be independent; that is only one response per subject. Second, all data points must be reported in frequencies, percentages or proportions cannot be used. Third, the dependent variable must be categorical. Fourth, both the expected value and the observed value cells should be too small. Expected values should be no less than .05, and lastly the categories for the independent and dependent variables must be mutually exclusive. All assumptions were met.
Degrees of Freedom

In order to determine whether a systematic relationship does exist using the Chi Square, it is necessary to ascertain the probability of obtaining a value of chi-square as large or larger than one calculated from the sample. This depends in part on the degrees of freedom. The degrees of freedom vary with the number of categories (rows and columns) used. They are important because the probability of obtaining a specific chi-square value depends on the number of cells in the table.

Chi – Square analysis was performed on the frequencies of the thirty educator’s responses to the survey. See Table 5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Traits</th>
<th>Chi-Square</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Table 5. ESSENTIAL LEADERSHIP SKILLS NEEDED FOR SUCCESSFUL MANAGEMENT OF SCHOOLS
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skill</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>P Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Stability</td>
<td>22.533</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written Communication</td>
<td>26.600</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Skills</td>
<td>7.800</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.020*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluates Previous Actions</td>
<td>16.220</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selfless Service</td>
<td>20.667</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses Student Evaluations</td>
<td>10.800</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivational Theories</td>
<td>6.200</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.045*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consensus Builder</td>
<td>26.800</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivates Individuals</td>
<td>13.333</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completes Tasks</td>
<td>3.333</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.068*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applies Mang. &amp; Devp.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills</td>
<td>12.600</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Issues</td>
<td>15.600</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethical Behavior</td>
<td>34.200</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect</td>
<td>13.333</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applies Prin. Organ. Dev.</td>
<td>7.200</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Skills</td>
<td>2.133</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.144*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applies Sound Fiscal Mang.</td>
<td>16.800</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tech. To Support Mang.</td>
<td>13.467</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td>6.533</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.011*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tech. Expertise</td>
<td>22.533</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Improvement</td>
<td>14.600</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategies of Change</td>
<td>9.600</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulatory Issues</td>
<td>23.067</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Issues</td>
<td>9.800</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Issues</td>
<td>15.067</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loyalty</td>
<td>26.000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Behavior</td>
<td>14.600</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Theories</td>
<td>12.200</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrity</td>
<td>22.533</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good Listening Skills</td>
<td>16.133</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Skills</td>
<td>14.600</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Resources</td>
<td>19.333</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courage</td>
<td>7.200</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.027*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Building</td>
<td>14.600</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity Within Organ.</td>
<td>10.267</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.016*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Plans</td>
<td>12.933</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 5. (continued)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skill</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>P Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prin. of Planning</td>
<td>23.800</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Communication</td>
<td>13.333</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good Oral Skills</td>
<td>18.200</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Notes. The significance level was p < .01
The asterisk (*) indicates results that were deleted from the main survey.
There were 30 participants

MAIN STUDY

Procedure
The overall sampling of survey items was developed from the pilot study and comprised a survey of a random sampling of superintendents throughout the United States, as listed in the American Association of School Administrators directory. The random samplings were sent to three hundred (300) superintendents of urban, rural, and suburban school districts. The surveys were mailed with a cover letter and a stamped return envelope. The allotted time given for the return of the surveys was three (3) weeks. Two hundred (200) surveys, seventy-five percent (75%) were returned within the allotted time.

**Results**

The Chi Square analysis was performed on 200 returned surveys. Results from the analysis suggest that all factors on the survey were significant to effective leadership. See Table 6.
Table 6. ESSENTIAL LEADERSHIP SKILLS NEEDED FOR SUCCESSFUL MANAGEMENT OF SCHOOLS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Traits</th>
<th>Chi-Square</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Stability</td>
<td>214.210</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written Communication</td>
<td>174.040</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluates Previous Actions</td>
<td>156.040</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selfless Service</td>
<td>115.480</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses Student Evaluations</td>
<td>195.240</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consensus Builder</td>
<td>82.270</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivates Individuals</td>
<td>217.840</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applies Mang. &amp; Devp. Skills</td>
<td>213.000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Issues</td>
<td>183.050</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethical Behavior</td>
<td>233.710</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates Respect</td>
<td>153.310</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applies Prin. Organ. Dev.</td>
<td>154.040</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applies Sound Fiscal Mang.</td>
<td>117.800</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tech. To Support Mang.</td>
<td>175.320</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tech. Expertise</td>
<td>170.150</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Improvement</td>
<td>139.720</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategies of Change</td>
<td>149.240</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulatory Issues</td>
<td>101.360</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Issues</td>
<td>142.200</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Issues</td>
<td>151.750</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates Loyalty</td>
<td>137.320</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Behavior</td>
<td>167.480</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Theories</td>
<td>151.840</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrity</td>
<td>411.120</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good Listening Skills</td>
<td>156.430</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Skills</td>
<td>172.600</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Resources</td>
<td>144.600</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Building</td>
<td>165.880</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Plans</td>
<td>215.500</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prin. of Planning</td>
<td>218.050</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Communication</td>
<td>189.840</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good Oral Skills</td>
<td>102.880</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: The significance level was p < .01
There were 200 participants.

Diagnostic Principal Assessment Instrument
From the analysis of the main survey results, a diagnostic principal assessment instrument was developed. The purpose of the instrument developed is to assess the leadership characteristics of principals. The instrument consists of thirty-two (32) characteristics. The instrument was designed using a Likert scale:

- NA=Cannot evaluate
- 1=None of the time
- 2=Very little
- 3=Sometimes
- 4=Most of the time
- 5=Always

The Likert type scale provides the rater with a series of statements to which they indicate a degree of disagreement or agreement. On this type of scale, items are usually treated as if they yield interval-scale data, that is, it is assumed to the raters’ opinion of the differences between a “1” and a “2” is the same difference between a “4” and a “5”.

**Point Scale**

If the superintendent rated a characteristic 5, that characteristic is given a raw score of 4. If the superintendent rated a characteristic 4, that characteristic was given a raw score of 3. If the superintendent rated a characteristic 3, that characteristic was given a raw score of 2. If the superintendent rated a characteristic 2, that characteristic was given a raw score 1. The raw score of 1 that denotes none-of-the-time is applicable because there are situations in which an individual never demonstrates efficiency within a particular area or category.
The opinion scales were converted to a raw score because regressions can only be run on raw scores.

The development of this key was based on the fact that this applied experience is the first of its kind in education, and it is imperative to denote the four types of leaders. The Very Effective Leader is the individual who has demonstrated competency above and beyond expectations. The Effective Leader is the individual that meets all expectations. The Adequate Leader is the individual that marginally meets the expectations and requirements, (that type of individual has the potential of becoming an Effective or Poor Leader). The Poor leader is the individual that does not meet the requirements or expectations of his/her leadership responsibilities.

**Score Key**

128-97 = **Very Effective Leader**  
96-65 = **Effective Leader**  
64-33 = **Adequate Leader**  
32-or below = **Poor Leader**

Each maximum range was set by multiplying the raw score by the point value set for that score. The low value in the range was set at one above the maximum of the previous range. See Table 7.
Table 7. DIAGNOSTIC PRINCIPAL ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENT

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Demonstrates adequate emotional stability.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Demonstrates skills in written communication.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Evaluates previous actions.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Demonstrates selfless service.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Uses student evaluation data to improve instruction.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Effective consensus builder and demonstrates negotiation skills.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Motivates individuals.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Applies management and development skills.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Uses knowledge of legal issues.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Demonstrates ethical behavior.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Demonstrates respect.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Applies the principles of organizational development.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Applies principles of sound fiscal management.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Uses technology to support management functions.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Demonstrates technological expertise.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Seeks self-improvement.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Incorporates strategies for change.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Uses knowledge of regulatory issues.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Uses knowledge of social issues.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Demonstrates knowledge of global issues.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Demonstrates loyalty.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Demonstrates knowledge of human behavior.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Applies learning theories.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Demonstrates integrity.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Displays good listening communications skills.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Applies knowledge of management skill.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Demonstrates knowledge and understanding of community resources.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Incorporates team building.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Create and implement strategic plans.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Uses principles of planning.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Demonstrates knowledge and understanding of effective communication.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Displays good oral communications skills.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Response**

**Circled Numbers**

5=4, 4=3, 3=2, 2=1, 1=0

**Example:**

25 circled 5’s=100
4 circled 4’s=16
3 circled 3’s=9

**Total Score 125**

Very Effective
Summary of Findings

The findings of this research profile the responses of the superintendents across the nation from urban, suburban, and rural school districts. The study produced a profile of collective consensus pertaining to the importance of leadership characteristics and the need to have an instrument to assess effective leadership characteristics of principals.

The response of 200 superintendents within a three-week period clearly indicates that there is not an existing leadership diagnostic assessment instrument and that there is a desire of superintendents to explore the use of such an instrument. Several superintendents have requested in the comments section of the main survey the desire to receive such an instrument as soon as possible. Such comments strengthen the notion that the need for such an instrument in school districts across the nation exists.

The findings of this research determined the significant factors that lead to effective leadership. The results supported that all predicted characteristics in the main survey were significant for effective leadership.
V. CONCLUSION

This study explored the process of developing a diagnostic instrument that superintendents would be able to use to assess the leadership characteristics of principals. The sample included 300 superintendents located throughout the United States, in rural, suburban and urban school districts. A survey was developed, piloted, validated, and mailed to each superintendent in the sample. The total responses yielded a 75 percent return rate within a two week period.

The purpose of this study was to examine the respondents' perception pertaining to specific characteristics of effective leadership from the corporate, military, and educational domains. Thus, the superintendents who are responsible for evaluating a principal’s effectiveness were the determining factor in the development of the diagnostic principal assessment instrument.

The following description is of the typical and nontraditional superintendent. The superintendents operate school districts in large and small urban, suburban, and rural areas. The typical traditional superintendent possesses a bachelor’s degree in education, a master’s degree, and in several school districts a Ph.D. or Ed.D. The nontraditional superintendents are senior experienced leaders from the military and corporate arenas. They possess degrees from bachelor to doctorate. Senior military personnel possess at a minimum a master’s degree. Most of the areas of concentration are not in education. The one common factor that transcends the military, corporate, and educational arenas is that school districts recruit individuals who were proven effective leaders in their professions.
Based on the analysis of data collected for this research project, I have drawn the following conclusion: **There is a need for an instrument to assess the leadership characteristics of Principals.**

It was not surprising from the research conducted, that there is a definite interest by superintendents to have access to an instrument that would assess the leadership characteristics of their principals. The two week response period in which two-hundred surveys were returned from superintendents across the nation, clearly indicates an interest in having such an instrument for available use.

Superintendents have traditionally been trained educators who have risen from the ranks in education from teacher to school administrator to superintendent. These superintendents whether they were in rural, suburban, or urban public school districts as principals, they were evaluated in a myriad of ways. There was no consistency from school district to school district.

The largest school systems run operations larger than many corporations, food and transportations services, library/information, equipment purchasing, counseling, school construction/renovation, finance management, community and public relations, athletics, arts, health services, personnel, the list is long. Regardless of devolution, if something goes wrong with any of these areas, the responsibility always stops at the superintendent’s desk (Hodgkinson, 1999). If the superintendent is going to have an
effectively functioning school district, then it is a necessity that the principals possess and demonstrate effective leadership. In order to determine if a principal demonstrates effective leadership, the superintendent needs an instrument that can assist in diagnosing the leadership characteristics of a principal.

School districts across the nation have begun to recruit nontraditional superintendents who have been effective leaders in their career fields, such as military and corporate. What these leaders bring to the various school districts is proven effective leadership within their arenas. In order for those nontraditional superintendents to make change within their school districts, they must have effective leadership at the school level. By having an instrument that emerged from effective leadership characteristics from the military, corporate, and educational domains, a superintendent can diagnose the leadership effectiveness of a principal.

The increasing complexity of the principal’s job makes it imperative that the person possesses and utilizes effective leadership characteristics. Today’s principals must be instructional leaders, visionary risk-takers, team builders, managers, planners, and accountable for all activities within a school. If today’s principal is to be successful, he/she must be effective an leader. With the use of a diagnostic principal assessment instrument, superintendents can assess and assist principals in reaching their full potential as effective leaders.

The following Leadership Styles (Directing, Participating, Delegating, Transformational, and Transactional) have served to categorize the 32-item assessment instrument that was developed in this study, (see Appendix E).
Implications

No single strategy appears to exist to accurately assess principal's leadership capabilities. The varied methods used by superintendents of large (100 or more schools) school districts have shown an inconsistency in assessing principals within the same district, when the regional superintendents within the same district utilize different means of assessment. In smaller school districts where the one superintendent assesses all principals, he/she utilizes a particular system, which may not be the same as the neighboring school district, or any school district within the state. School districts across the nation utilize assessment methods that are perceived as germane to the districts climate, culture, and vision. Regardless of what method a superintendent utilizes to evaluate principals, it is clearly evident from the responses of superintendents across the nation that there is a desire to have an instrument that can assess a principal's leadership effectiveness.

One implication drawn from the findings is that, as the role of principal becomes more complex and demanding, the need for effective leadership in the schools is imperative. Many principals have been relieved of their duties due to poor leadership skills (not due to lack of instructional knowledge). Schools have achieved acceptable scores on standardized tests with poor leadership from the school administrator. Such schools with effective or highly effective leaders have the capability of achieving higher academic attainment. With the current federal mandate of “No Child Left Behind”, in order for schools to achieve that goal, it is imperative that schools have principals that are effective leaders. To assist in determining the effectiveness of a
Principal's leadership, superintendents need an instrument to assist in diagnosing the effectiveness of a principal's leadership characteristics.

**Suggestions for Further Research**

Based on the findings of this study, the Diagnostic Principal Assessment Instrument that was developed may be considered as a viable means of assessing the effectiveness of principals. In order to document the strategy used in the development of this instrument, this study was of an exploratory nature. For further research, one may use more extensive analytical approaches.

The following recommendations are offered:

1. As society, climates, and culture change, so will the demands and responsibilities of the school principal. Therefore, it is recommended that a replication of this study be conducted, with a similar sample population to provide an update and additional information.

2. Other research methods may provide information that is not easily obtained in a survey instrument. Therefore, it is recommended that the study be replicated using data gathered through the case study method, personal interviews, and on-the-job observations.

3. After performing a Factor Analysis on all the variables, results suggest a correlation between several factors. In a follow-up investigation, a regression analysis could be performed on scored diagnostic assessment instruments, and correlated factors.
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APPENDIX A

Pilot Study Survey Questionnaire

SURVEY OF EFFECTIVE LEADERSHIP

GENERAL INFORMATION

1. Please circle the response which best reflects your position or opinion. Thank you for taking time to answer carefully.
2. After you complete the survey, go back and circle what you think are the ten (10) most important characteristics.

PROFESSIONAL STATUS - CIRCLE ONE (1)

Military    Corporate    Teacher    Principal    Regional Superintendent

Please rate Principal effectiveness characteristics on the following items.

Response key:  5 = Essential   4 = Very Important   3 = Neutral  2 = Less Important   1 = Non-Essential

1. Demonstrates adequate emotional stability.  
2. Demonstrates skills in written communication.  
3. Uses research skills to improve instruction.  
4. Evaluates previous actions.  
5. Demonstrates selfless service.  
6. Uses student evaluation data to improve instruction.  
7. Applies motivational theories.  
8. Effective consensus builder and demonstrates negotiation skills.  
9. Motivates individuals.  
10. Completes tasks.  
11. Applies management and development skills.  
12. Uses knowledge of legal issues.  
13. Demonstrates ethical behavior.  
15. Applies the principles of organizational development. 5 4 3 2 1
16. Applies knowledge of interpersonal skills. 5 4 3 2 1
17. Applies principles of sound fiscal management. 5 4 3 2 1
18. Uses technology to support management functions. 5 4 3 2 1
19. Encourages professional development. 5 4 3 2 1
20. Demonstrates technological expertise. 5 4 3 2 1
21. Seeks self-improvement. 5 4 3 2 1
22. Incorporates strategies for change. 5 4 3 2 1
23. Uses knowledge of regulatory issues. 5 4 3 2 1
24. Uses knowledge of social issues. 5 4 3 2 1
25. Demonstrates knowledge of global issues. 5 4 3 2 1
26. Demonstrates loyalty. 5 4 3 2 1
27. Demonstrates knowledge of human behavior. 5 4 3 2 1
28. Applies learning theories. 5 4 3 2 1
29. Demonstrates integrity. 5 4 3 2 1
30. Displays good listening communications skills. 5 4 3 2 1
31. Applies knowledge of management skills. 5 4 3 2 1
32. Demonstrates knowledge and understanding of community resources. 5 4 3 2 1
33. Demonstrates courage. 5 4 3 2 1
34. Incorporates team building. 5 4 3 2 1
35. Uses knowledge of demographic diversity within organizations. 5 4 3 2 1
36. Create and implement strategic plans. 5 4 3 2 1
37. Uses principles of planning. 5 4 3 2 1
38. Demonstrates knowledge and understanding of effective communication. 5 4 3 2 1
39. Displays good oral communications skills. 5 4 3 2 1

Comments:
Appendix A (continued)

Project: Dissertation
Topic: Comparative Analysis of Leadership Skills: Military, Corporate, and Educational as a Basis for Diagnostic Principal Assessment

Researcher: Robert L. Manning, Ph.D. Candidate
Drexel University, Department of Education
Educational Leadership and Learning Technologies

Please consider this invitation to participate in a research project that I am conducting as part of my Ph.D. program at Drexel University. The purpose of this research is to develop a diagnostic leadership assessment tool that superintendents can use to assess principal leadership skills. Your participation would help to develop an effective leadership diagnostic instrument for use by superintendents.

Attached, you will find a survey. This survey will require approximately 5 to 10 minutes of your time. Please complete the survey and return it in the envelope provided. Please return the survey no later than, February 20, 2004. All information gathered through the survey will be kept anonymous. No individual will be identified.

If you have any questions concerning this research or if you would like a copy of the results of the survey, you can contact me via email or telephone. My email address is rmanning@phila.k12.pa.us and my telephone number is (h) 215-657-1274, (w) 215-951-4102/4007.

Thank you in advance for your input and for taking the time to complete and return this survey. Should you lose the return envelope, you may return the survey to me at the following address: 1802 St. Georges Rd., Dresher, PA 19025.

Sincerely,

Robert L. Manning
Ph.D. Candidate
APPENDIX B

Table of Categories and Items

LEADERSHIP CATEGORIES AND ITEMS

Visionary / Leader Provides Direction (Military, Corporate):

- Create and implement strategic plans.
  65. Incorporates strategies for change.
  18. Uses principles of planning.
  23. Demonstrates knowledge of global issues.
  25. Uses knowledge of social issues.
  26. Uses knowledge of legal issues.
  27. Uses knowledge of regulatory issuers.

Drive for Results (Corporate) / Motivator (Military) /Catalytic Leadership (Education):

- Motivates individuals.
  7. Completes tasks.
  52. Applies motivational theories.
  57. Applies the principles of organizational development.

Interpersonal skills (Military, Corporate) / People Development (Corporate) / Skilled Team Builder (Education):

  18. Incorporates team building.
  3. Demonstrates courage.
  4. Demonstrates respect.
  14. Displays good oral communications skills.
  15. Displays good listening communications skills.
  22. Encourages professional development.
  35. Demonstrates skills in written communication.
  43. Applies Knowledge of interpersonal skills.
  45. Applies knowledge of management skills.
  47. Demonstrates knowledge and understanding of effective communication.
  48. Effective consensus builder and demonstrates negotiation skills.
  58. Applies management and development skills.
  61. Demonstrates knowledge and understanding of community resources.
  30. Uses knowledge of demographic diversity within organizations.
Trust (Military) / Emotional Competence, Integrity, Honesty, Ethical Practice (Corporate) / Empathy (Education):

11. Demonstrates adequate emotional stability.
2. Demonstrates integrity.
5. Demonstrates Loyalty.
6. Demonstrates selfless service.
19. Evaluates previous actions.
63. Demonstrates ethical behavior.

Technology Skills (Military, Corporate, Education):

60. Uses technology to support management functions.
12. Demonstrates technological expertise.
49. Uses research skills to improve instruction.
53. Uses student evaluation data to improve instruction.
59. Applies principles of sound fiscal management.

Conceptual Grasp (Military, Corporate, Education):

- Applies learning theories.
31. Demonstrates knowledge of human behavior.
APPENDIX C

Main Survey

SURVEY OF EFFECTIVE LEADERSHIP

General Information

1. Please circle the response which best reflects your position or opinion. Thank you for taking time to answer carefully.
2. After you complete the survey, go back and circle what you think are the ten (10) most important characteristics.

Superintendent Please circle one. Urban Suburban Rural

Please rate Principal effectiveness characteristics on the following items.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Key:</th>
<th>5=Essential</th>
<th>4=Very Important</th>
<th>3=Neutral</th>
<th>2=Less Important</th>
<th>1=Non-Essential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Demonstrates adequate emotional stability.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Demonstrates skills in written communication.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Evaluates previous actions.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Demonstrates selfless service.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Uses student evaluation data to improve instruction.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Effective consensus builder and demonstrates negotiation skills.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Motivates individuals.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Applies management and development skills.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Uses knowledge of legal issues.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Demonstrates ethical behavior.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Demonstrates respect.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Applies the principles of organizational development.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Applies principles of sound fiscal management.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Uses technology to support management functions.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Demonstrates technological expertise.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Seeks self-improvement.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Incorporates strategies for change.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Uses knowledge of regulatory issues.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Uses knowledge of social issues.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Demonstrates knowledge of global issues.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Demonstrates loyalty.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Demonstrates knowledge of human behavior.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Applies learning theories.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Demonstrates integrity.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Displays good listening communications skills.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Applies knowledge of management skill.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Demonstrates knowledge and understanding of community resources.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Incorporates team building.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Create and implement strategic plans.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Uses principles of planning.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Demonstrates knowledge and understanding of effective communication.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Displays good oral communications skills.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
APPENDIX D

DIAGNOSTIC PRINCIPAL ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENT KEY

**Score Key**

128-97 = Very Effective Leader
96-65 = Effective Leader
64-33 = Adequate Leader
32 or below = Poor Leader

**Response Key**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Circled Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 = Always</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 = Most of the time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 = Sometimes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 = Very little</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 = None or N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Example:** 25 circled 5’s = 100
4 circled 4’s = 16
3 circled 3’s = 9
Total Score 125 =
Very Effective

1. Demonstrates adequate emotional stability. 5 4 3 2 1
2. Demonstrates skills in written communication. 5 4 3 2 1
3. Evaluates previous actions. 5 4 3 2 1
4. Demonstrates selfless service. 5 4 3 2 1
5. Uses student evaluation data to improve instruction. 5 4 3 2 1
6. Effective consensus builder and demonstrates negotiation skills. 5 4 3 2 1
7. Motivates individuals. 5 4 3 2 1
8. Applies management and development skills. 5 4 3 2 1
9. Uses knowledge of legal issues. 5 4 3 2 1
10. Demonstrates ethical behavior. 5 4 3 2 1
11. Demonstrates respect. 5 4 3 2 1
12. Applies the principles of organizational development. 5 4 3 2 1
13. Applies principles of sound fiscal management. 5 4 3 2 1
14. Uses technology to support management functions. 5 4 3 2 1
15. Demonstrates technological expertise. 5 4 3 2 1
16. Seeks self-improvement. 5 4 3 2 1
17. Incorporates strategies for change. 5 4 3 2 1
18. Uses knowledge of regulatory issues. 5 4 3 2 1
19. Uses knowledge of social issues. 5 4 3 2 1
20. Demonstrates knowledge of global issues. 5 4 3 2 1
21. Demonstrates loyalty. 5 4 3 2 1
22. Demonstrates knowledge of human behavior. 5 4 3 2 1
23. Applies learning theories. 5 4 3 2 1
24. Demonstrates integrity. 5 4 3 2 1
25. Displays good listening communications skills. 5 4 3 2 1
26. Applies knowledge of management skill. 5 4 3 2 1
27. Demonstrates knowledge and understanding of community resources. 5 4 3 2 1
28. Incorporates team building. 5 4 3 2 1
29. Create and implement strategic plans. 5 4 3 2 1
30. Uses principles of planning. 5 4 3 2 1
31. Demonstrates knowledge and understanding of effective communication. 5 4 3 2 1
32. Displays good oral communications skills. 5 4 3 2 1
APPENDIX E

Leadership Styles

Directing:
- Demonstrates skills in written communication
- Uses knowledge of legal issues
- Applies the principles of organizational development
- Applies the principles of organizational development
- Uses knowledge of regulatory issues
- Demonstrates knowledge of global issues
- Applies learning theories
- Create and implement strategic plans
- Uses principles of planning

Participating:
- Demonstrates adequate emotional stability
- Demonstrates selfless service
- Effective consensus builder and demonstrates negotiation skills
- Seeks self-improvement
- Uses knowledge of social issues
- Demonstrates knowledge of human behavior
- Displays good listening communications skills
- Demonstrates knowledge and understanding of community resources
- Incorporates team building
• Demonstrates knowledge and understanding of effective communication
• Displays good oral communications skills

Delegating:
• Applies management and development skills
• Demonstrates integrity
• Applies knowledge of management skills

Transformational:
• Evaluates previous actions
• Uses student evaluation data to improve instruction
• Demonstrates ethical behavior
• Demonstrates respect
• Uses technology to support management functions
• Demonstrates technological expertise
• Incorporates strategies for change

Transactional:
• Motivates individuals
• Demonstrates loyalty
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