May 1986

Principals' Perceptions of Superintendents' Leadership Ability in Tennessee

Michael K. Amstein
East Tennessee State University

Follow this and additional works at: http://dc.etsu.edu/etd
Part of the Educational Administration and Supervision Commons

Recommended Citation

This Dissertation - Open Access is brought to you for free and open access by Digital Commons @ East Tennessee State University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electronic Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ East Tennessee State University. For more information, please contact dcadmin@etsu.edu.
INFORMATION TO USERS

This reproduction was made from a copy of a manuscript sent to us for publication and microfilming. While the most advanced technology has been used to photograph and reproduce this manuscript, the quality of the reproduction is heavily dependent upon the quality of the material submitted. Pages in any manuscript may have indistinct print. In all cases the best available copy has been filmed.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help clarify notations which may appear on this reproduction.

1. Manuscripts may not always be complete. When it is not possible to obtain missing pages, a note appears to indicate this.

2. When copyrighted materials are removed from the manuscript, a note appears to indicate this.

3. Oversize materials (maps, drawings, and charts) are photographed by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. Each oversize page is also filmed as one exposure and is available, for an additional charge, as a standard 35mm slide or in black and white paper format.*

4. Most photographs reproduce acceptably on positive microfilm or microfiche but lack clarity on xerographic copies made from the microfilm. For an additional charge, all photographs are available in black and white standard 35mm slide format.*

*For more information about black and white slides or enlarged paper reproductions, please contact the Dissertations Customer Services Department.

UMI Dissertation Information Service

University Microfilms International
A Bell & Howell Information Company
300 N. Zeab Road, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106
Amstein, Michael Kerry

PRINCIPALS' PERCEPTIONS OF SUPERINTENDENTS' LEADERSHIP ABILITY IN TENNESSEE

East Tennessee State University

Ed.D. 1986

University Microfilms International 300 N. Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106

Copyright 1986
by
Amstein, Michael Kerry
All Rights Reserved
PLEASE NOTE:

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

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

University
Microfilms
International
PRINCIPALS' PERCEPTIONS OF SUPERINTENDENTS' LEADERSHIP ABILITY IN TENNESSEE

A Dissertation
Presented to
the Faculty of the Department of Supervision and Administration
East Tennessee State University

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Education

by
Michael Kerry Amstein
May, 1986
APPROVAL

This is to certify that the Graduate Committee of

MICHAEL KERRY AMSTEIN

met on the

1st day of April, 1986.

The committee read and examined his dissertation, supervised his defense of it in an oral examination, and decided to recommend that his study be submitted to the Graduate Council and the Associate Vice-President for Research and Graduate Studies in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree Doctor of Education.

[Signatures]

Signed on behalf of the Graduate Council

Associate Vice-President for Research and Graduate Studies

[Signature]

[Signature]
ABSTRACT

A STUDY OF PRINCIPALS' PERCEPTIONS OF SUPERINTENDENTS' LEADERSHIP ABILITY IN TENNESSEE

by

Michael Kerry Amstein

The problem of this study was to determine whether principals' perceptions of their superintendents' leadership ability were affected by selected demographic variables.

This study followed the ex-post facto design. Twelve dimensions of the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire, Form 12 (LBDQ-XII) were selected to assess the perceptions of principals of the leadership behavior of superintendents in Tennessee. Four hundred principals were randomly selected to participate in this study. One hundred sixty-one principals responded and the findings reflect their responses.

The unpaired t-test and Analysis of Variance were applied to the data for Hypotheses 1 through 15. The statistical analysis was intended to determine significant differences in the ratings by principals of the leadership behavior of superintendents in Tennessee.

The differences showing significance in the study warranted the following conclusions.

1. Male principals rate the leadership behavior of their superintendents higher than female principals when assessing twelve dimensions of leadership behavior.

2. Black and white principals perceive a difference in the leadership behavior of their superintendents when assessing twelve dimensions of leadership behavior.

3. Principals from city and county school systems do perceive a difference in the leadership behavior of their superintendents when assessing twelve dimensions of leadership behavior.

4. Principals with an elected or appointed superintendent perceive a difference in the leadership behavior of their superintendents when assessing twelve dimensions of leadership behavior.

5. Principals with different last dates of attendance of graduate school do perceive a difference in the leadership behavior of their superintendents when assessing twelve dimensions of leadership behavior.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

The growth in size and complexity of institutions of learning in the United States has brought with it many new problems and challenges for the educational administrator. Great skill is required for successful management of modern schools, and it is obvious that the caliber of the person selected for the superintendency plays a major part in determining the scope and quality of the educational program that will be developed in a school district (AASA, 1962).

The superintendent of schools is the most visible, most vulnerable, and potentially, the most influential member of the educational organization (Campbell, Cunningham, Nystrand, & Usden, 1980). The superintendent's role involves clarifying educational goals, evaluating the adequacy of the program in relation to these goals, engaging in a vigorous program of curriculum development and instructional improvement and coordinating and organizing the school system for effective learning (Gilchrist, 1961). These role expectations require effective leadership. To be an effective leader, one must have the ability to diagnose his/her environment and adapt his/her leadership style to fit the demands of the environment (Hersey & Blanchard, 1977).

It is quite evident that if the principals are the direct extensions of the superintendent, they must perceive the leader of their given school system to be strong and know what the system's goals are in order to accomplish them.
The Problem

Statement of the Problem

The problem of this study was to determine whether some of principals' perceptions of their superintendents' leadership ability were affected by selected demographic variables.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to investigate how principals in Tennessee perceived their superintendent's leadership ability as measured by the Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ XII).

Significance of the Study

Many articles had been written on the importance of the principal as an instructional and school leader. The principal had been identified in many studies as the most important and influential person within a school. He/she was responsible for the quality of instruction within the school and dictated how this instruction was presented by the teachers. Any changes were handled and implemented by the principal. The principal was therefore an integral part of an effective educational system. If this educational process were to be carried out effectively and efficiently, the principal and superintendent had to work together as an administrative team. This study was significant to the extent that it identified specific demographic variables of principals and compared these variables to how the leadership behavior of the superintendent was perceived. The findings of this study represented current perceptions principals had about the leadership behavior exhibited by superintendents in Tennessee.
Limitations

1. The study was limited to 400 randomly selected principals across Tennessee.

2. Responses were limited to a personal data sheet and the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ-XII).

3. The review of literature was limited to the Sherrod Library located at East Tennessee State University.

Assumptions

1. There were specific demographic variables which could be compared to the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ XII).

2. The Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ XII) and the demographic data sheet were appropriate instruments for this study.

3. It was assumed that all respondents answered the questionnaire honestly.

Procedures

1. The investigator reviewed current literature.

2. The investigator selected the Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire XII and a validated demographic data sheet to be used in the study.

3. The investigator contacted the Tennessee Department of Education and requested a 1985-86 roster of principals in the Tennessee public school system, and their current school addresses.

4. The investigator contacted The Ohio State University to secure permission to use the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire and ordered copies of the questionnaire to be used in this study.
5. The investigator randomly selected respondents for the study.

6. The investigator sent out a cover letter, the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire XII, demographic data sheet, and a self addressed, stamped envelope to selected principals.

7. Two weeks later, the investigator sent out a follow-up letter to remind participants to return the LBDQ XII and demographic data sheet.

8. The investigator applied statistical procedures to data.

9. The investigator reported and summarized results.

**Hypotheses**

The following hypotheses were stated in the declarative format and were tested at the .05 level using the t test and analysis of variance.

1. There will be significant differences between principals whose ages are: 29 and under, 30-39, 40-49, 50-59, 60 and over in how they perceive their superintendents' leadership ability as measured by the LBDQ XII.

2. There will be significant differences between how male and female principals perceive their superintendents' leadership ability as measured by the LBDQ XII.

3. There will be significant differences between how black and white principals perceive their superintendents' leadership ability as measured by LBDQ XII.

4. There will be significant differences between principals with different formal education levels in how they perceive their superintendents' leadership ability as measured by the LBDQ XII.
5. There will be significant differences between how principals perceive the leadership ability of county and city school superintendents as measured by the LBDQ XII.

6. There will be significant differences between how principals perceive the leadership ability of elected and appointed superintendents as measured by the LBDQ XII.

7. There will be significant differences between principals who were born within a 50 mile radius of the school system and principals who were born outside that 50 miles radius in how they perceive the leadership ability of their superintendents as measured by the LBDQ XII.

8. There will be significant differences between how elementary, middle, and high school principals perceive the leadership ability of their superintendents as measured by the LBDQ XII.

9. There will be significant differences between principals' experience at their present schools; 0-5 years, 6-10 years, 10 years or more in how they perceive their superintendents' leadership ability as measured by the LBDQ XII.

10. There will be significant differences between principals with different educational experience levels: 0-5 years, 6-10 years, 11-15 years, and 16 or more years in how they perceive their superintendents' leadership ability as measured by the LBDQ XII.

11. There will be significant differences between principals who last attended graduate school: within 1 year, 2-4 years ago, 5-8 years ago, over 9 years ago, in how they perceive their superintendents' leadership ability as measured by the LBDQ XII.
12. There will be significant differences between how principals from east, west, and middle Tennessee perceive their superintendents' leadership ability as measured by the LBDQ XII.

13. There will be significant differences between superintendents with experience levels in the present school system: 0-4 years, 5-0 years, 10 or more years in how principals perceive their leadership ability as measured by the LBDQ XII.

14. There will be significant differences between principals with different levels of principalship experience; 0-4 years, 5-9 years, 10-14 years, and over 15 years in how they perceive their superintendents' leadership ability as measured by the LBDQ XII.

15. There will be significant differences between principals with experience levels in the present school system; 0-4 years, 5-9 years, 10-14 years, over 15 years in how they perceive the superintendents' leadership ability as measured by the LBDQ XII.

Definitions of Terms

Principal

A principal is the administrative head and professional leader of a school division on unit; a highly specialized, full-time administrative officer in large public school systems, but usually carries a teaching load in the smaller ones, in public education, usually subordinate to a superintendent of schools (Good, 1973, p. 436).

Perception

A perception is a direct or intuitive cognition, a capacity for comprehension, insight (Webster, 1969, p. 626).
Leadership

Leadership is the initiation of a new structure or procedure for accomplishing an organization's goals and objectives or for changing an organization's goals or objectives (Lipham, 1964, p. 122).

Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire XII

This instrument was developed by the staff of the Personnel Research Board at The Ohio State University to assess actual and preferred leadership behavior. Actual (empirical) leadership behavior is referred to as "real" leadership behavior and preferred (normative) leadership behavior is referred to as "ideal" leadership behavior (Dipboye, 1978, p. 1174).

Leadership Behavior

Leadership behavior is any act that a recognized leader demonstrates or exhibits to cause his/her followers to change their behaviors, motivate them into a planned action, or produce behaviors that they would not have exhibited on their own initiative (Fiedler & Chemers, 1974, p. 39).

Superintendent

The superintendent is the chief administrative officer in a school system, whose primary role is to provide the best possible education in his/her community (Educational Policies Commission, 1965, p. 2).
Organization of the Study

This study was organized into five chapters. Chapter 1 contained an introduction to the study, the statement of the problem, the purpose of the study, the significance of the study, the limitations, the assumptions, procedures, the hypotheses, the definition of relevant terms, and the organization of the study.

Chapter 2 presented a review of related literature.

Chapter 3 describes the methodology by which the study was conducted.

Chapter 4 contains statistical treatment of the data.

Chapter 5 includes the summary, findings, conclusions, and recommendations of the study.
CHAPTER 2

Review of Related Literature

Introduction

A review of related literature was conducted to identify prior studies dealing with the principalship, public school superintendency, and leadership behavior.

In the portion of literature review dealing with the principalship, there was a brief description of the principalship and the role of a principal in the school.

The literature review pertaining to superintendency involved a brief history of the evolution of the superintendent in the public school system and the role of a superintendent.

In the section of the literature review dealing with leadership behavior, there was a statement concerning leadership behavior, definitions and explanations of leader and leadership; a history of leadership behavior studies and theories of leadership and group interaction.

In order to identify pertinent studies of the principalship, superintendency, and leadership behavior; several periodicals, bibliographies, and references to major works were reviewed. In addition, an Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) search was conducted using the facilities of the Sherrod Library at East Tennessee State University.
The Principalship

The principalship today is the product of an evolutionary period lasting approximately one hundred years. Beginning as a clerical role, the principalship has become a leadership position in America's educational system (Goldman, 1966). Of these educational administrators, the following statement has been made.

Principals are not average people. They occupy positions of leadership and respect, positions they have earned on the basis of advanced academic degrees and years of professional experience. By almost any measure that one might use, principals would have to be considered high achievers. (Pharis & Zakariya, 1978, n. 1)

A national study of principals was conducted in 1978 by William L. Pharis and Sally B. Zakariya. The purpose of this study was to construct a profile of the typical principal. The study reported the average principal was a white male, married and 46 years old. The average principal held a master's degree, felt secure in his position, saw his job as a final occupational goal, and had high professional morale. The majority of these principals would elect to enter the profession if they were beginning again. Their political outlook was generally conservative and they were registered Democrats (Pharis & Zakariya, 1970).

In examining the principal's experience and professional activities, Pharis and Zakariya concluded the average principal had been employed for ten years with the past five years having been spent in the present position. He has served in the same school system throughout his employment as principal. Most principals have been in the field of education for twenty years having held such positions as a secondary schoolteacher, coach, or an assistant principal prior
to accepting the principalship. The majority of principals were no
longer active in the National Education Association, but held
membership in local and state principals' associations and their
respective associations of school principals. Professional growth came
from on-the-job experience and peers. Prior teaching experience
contributed to the ability to function successfully in his present

A study of the principalship was conducted in the state of
Louisiana to determine the present status of the position (Smith,
1976). The following profile was reported. The average principal was
a white, Protestant, married male between the ages of 40 and 44, and
affiliated with the Democratic party. Eighty-nine percent of the
principals held a master's degree or a master's degree plus 30
postgraduate hours. Eighty-four percent had earned tenure as a
principal. The majority of this group had been a principal less than
14 years with the largest percentage having served four to six years.
The majority of those responding indicated this position as their final
occupational goal. If entering the employment field again, a large
percentage reported they would choose the principalship as a
profession again because of the importance they personally attach to
the position (Smith, 1965).

A study of principals in the state of Alabama was conducted in
1980 to determine the characteristics, background, qualifications,
role and attitudes of the typical administrator (Haywood, 1980).
Three hundred principals ranging from elementary to high school were
randomly selected to participate in this study. The findings revealed
the majority were married males between the ages of 36 and 50. The majority of Alabama principals held a master's degree and additional 15 to 60 hours of academic credit. Principals in larger schools tended to hold more advanced degrees. Two-thirds of the principals taught less than ten years prior to becoming an administrator. Approximately 50% of all respondents had 21 years of experience in the field of education. Slightly more than 50% of those surveyed indicated the principalship is their final occupational goal (Haywood, 1980).

**Role of the Principal**

Research had been conducted to determine what made up the role of the principal and how this role was related to the effectiveness of the principal within a school system. The conclusions regarding principal characteristics and competencies contributing to their effectiveness may be divided into five categories: (a) a vision of the school and the principal's role, (b) the ability to recognize and use power in self and others, (c) knowledge of human relations, (d) skills to serve as an instructional leader, and (e) the ability to manage.

**Vision**

The view of principals as symbolic leaders in loosely coupled organizations was consistent with studies of effective schools and descriptive studies of principal behavior. However, effective schools required a sense of purpose and direction provided by well-developed and clearly articulated goals (Manasse, 1982). The principal was the one who sets the goals, objectives, and priorities
of the learners (Murphy, Weil, Mesa, & Mitman, 1983). The principal had to be a goal-oriented coordinator of people and resources, including pupils, staff, and community (LoPresti, 1982).

Personal vision of the school has been an important theme recurring in studies of effective principals (Blumberg & Greenfield, 1980; Manasse, 1982). This vision helped set priorities so they were not constantly consumed by organizational maintenance requirements. A clear image of the school helped principals make management decisions that promote student learning (Blumberg & Greenfield, 1980). This vision gave the principals an opportunity to view themselves as leaders, with a willingness to assume command (Klopf, 1982). Effective principals were not afraid to act (Manasse, 1982; Staven, 1982).

Power

Effective principals were aware of the need to form alliances to get things done and were strongly aware of the dynamics of power, they understood their boundaries, both within their school districts and their communities (Lipham, 1981). Effective principals established a firm power base both inside and outside the school ("Why Do Some," 1980). Lipham (1982) noted that more effective principals tended also to be more powerful principals in the district hierarchy. They used their understanding of the power base to mobilize the support of parents and community (Olivero, 1980).

Several studies related to the principal as a change agent within the school have been conducted. Many teachers felt the principal was the leading initiator of change in the school district (Mahan, 1970).
Principals in high-change schools acted as monitors rather than as authoritarian leaders (Bentzen, 1975).

**Human Relations**

Studies in characteristics of the effective principal revealed that effective principals possess skills in human relations (Haroldson, 1974; May, 1980; Vallina, 1978, Walters, 1979). Principals were constantly communicating with people from all walks of life and successfully refined their interpersonal skills (Gorton & McIntyre, 1978). The ability to work with different kinds of people, allowed understanding people, motivating people, and dealing effectively with their problems, were the strongest assets of an effective principal (Goldhammer, 1971; Gross & Herriott, 1965).

The ability to listen was a common characteristic of effective principals (Blumberg & Greenfield, 1980). The effective principal was aware of what was going on around him and was good at absorbing ideas. He listened well to parents, teachers, and pupils, took action, and then communicated with them (Blumberg & Greenfield, 1980).

**Instructional Leader**

Principals of effective schools understood their school's instructional programs thoroughly (Benjamin, 1981). Their first priority was instruction and its improvement, and they communicated this to their staff. Effective principals insisted on giving priority to instructional concerns by concentrating time and effort on instructional matters and delegating as many non-instructional matters as possible (Pinero, 1982; Vallina, 1978).
Outstanding principals as instructional leaders attempted to make teaching fun and were quite enthusiastic about their jobs (Forquer, 1981). Effective instructional leaders knew the issues, identified the appropriate expertise and resources, provided necessary incentives, and orchestrated the processes for bringing resources to the staff and putting them to use (Masasse, 1982).

Manager

Effective principals had the ability to manage. They managed time, school finances, and the school plant (Walters, 1979). Principals were resourceful in being able to structure their roles and the demands on their time in a manner that permitted them to meet their objectives as a principal (Blumberg & Greenfield, 1980). The principal must manage the school plant, facilities, effective supervision of school personnel, and school services (Klopf, 1982). The principal must also be the fiscal manager for the school. Any transaction that took place within the school dealing with school funds was the responsibility of the principal. An effective principal learned how to keep accurate records on school funds and delegated authority in managing school funds to subordinates (Ellett, 1976; Walters, 1979).

Leadership Behavior

Leadership behavior was a term often confused with term leader. Leadership behavior was any act that a recognized leader demonstrated or exhibited to cause his/her followers to change their behaviors.
motivated them into a planned action, or produced behaviors that they
would not have exhibited on their own initiative (Fiedler & Chemers,
1974).

**Leader and Leadership**

There was no single application which would serve to identify or
predict leaders in any practical situation. Attempts to predict or
identify leaders had been futile at the most. Ralph Stodgill stated:

> A person does not become a leader by virtue of the possession
> of some combination of traits, but by the pattern of personal
> characteristics, activities, and goals of followers. Thus,
> leadership must not be conceived in terms of the interaction
> of variables which are in constant flux and change. The
> factor of change is especially characteristic of the
> situation, which may be radically altered by the addition or
> loss of members, changes in interpersonal relationships,
> changes in goals, competition of extra-group influences, and
> the like. The personal characteristics of the leader and of
> the followers are, in comparison, highly stable. The
> persistence of individual patterns of human behavior in the
> face of constant situational change appears to be a primary
> obstacle encountered not only in the practice of leadership,
> but in the selection and placement of leaders. It becomes
> clear that an adequate analysis of leadership involves not
> only a study of leaders, but also of situations. (Stodgill,
> 1948, pp. 64-65)

A leader was the person who came closest to realizing the norms
the group valued highest. The norms could be unusual, but so long as
they were genuinely accepted by the group, the leader in that group,
had to embody them. The embodiment of the norms gave the leader a
high rank and that rank attracted people. The leader was the person
people came to; the scheme of the interaction focused on the leader
(Homans, 1950). Fiedler described the leader as the individual in the
group given the task of directing and coordinating task-relevant group
activities or who, in the absence of the designated leader, carried
the responsibility for performing those functions in a group.
Leadership functions were often shared among group members (Fiedler, 1974). Reddin defined a leader as a person who was seen by others as being primarily responsible for achieving group objectives (Reddin, 1970).

Leadership behavior as a process or function, rather than an exclusive attribute of a prescribed role, was advanced by Tannenbaum, Weschler, and Massarik. They described leadership behavior as:

Leadership is interpersonal influence, exercised in situation and directed, through the communication process, toward the attainment of a specified goal or goals. Leadership always involves attempts on the part of a leader (influencer) to affect (influence) the behavior of a follower (influences) or followers in a situation. (Tannenbaum, Weschler & Massarik, 1961, p. 24)

Leadership in an organization involved the exercise of authority and decision making for the organization (Dubin, 1961). Leadership acts may be engaged in by a party to a mutual problem. It is only when an individual is differentiated from others by the fact that he/she engaged in leadership acts that he/she was identified as a leader (Hemphill, 1958). Leadership was the name for relatively high personal capacity for both technological attainments and moral complexity, combined with propensity for consistency in conformance to moral factors of the individual (Barnard, 1938). Tead (1935) postulated that leadership was the activity of influencing people to cooperate toward some goal which they came to find desirable. It was increasingly evident that although many of the writers and researchers could not come up with a universal definition for leadership behavior,
one component was repeated, that of influencing the behavior of followers was a common trend to all these definitions.

**Leader Behavior Studies**

Theory, research, and practice of leadership behavior has intrigued mankind for centuries. The attempts by researchers to readily identify and predict leaders has been quite unsuccessful, in 1952, Filmore Stanford concluded that there were either no general leadership traits or, if they do exist, they were not described in any familiar psychological or common sense terms. Traits that set leaders apart from followers will vary from situation to situation (Stanford, 1952).

In 1945, the Ohio State Leadership studies were organized with the intent of describing what an individual did while he operated as a leader and how he went about what he did (Hemphill & Coons, 1950). From a list of 1,790 descriptive items, 150 items were selected and arranged in the form of a preliminary questionnaire. After much refinement and categorization, the 150 items were reduced to 40 items which constituted the first form of the Leadership Behavior Descriptive Questionnaire (LBDQ).

In reporting the Air Force adaptation to the instrument, Halpin identified two fundamental dimensions of leadership behavior, initiating structure and consideration (Halpin, 1957). Initiating structure referred to the leader's behavior in delineating the relationship between himself/herself and the members of the group. Consideration referred to the establishment of a warm, trusting relationship between the leader and members of the group (Halpin, 1957).
The two dimensions of the LBDQ were independent of each other rather than being on opposite ends of a continuum. This led to the establishment of four quadrants or leadership styles that could be formed by cross-partitioning on the mean score values of each scale. Each subscale was divided into high and low groups and, when combined with one another, yielded four groups or quadrants (Hoy & Miskel, 1978). Leaders who scored above the mean on both dimensions were in Quadrant 1 (high initiating structure and consideration); Quadrant II (high initiating structure and low consideration); Quadrant III (low initiating structure and high consideration) (Hoy & Miskel, 1978).

The findings of the Ohio State Leadership Studies were as follows:

1. **Initiating Structure** and **Consideration**, as measured by the LBDQ, were fundamental dimensions of leader behavior.

2. Effective leader behavior tended to be more often associated with high performance on both dimensions.

3. Superiors and subordinates tended to evaluate the contributions of the leader behavior dimensions differently in assessing effectiveness. Superiors tended to emphasize **Initiating Structure**, whereas subordinates were more concerned with **Consideration**. Hence the leader found some degree of role conflict.

4. The leadership style characterized by Quadrant 1, high on both dimensions, was associated with such group characteristics as harmony, intimacy, and procedural clarity, and with favorable changes in group attitude.

5. There was only a slight relationship between how leaders say they should behave and how subordinates described how they do behave.
6. Different institutional settings tended to foster different leadership styles (Halpin, 1966).

Concurrent with the Ohio State Studies, the University of Michigan Survey Research Center conducted their studies of leadership behavior. This study dealt primarily with business and industrial organizations.

The Michigan study concentrated primarily on employee orientation; the supervisor stresses "human relations" aspect of the job, and production orientation; the mission or job to be done and the technical aspects of the job (Hoy & Miskel, 1978). In summarizing the Michigan studies it was found that heads of high-producing sections were significantly more likely.

1. To receive general rather than close supervision from their superiors.

2. To like the amount of authority and responsibility they have in their jobs.

3. To spend more time in supervision.

4. To give general rather than close supervision to their employees.

5. To be employee-oriented rather than production-oriented (Katz, Maccoby & Morse, 1950).

In 1947, the Laboratory of Social Relations at Harvard University took a different line of inquiry. Small groups were set up in laboratory conditions to be directly observed for the study of social behavior. These groups consisted of college students rather than organizational leaders. The most startling implication found
in this study was that there was usually another leader in the group who was overlooked by the designated leader and caused complications for the designated leader (Bales, 1969).

**Theories of Leadership and Group Interaction**

Authority existed when a common set of beliefs (norms) in an organization legitimized the use of power (Weber, 1961). Weber identified three types of authority upon which social systems depended if followers allow their leaders to exercise control. The three types of authority were:

1. **Charismatic Authority.** Leaders are thought to be endowed with extraordinary powers. Followers develop an intense normative commitment and identification with the person.

2. **Traditional Authority.** Authority is bestowed by virtue of birth or class. Obedience is owed to the traditionally sanctioned position.

3. **Legal Authority.** Leadership is awarded to those who have demonstrated technical competence. Legal authorities are obeyed impersonally out of a sense or duty to the law (Weber, 1961).

The Three-Dimensional Theory, developed by Reddin (1970), dealt with concern for production, concern for people, and leadership effectiveness. Through this model Reddin identified eight leadership styles.

1. **The Separated Leader.** Leadership style was characterized by low interpersonal relationship and low task orientation. The Deserter was perceived as having abdicated all responsibilities. The
Bureaucrat was more effective because he/she was perceived as an impartial exerciser of rules and regulations.

2. The Related Leader. Leadership style was characterized by a leader who has high interpersonal relations and low-task orientation. The Missionary was perceived less effective because he/she preached good will while the organization drifted. The Developer was perceived more effective because he/she was a warm human being and was concerned with developing people as individuals.

3. The Dedicated Leader. Leadership was characterized by low interpersonal relations and high task orientation. The Autocrat was less effective because he/she was perceived as being interested only in the immediate task. The Benevolent Autocrat was more effective because he/she was perceived a dynamic and driving administrator who knew what needed to be done and who could do it effectively and without causing hostility.

4. The Integrated Leader. Leadership style was characterized by high interpersonal relations and high task orientation. The Compromiser was less effective because he/she was perceived as a poor decision maker. The Executive was more effective because he/she was perceived as one who motivated subordinates and tended to prefer a team approach (Reddin, 1970).

Likert and Bowers (1973) contributed their interpretation of leadership styles using a systems theory that concluded that all leadership styles fall into one of four systems. The systems were as follows:
System 1 (Exploitive Authoritative). This system maintained control and direction at the very top of the organization. Distrust and dissatisfaction replaced motivation among subordinates.

System 2 (Benevolent Authoritative). Not all decisions were made at the top of the organization. Money and status were used as motivators. There was usually a substantial degree of dissatisfaction.

System 3 (Consultative). Broad policy was only determined at the top of the organization. Decisions were partially participative. Most people felt a responsibility for the organization's welfare and moderate degree of satisfaction.

System 4 (Participative Group). Decisions were made throughout the organization with overlapping groups. Satisfaction was generally at a high level (Likert & Bowers, 1973).

After studying and analyzing many research studies, Bowers and Seashore (1966) developed the Four-Factor Theory of Leadership. They contended that there were four dimensions of leadership. These dimensions were:

1. Support. Behaviors that enhanced one's feeling of personal worth and importance.

2. Interaction Facilitation. Behaviors that encouraged members of a group to develop close, mutually satisfying relationships.

3. Group Emphasis. Behaviors that stimulated an enthusiasm for meeting the group's goals and achieving excellent performance.

4. Work Facilitation. Behaviors that helped to achieve goal attainment by such activities as scheduling, coordinating, planning and providing resources.
White and Lippett (1960) provided a description of three types of leadership styles. They were as follows:

**Autocratic Leadership.** All policies were decided by the leader. The leader was "personal" in praise or criticism, but remained aloof from active group participation.

**Democratic Leadership.** All policies were a matter of group discussion and determination. The leader was "objective" in praise or criticism and tried to be a regular group member without doing too much of the work.

**Laissez-faire Leadership.** Group had complete freedom in determining organizational and individual policies. No attempt was made to appraise or regulate the course of events.

The terms autocratic, democratic, and laissez-faire have desirable and undesirable connotations. Getzels and Guba (1957) used another group of terms to describe leadership styles. They are:

**Nomothetic Leadership.** Stressed requirements of the institution and conformity of role behavior to expectations, individual personality and needs were sometimes sacrificed to meet institutional expectations.

**Idiographic Leadership.** More concern for the ego of the leader and other group members. Institutional demands were secondary.

**Transactional Leadership.** A compromise between the nomothetic and ideographic leadership styles. In the attainment of institutional goals there was a realization of individual personality and needs.

Theory X leadership held the traditional view of direction and control. Three basic assumptions of Theory X were as follows:

1. The average human being had an inherent dislike for work and will avoid it if possible.
2. Most people must be coerced to get them to put forth adequate effort toward the achievement of the organizational objectives.
3. The average human being preferred to be directed, wanted little responsibility, had little ambition, and wanted to be secure.

Theory Y combined organizational and individual goals (McGregor, 1960). The following is a list of basic assumptions that underlie Theory Y:

1. Expenditure of physical and mental energy in work was natural.
2. People will use self-direction and self-confidence to attain objectives to which they were committed.
3. Commitment to objectives is a function of the rewards associated with their achievement.
4. The average human being learns not only to accept, but seek responsibility.
5. The ability to exercise a high degree of imagination, ingenuity, and creativity to solve organizational problems is widely distributed in the population.
6. The intellectual potential of the average human is only partially utilized.

In summary, Fiedler (1967) maintained that one style of leadership was not, in itself, better than any other style, nor was one leadership
behavior appropriate for all conditions. Almost everyone should be able to succeed as a leader in some situations and everyone was likely to fail in others.

The Superintendency

The office of school superintendent was a relatively new position within the public school system. It was derived from the public schools' need for an executive officer due to the increase in school system size and the growing complexity of the responsibilities afforded the public schools. In the early years of American public education, the operation of schools was attended to by a board of lay persons. Individual school principals also contributed to the operations of his/her own school (Knezovich, 1969). As the school population increased, the responsibilities, and tasks of running a school system increased (Cubberly, 1916).

The first public school superintendent was appointed in the spring of 1837 in Buffalo, New York. That same year, Louisville also appointed a school superintendent and many school systems soon followed (Bolton, Cole, & Jessup, 1937). By 1870, there were 29 school superintendents in these United States. The office of superintendent was also assisted by the centralization of the school administration movement at that time (Burbank, 1968).

The first superintendents were more likely to have a business background, than an educational one, but as the boards of education saw a greater need for specialized educational competencies in their chief executive officer, the qualifications changed more towards educational training to become superintendent (Mayer & Wilson, 1972).
Early superintendents were mostly given clerical duties or menial tasks by the board of education, who still viewed the office of superintendency as possible erosion of their power (Walquist, Arnold, Campbell, Reller, & Sands, 1952). As school operations became too much for lay boards to handle, the delegation of more authority and responsibility was given to the superintendent. While the position of superintendent was given more authority over operations of the school system, superintendents were also sharpening their skills as administrators and more importantly, as educational leaders (Gilland, 1935). The more responsibilities that the superintendent had, led to the first job description for a superintendent. This job description was prepared by the Los Angeles board of education in 1881 (Gilland, 1935). The main competencies of that office were as follows:

1. Financial administration
2. School Plant administration
3. Personnel administration
4. Instructional program administration
5. Pupil Personnel administration
6. Office administration
7. Any other duties as stated by the board

The office of school superintendent was now a recognized position with duties and responsibilities towards public education. The position of superintendent was also furthered by the establishment of the Superintendents National Association in 1865. This organization is now known as the American Association of School Administrators.

The position of school superintendent had come a long way in a little over 100 years. As the position has evolved, it has accumulated complex duties and responsibilities along the way. In the present state of school administration it has been said that a school
superintendent must be a "jack of all trades." There have been many authors and commissions, along with boards of education who have tried to define the role of the superintendent. One of the most recognized descriptions of the role of the superintendent comes from the Educational Policies Commission (1965). They stated the role of the superintendent was as follows:

An effective superintendent must

1. Provide educational leadership
2. Operate office management effectively
3. Work with the school board
4. Procure and manage finances
5. Oversee school plant
6. Work together with the public
7. Hire personnel
8. Improve personnel
9. Supervise personnel
10. Curriculum development and textbook selection
11. Attend to pupil services
12. Oversee pupil accounting
13. Provide guidance personnel to pupils
14. Maintain transportation of pupils

In addition to the role of the superintendent, the superintendent must also possess certain competencies to fulfill his/her role of chief executive officer of a school system. Walquist, Arnold, Campbell, Roller, & Sands (1952) wrote that the following competencies were essential if a superintendent was to be successful:

1. Understanding of child growth and development
2. Understanding of social forces and the ability to develop school programs compatible to these forces.
3. Ability to give leadership in development of curriculum programs.
4. A working conviction that education can and must be a force for improving community living.
5. A genuine reliance on the problem solving method.
6. Technical competence in school administration such as: school finance and school plant.
7. A habit of seeking help when needed from appropriate resource people and professional readings.
8. A conviction and facility in group process.
9. Ability to select competent personnel and delegate responsibility.

Richard Carlson (1972) also wrote about competencies that a school superintendent must possess to be successful. His list was shorter, but included many of the competencies stated earlier. He listed the following competencies:

1. The superintendent must first of all be dedicated to the belief that the first ideals of American life depend on school for their realization.
2. The superintendent must have temperance as an educator.
3. The superintendent must be a person of considerable knowledge.
4. The superintendent must be an expert in dealing with conflict and controversy. (p. 139)

In summary, the position of superintendent arose from the need to have an executive officer whose expertise and training had prepared him/her for the problems related to the operation of the schools and education. The position of school superintendent was relatively new, but the responsibilities of the office have increased tenfold. There were many competencies a superintendent needed in order to be effective and many roles he/she had to fill to meet the duties of school superintendent. The most important role or competency expected of the superintendent was that he/she had to be a leader, and educational leader. This leadership determined the path that a school system would take and if the school system accomplished its ultimate goal, to provide the best education possible for its clients.
CHAPTER 3
Research Methodology and Instruments

Introduction

This chapter contained the research design, selection of the sample, procedures used in gathering the data, and a description of the instruments used in the study. In addition, an explanation is given of the techniques followed in the statistical analysis of the data as well as the research hypotheses stated in the null form.

Research Design

This study followed the ex-post-facto design. Many important social, scientific, and educational research problems do not lend themselves to experimentation, although many of them do lend themselves to controlled inquiry of the ex-post-facto kind (Kerlinger, 1973). Kerlinger stated,

Ex-post-facto research is systematic empirical inquiry in which the scientist does not have direct control of independent variables because their manifestations have already occurred or because they are inherently not manipulable. Inferences about relations among variables are made, without direct intervention, from concomitant variation of independent and dependent variables. (Kerlinger, 1973, p. 379)

The design involved the collection of data utilizing (1) the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire XII and (2) a demographic data sheet with an attempt to determine if a relationship existed between the sets of data. Before selecting the ex-post-facto design, it was vital to understand that one could not always assume a causal
relation between independent and dependent variables. If the predicted relationship was observed, it would not necessarily mean the variables were casually related (Tuckman, 1972).

**Selection of the Sample**

The *Tennessee Education Directory 1984-1985* was used to identify the total population of school principals in the state. One thousand nine hundred and twelve principals were identified. In order to facilitate the collection of data, the process of random sampling was used. Each principal was assigned a number beginning with 001 and running consecutively until all names were assigned numbers. Four hundred principals were then selected using a table of random numbers (Borg & Gall, 1983). This group was identified as the sample from the target population. The data acquired, analyzed, and interpreted in the study came from this randomly selected sample. A 40% return rate was requested for this study.

**Instruments**

**LBDQ-XII**

The *Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire*, Form XII was developed by staff members of The Ohio State Leadership Studies and revised by the Bureau of Business and Research. The Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire was administered to randomly selected principals across the state of Tennessee to measure the leadership behavior by their school superintendent.

The LBDQ-XII, published in 1962, consisted of 100 items which measured twelve dimensions of leader behavior with each arranged on a continuum. A high score on any one subtest indicated that the
respondent (teacher) perceived the particular dimension of behavior to be present in the principal being described, while a low score indicated that the respondent perceived it to be absent in the principal being evaluated (Stodgill, 1963).

The twelve dimensions of leader behavior as identified by the LBDQ-XII were as follows:

- **Representation** - speaks and acts as representative of the group.
- **Demand Reconciliation** - reconciles conflicting organizational demands and reduces disorder to the system.
- **Tolerance of Uncertainty** - is able to tolerate uncertainty and postponements without anxiety or upset.
- **Persuasiveness** - uses persuasion and argument effectively, exhibits strong convictions.
- **Initiation of Structure** - clearly defines own role, and lets followers know what is expected.
- **Tolerance of Freedom** - allows followers scope for initiative, decision, and action.
- **Role Retention** - actively exercises leadership role rather than surrendering leadership role to others.
- **Consideration** - regards the comfort, well-being, status, and contributions of followers.
- **Production Emphasis** - applies pressure for productive output.
- **Predictive Accuracy** - exhibits foresight and the ability to predict outcomes accurately.
- **Integration** - maintains a closely knit organization, resolves intermember conflicts.
- **Influence with Superiors** - maintains cordial relations with superiors; has influence with them, is striving for higher status (Stodgill, 1963).

**Reliability.** Reliability was defined by Kerlinger as the accuracy or precision of a measuring instrument. The internal consistency of a test was another interpretation of reliability (Kerlinger, 1973).
An analysis of subscales intercorrelations of the LBDQ-XII was conducted by the staff of the Ohio State Leadership Studies. This staff determined that each factor of the LBDQ-XII was strongly dominated by a single and thereby established reliability for the LBDQ-XII (Stodgill, 1974).

Robert Dipboye reported that both Initiating Structure and Consideration have been found to have high coefficients of internal consistency and that interrater agreement appears sufficiently high to justify the procedures stated in the LBDQ manual (Dipboye, 1978).

Validity. Validity as defined by Kerlinger represented the degree to which a scale measured what it was designed to measure (Kerlinger, 1973). Stodgill tested the validity of the LBDQ-XII and concluded that the 12 scales measured what they were intended to measure (Stodgill, 1974).

Dipboye found, that in terms of face validity, the terms are straightforward and seem to match common sense descriptions of leader behavior in a variety of settings. He also found that the validity of the LBDQ-XII as correlates of job satisfaction and work group performance seem "fairly good" in that most studies indicate significant correlations between the LBDQ scales and both satisfaction and performance.

Demographic Data Sheet

The demographic data sheet sent out to each principal was developed from studies that had already been completed. The researcher found that 12 of the 15 items selected to be used in this study
were repeated in earlier studies conducted by Brown in Mississippi and Saylor in Alabama. Brown had a 20 item demographic data sheet to solicit demographic information from teachers who were completing the LBDQ-XII on their principals. He validated this instrument by giving it to three different sets of teachers that were not included in his study. The demographic data sheet was then revised after each administration of the sheet (Brown, 1977). Saylor also used a 20 item demographic data sheet in which 12 items solicited the same information as Brown. This study investigated the perceptions principals had of the local superintendents in a selected eight county region. The demographic data sheet that Saylor used was validated by a panel of experts at the University of Alabama (Saylor, 1983).

The demographic data sheet used in this study was comprised of the 12 items common to both studies done by Brown and Saylor. The three additional items were added to the demographic data sheet upon suggestions from the researcher's advanced research seminar class. The demographic data sheet was then administered to a group of principals in North Carolina who would not be included in the study. The demographic data sheet was revised and then analyzed by the doctoral seminar at East Tennessee State University. The seminar concluded that the demographic data sheet was both valid and reliable for use in this study.

**Scoring of the Instrument's Responses**

The *Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire—Form XII* was scored manually by the researcher, who used scoring keys supplied by The Ohio
State University. Twelve leader behavior scores were obtained from each principal who participated in this study. The scores were averaged by subgroups (categories) and the mean scores were determined for each of the 12 leadership dimensions.

**Procedures**

The first step completed in this research project was to conduct a review of literature to ascertain whether sufficient research data could be located to support this project. This search was conducted through the Sherrod Library on the campus of East Tennessee State University.

After receiving approval from the East Tennessee State University (ETSU) Institutional Review Board to conduct this study, the researcher received permission from The Ohio State University Department of Business Research to use the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire XII in this research study. The researcher then ordered 400 copies of the LBDQ-XII and a scoring kit from The Ohio State University Department of Business Research.

After the sample to be used in this study had been selected, the researcher then mailed out to each selected principal, a cover letter explaining the research to be conducted and encouraging participation in the study, a copy of the LBDQ-XII, the demographic data sheet, and a self-addressed stamped envelope for the return of the instruments. Two weeks later a follow up letter was sent to each respondent to ensure participation of each selected principal.
The returned instruments were then hand scored by the researcher and proper statistical procedures were then applied to the data. Data analysis was done by Mr. Jerry Cole using Statfast software on a Macintosh XL.

**Statistical Analysis Procedures**

The hypotheses of this study were stated in both the declarative and null form. However, for the purpose of statistical treatment, the null form for each hypothesis was tested. The use of the null hypothesis asserts there is no difference between the population means and that any difference found is unimportant and incidental.

The data from the completed instruments were transferred to the Macintosh XL and processed in the software package Statfast. The unpaired t-test and Analysis of Variance were selected for use in this research study and was used for analyzing and interpreting data for all hypotheses stated in this research project. The minimum acceptable level for determining statistical significance for differences was the .05 level.

**Null Hypotheses**

1H$_0$. There will be no significant differences between principals whose ages are: 29 and under, 30-39, 40-49, 50-59, 60 and over in how they perceive their superintendents' leadership ability as measured by the LBDQ-XII.

2H$_0$. There will be no significant differences between how male and female principals perceive their superintendents' leadership ability as measured by the LBDQ-XII.
3H0. There will be no significant differences between how black and white principals perceive their superintendents' leadership ability as measured by the LBDQ-XII.

4H0. There will be no significant differences between principals with different formal education levels in how they perceive their superintendents' leadership ability as measured by the LBDQ XII.

5H0. There will be no significant differences between how principals perceive the leadership ability of county and city school superintendents as measured by the LBDQ XII.

6H0. There will be no significant differences between how principals perceive the leadership ability of an elected and appointed superintendent as measured by the LBDQ XII.

7H0. There will be no significant differences between principals who were born in a 50 mile radius of the school system and principals who were born outside that 50 mile radius in how they perceive the leadership ability of their superintendents as measured by the LBDQ XII.

8H0. There will be no significant differences between how elementary, middle, and high school principals perceive the leadership ability of their superintendents as measured by the LBDQ-XII.

9H0. There will be no significant differences between principals' experience at their present schools; 0-5 years, 6-10 years, 10 years or more in how they perceive their superintendents' leadership ability as measured by the LBDQ XII.
$10H_0$. There will be no significant differences between principals with different educational experience levels: 0-5 years, 6-10 years, 11-15 years, and 16 or more years in how they perceive their superintendents' leadership ability as measured by the LBDQ XII.

$11H_0$. There will be no significant differences between principals who last attended graduate school: within 1 year, 2-4 years ago, 5-8 years ago, over 9 years ago, in how they perceive their superintendents' leadership ability as measured by the LBDQ XII.

$12H_0$. There will be no significant differences between how principals from east, west, and middle Tennessee perceive their superintendents' leadership ability as measured by the LBDQ XII.

$13H_0$. There will be no significant differences between superintendents with experience levels in the present school system: 0-4 years, 5-9 years, 10 or more years in how principals perceive their superintendents' leadership ability as measured by the LBDQ-XII.

$14H_0$. There will be no significant differences between principals with different levels of principalship experience: 0-4 years, 5-9 years, 10-15 years, over 15 years in how they perceive their superintendents' leadership ability by the LBDQ XII.

$15H_0$. There will be no significant differences between principals with experience levels in the present school system: 0-4 years, 5-9 years, 10-14 years, over 15 years in how they perceive the superintendents' leadership ability as measured by the LBDQ XII.
CHAPTER 4
Analysis of Data

Findings of the results obtained from the data of this study are reported in this chapter. Data were gathered and treated to test the hypotheses set forth in Chapter 1. These hypotheses were tested to determine whether significant differences existed in the perceptions of principals grouped by selected demographic variables in how they perceive the leadership behavior of their superintendent as measured by the LBDQ-XII.

The general procedures for the statistical treatment of the data were outlined in Chapter 3. Further elaboration on the procedures will be necessary in this chapter to clarify the output produced.

The $t$-test and the analysis of variance were used to analyze the data and determine whether significant differences existed between variables. The $t$-test was used to analyze data for Hypotheses 2, 3, 5, 6, and 7. The analysis of variance was used to analyze data for Hypotheses 1, 4, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, and 15. The Newman-Keuls procedure was used on hypotheses which had significant $F$ scores. This procedure was used to determine where significant differences existed as they occurred.

The data analysis and interpretation for Hypotheses 1 through 15 are presented in Tables 1 through 15. The data were analyzed and interpreted as they pertained to each of the hypotheses developed for the study.
Presentation of Data

H₀₁. There will be no significant differences between principals whose ages are: 29 and under, 30-39, 40-49, 50-59, 60 and over in how they perceive their superintendents' leadership ability as measured by the LBDQ-XII.

There were no significant differences found between principals of different age levels in how they perceived the leadership behavior of their respective superintendents. It was found that principals in the age group 29 and under rated their superintendents' leadership behavior highest in nine of the twelve leadership dimensions. Principals in the age group 30-39 rated their superintendents' leadership behavior the lowest of all the groups in eight of the twelve leadership dimensions. A comparison was made of the achieved mean scores for each age group in the twelve leadership dimensions of the LBDQ-XII to one another. There were no significant differences found between any of the leadership dimensions with the highest achieved level of significance being .345 found in Production Emphasis. None of the F scores were significant even at the .25 level. Table 1 illustrates the findings of the analysis of variance procedure in the ratings of superintendents by principals from five age groups.

The null hypotheses that there would be no significant difference between principals of different age levels in how they perceive their superintendents' leadership behavior was not rejected. Principals of one particular age group did not rate the leadership behavior of superintendents significantly higher than principals belonging to other age groups.
Table 1
Comparison Between Perceptions of Principals with Different Age Levels of Their Superintendents' Leadership Behavior as Measured by the LBDO-XII

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Dimensions</th>
<th>29 and under (N=17)</th>
<th>30-39</th>
<th>40-49</th>
<th>50-59</th>
<th>60 and over (N=3)</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. Tolerance of Uncertainty</td>
<td>30.059</td>
<td>29.607</td>
<td>29.923</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>29.667</td>
<td>.214</td>
<td>p &gt; .25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Role Retention</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>30.459</td>
<td>30.785</td>
<td>30.933</td>
<td>30.933</td>
<td>.115</td>
<td>p &gt; .25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
H₀₂. There will be no significant difference between how male and female principals perceive the leadership behavior of their superintendents as measured by the LBDQ-XII.

Male and female principals rated the leadership behavior of their respective superintendents using the LBDQ-XII. Significant differences were found in six of the twelve leadership dimensions measured by the LBDQ-XII. The five dimensions where the mean scores were significantly different were: Tolerance of Uncertainty, Initiation of Structure, Role Retention, Consideration, Predictive Accuracy, and Integration. Four of these dimensions were found to be significant to .05 and two at the .01 level of significance when compared using the Z-test. Male principals achieved higher mean scores in all twelve of the leadership dimensions of the LBDQ-XII. Table 2 illustrates the findings of the data analysis when male principals were compared to female principals in the rating of their superintendents' leadership behavior.

The null hypothesis that there would be no significant differences between how male and female principals perceive the leadership behavior of their superintendents was rejected for Tolerance of Uncertainty, Initiation of Structure, Role Retention, Consideration, Predictive Accuracy, and integration. Male principals rated the leadership behavior of their superintendents significantly higher in six of the twelve leadership dimensions measured by the LBDQ-XII.

H₀³. There will be no significant differences between how black and white principals perceive the leadership behavior of their superintendents as measured by the LBDQ-XII.
Table 2
Comparison Between Perceptions of Male and Female Principals of Their Superintendents' Leadership Behavior as Measured by the LBDQ-XII

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Dimensions</th>
<th>Male N=117</th>
<th>Female N=44</th>
<th>t value</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Representation</td>
<td>15.556</td>
<td>13.318</td>
<td>.896</td>
<td>p &gt; .1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Demand Reconciliation</td>
<td>15.778</td>
<td>15.735</td>
<td>.092</td>
<td>p &gt; .4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Tolerance of Uncertainty</td>
<td>30.957</td>
<td>29.841</td>
<td>1.956</td>
<td>p &lt; .05*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Initiation of Structure</td>
<td>31.162</td>
<td>30.25</td>
<td>1.463</td>
<td>p &lt; .05*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Role Retention</td>
<td>30.641</td>
<td>29.25</td>
<td>2.037</td>
<td>p &lt; .01**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Consideration</td>
<td>31.786</td>
<td>29.35</td>
<td>3.478</td>
<td>p &lt; .005***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Predictive Accuracy</td>
<td>15.282</td>
<td>14.659</td>
<td>1.959</td>
<td>p &lt; .05*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Integration</td>
<td>15.47</td>
<td>15.114</td>
<td>1.363</td>
<td>p &lt; .05*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Superior Orientation</td>
<td>31.12</td>
<td>31.205</td>
<td>.125</td>
<td>p &gt; .4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant to the .05 level
** Significant to the .01 level
*** Significant beyond the .01 level
Black and white principals rated their superintendents' leadership behavior using the LBDQ-XII. A significant difference was found in only 1 of the 12 leadership dimensions. Black principals achieved higher mean scores in 9 of the 12 leadership dimensions. Demand Reconciliation was the dimension where black principals achieved a significantly higher mean score than white principals. This significant difference was at the .05 level. Table 3 illustrates the findings of the data analysis when black principals were compared to white principals in rating the leadership behavior of their respective superintendents. Four other leadership dimensions had significance levels of .1, but these were not significant at the acceptable .05 level. Table 3 also shows that black principals perceived their superintendents higher in 9 of the 12 leadership dimensions.

The null hypothesis that there would be no significant differences between how black and white principals perceive the leadership behavior of their superintendents was rejected for the dimension of Demand Reconciliation. Black principals did perceive the leadership behavior significantly higher in the leadership dimension Demand Reconciliation than did white principals.

$H_0^4$. There will be no significant differences between principals with different formal education levels in how they perceive their superintendents' leadership behavior as measured by the LBDQ-XII.

Principals with different levels of formal education rated their superintendents' leadership behavior using the LBDQ-XII. The levels of formal education were: B.S., M.A., Ed.S., and Ph.D. or Ed.D. The analysis of variance was used to test this hypothesis. No significant
Table 3
Comparison Between Perceptions of Black and White Principals
of Their Superintendents' Leadership Behavior
as Measured by LBDQ-XII

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Dimensions</th>
<th>Mean Scores for Principals by Race</th>
<th>t value</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Black N=37</td>
<td>White N=124</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Representation</td>
<td>15.468</td>
<td>15.402</td>
<td>.047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Demand Reconciliation</td>
<td>15.368</td>
<td>14.784</td>
<td>1.865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Tolerance of Uncertainty</td>
<td>30.839</td>
<td>30.781</td>
<td>.065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Persuasiveness</td>
<td>30.641</td>
<td>30.405</td>
<td>.299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Initiition of Structure</td>
<td>31.387</td>
<td>32.216</td>
<td>1.121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Role Retention</td>
<td>31.093</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>.136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Consideration</td>
<td>31.008</td>
<td>31.002</td>
<td>.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Predictive Accuracy</td>
<td>15.855</td>
<td>15.802</td>
<td>.109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Integration</td>
<td>15.395</td>
<td>15.27</td>
<td>.455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Superior Orientation</td>
<td>31.121</td>
<td>31.216</td>
<td>.132</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant to the .05 level
differences were found between any of the groups of principals in any of the twelve leadership dimensions assessed by the LBDQ-XII. The highest achieved F score was .882 in the dimension of Representation, but none of the scores were less than .25 level of significance. Table 4 illustrates the findings of the data analysis for this hypothesis. Principals with an Ed.D. or Ph.D. achieved the highest mean score among all groups in 6 of the 23 leadership dimensions, while principals with an M.A. achieved the lowest mean scores in 6 of the 12 dimensions.

The null hypothesis that there would be no significant differences between principals with different formal education levels in how they perceive their superintendents' leadership behavior was not rejected. There were no significant differences between different formal education levels of principals in how they perceive the leadership behavior of their respective superintendents as measured by the LBDQ-XII.

H0.5 There will be no significant differences between how principals perceive the leadership ability of county and city school superintendents as measured by the LBDQ-XII.

Principals in county and city school systems rated the leadership behavior of their superintendents using the LBDQ-XII. Table 5 reveals the significant differences achieved by administering the t-test to this data. Significant differences were found in 9 of the 12 leadership dimensions tested by the LBDQ-XII. The dimensions Initiation of Structure, and Representation achieved significant differences at the .05 level. Role Retention was significant at the
Table 4
Comparison Between Perceptions of Principals with Different Formal Education Levels of Their Superintendents' Leadership Behavior as Measured by the LBDQ-XII

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Dimensions</th>
<th>Mean Scores for Principals with Different Formal Education Levels</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B.S. N=37</td>
<td>M.A. N=68</td>
<td>Ed.S. N=10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Demand Reconciliation</td>
<td>17.133</td>
<td>16.442</td>
<td>15.719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Tolerance of Uncertainty</td>
<td>34.133</td>
<td>33.968</td>
<td>33.963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Persuasiveness</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>32.516</td>
<td>33.386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Initiation of Structure</td>
<td>34.133</td>
<td>34.645</td>
<td>34.912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Tolerance of Freedom</td>
<td>33.933</td>
<td>33.484</td>
<td>33.737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Role Retention</td>
<td>33.533</td>
<td>32.419</td>
<td>32.947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Consideration</td>
<td>32.867</td>
<td>32.29</td>
<td>32.702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Production Emphasis</td>
<td>33.867</td>
<td>33.806</td>
<td>33.947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Integration</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>16.806</td>
<td>16.228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Superior Orientation</td>
<td>34.333</td>
<td>34.129</td>
<td>34.561</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 5
Comparison Between Perceptions of Principals in City and County School Systems of Their Superintendents' Leadership Behavior as Measured by the LBDQ-XII

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Dimensions</th>
<th>City N=69</th>
<th>County N=92</th>
<th>( t ) value</th>
<th>( p )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Representation</td>
<td>15.406</td>
<td>14.848</td>
<td>1.606</td>
<td>( p &lt; .05^* )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Demand Reconciliation</td>
<td>15.507</td>
<td>14.772</td>
<td>2.208</td>
<td>( p &lt; .01^{**} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Tolerance of Uncertainty</td>
<td>30.333</td>
<td>31.196</td>
<td>-1.271</td>
<td>( p &gt; .01 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Persuasiveness</td>
<td>31.697</td>
<td>29.804</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>( p &lt; .005^{***} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Initiation of Structure</td>
<td>31.696</td>
<td>30.641</td>
<td>1.568</td>
<td>( p &lt; .05 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Tolerance of Freedom</td>
<td>31.493</td>
<td>30.967</td>
<td>.798</td>
<td>( p &gt; .1 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Role Retention</td>
<td>31.246</td>
<td>30.954</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>( p &lt; .025^* )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Consideration</td>
<td>30.783</td>
<td>30.337</td>
<td>.689</td>
<td>( p &gt; .1 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Production Emphasis</td>
<td>32.522</td>
<td>28.674</td>
<td>5.277</td>
<td>( p &lt; .0005^{***} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Predictive Accuracy</td>
<td>15.812</td>
<td>14.978</td>
<td>2.441</td>
<td>( p &lt; .01^* )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Integration</td>
<td>17.304</td>
<td>15.215</td>
<td>6.791</td>
<td>( p &lt; .005^{***} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Superior Orientation</td>
<td>32.217</td>
<td>30.041</td>
<td>3.002</td>
<td>( p &lt; .0005^{***} )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\* Significant to the .05 level  
\** Significant to the .01 level  
\*** Significant beyond the .01 level
Demand Reconciliation and Predictive Accuracy were significant at the .01 level, while the dimensions of Persuasiveness, Production Emphasis, Integration, and Superior Orientation were statistically significant beyond the .01 level. Principals from city systems rated the leadership behavior of their superintendents higher than the ratings of county principals of their superintendents in 11 of the 12 leadership dimensions. The only leadership dimension which county superintendents were rated higher in was Tolerance of Uncertainty and that difference was not significant.

The null hypothesis that there would be no significant differences between how principals perceive the leadership ability of county and city school superintendents was rejected for Initiation of Structure, Representation, Role Retention, Demand Reconciliation, Predictive Accuracy, Persuasiveness, Production Emphasis, Integration, and Superior Orientation. City superintendents were rated higher than county superintendents in 11 of 12 leadership dimensions. Nine of the 12 dimensions revealed significant differences; two dimensions were significantly different at the .05 level of significance, one dimension at the .025 level of significance, two dimensions at the .01 level of significance, and four dimensions were significantly different at beyond the .01 level of significance.

H_06. There will be no significant differences between how principals perceive the leadership ability of elected and appointed superintendents as measured by the LBDQ-XII,
Principals who served under elected and appointed school superintendents rated their leadership behavior using the LBDQ-XII. Table 6 reveals the significant differences achieved by administering the t test to these data. Appointed superintendents were rated higher than elected superintendents in 11 of the twelve leadership dimensions. Significant differences were found in 9 of the 12 leadership dimensions tested by the LBDQ-XII. The dimensions Initiation of Structure and Representation achieved significant differences at the .05 level. Role Retention was significant at the .025 level. Demand Reconciliation and Predictive Accuracy were significant at the .01 level, while the dimensions of Persuasiveness, Production Emphasis, Integration and Superior Orientation were statistically significant beyond the .01 level. Principals with appointed superintendents rated the leadership behavior of their superintendents higher than principals with an elected superintendent in 11 of the 12 leadership dimensions. The only leadership dimension which county superintendents were rated higher in was Tolerance of Uncertainty and that difference was not significant.

The null hypothesis that there would be no significant differences between how principals perceive the leadership ability of elected and appointed school superintendents was rejected for Initiation of Structure, Representation, Role Retention, Demand Reconciliation, Predictive Accuracy, Persuasiveness, Production Emphasis, Integration, and Superior Orientation. Appointed superintendents were rated higher than elected superintendents in 11 of 12 leadership dimensions. Nine of the 12 dimensions revealed significant differences; 2 dimensions
Table 6
Comparison Between Perceptions of Principals with an Appointed or Elected Superintendent of Their Superintendents' Leadership Behavior as Measured by the LBDQ-XII

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Dimensions</th>
<th>Mean Scores for Principals by Superintendent Type</th>
<th>Z value</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Appointed N=69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elected N=92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Representation</td>
<td>15.406</td>
<td>14.848</td>
<td>1.606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Demand Reconciliation</td>
<td>15.507</td>
<td>14.772</td>
<td>2.208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Tolerance of Uncertainty</td>
<td>30.333</td>
<td>31.196</td>
<td>-1.271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Persuasiveness</td>
<td>31.697</td>
<td>29.504</td>
<td>2.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Initiation of Structure</td>
<td>31.698</td>
<td>30.661</td>
<td>1.568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Role Retention</td>
<td>31.246</td>
<td>30.054</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Consideration</td>
<td>30.781</td>
<td>30.337</td>
<td>.689</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Predictive Accuracy</td>
<td>15.812</td>
<td>14.978</td>
<td>2.441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Integration</td>
<td>17.304</td>
<td>15.315</td>
<td>4.791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Superior Orientation</td>
<td>32.217</td>
<td>30.043</td>
<td>3.002</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant to the .05 level
** Significant to the .01 level
*** Significant beyond the .01 level
were significantly different at the .05 level of significance, one
dimension at the .025 level of significance, two dimensions at the .01
level of significance, and four dimensions were significantly different
at beyond the .01 level of significance.

H<sub>0</sub>7. There will be no significant differences between principals
who were born in a 50-mile radius of the school system and principals
who were born outside a 50-mile radius in how they perceive the
leadership ability of their superintendents as measured by the LBDQ-XII.

Principals born within a 50-mile radius of their school system
and principals born outside a 50-mile radius rated the leadership
behavior of their superintendents using the LBDQ-XII. Table 7
illustrates the findings of the data treatment using the t-test. No
significant differences were found between how principals born within
a 50-mile radius and principals born outside a 50-mile radius when
compared to each other in their perceptions of the 12 leadership
dimensions of the LBDQ-XII. The highest achieved t value was 1.236
in the dimension of Representation. This value was not significant
even at the .1 level of significance. Principals born within a 50-mile
radius had higher mean scores in all 12 of the leadership dimensions,
although none of the scores were significantly higher than principals
born outside a 50-mile radius.

The null hypothesis that there would be no significant differences
between principals born in a 50-mile radius of the school system and
principals born outside a 50-mile radius in how they perceive the
leadership ability of their superintendents was not rejected. Although
Table 7
Comparison Between Perceptions of Principals Born Within a 50-Mile Radius
of the Present School System and Principals Born Outside a 50-Mile Radius
of the Present School System of Their Superintendents' Leadership
Behavior as Measured by the LBQ-XII

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Dimensions</th>
<th>Mean Scores for Principals by Place of Birth</th>
<th>t value</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within 50 mile radius N=97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Representation</td>
<td>13.423</td>
<td>1.236</td>
<td>p &gt; .1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Demand Reconciliation</td>
<td>15.753</td>
<td>1.148</td>
<td>p &gt; .1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Tolerance of Uncertainty</td>
<td>30.887</td>
<td>.992</td>
<td>p &gt; .1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Persuasiveness</td>
<td>30.536</td>
<td>.925</td>
<td>p &gt; .1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Initiation of Structure</td>
<td>30.856</td>
<td>1.084</td>
<td>p &gt; .1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Tolerance of Freedom</td>
<td>30.961</td>
<td>1.046</td>
<td>p &gt; .1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Role Retention</td>
<td>31.33</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>p &gt; .1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Consideration</td>
<td>31.186</td>
<td>.999</td>
<td>p &gt; .1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Production Emphasis</td>
<td>31.103</td>
<td>.751</td>
<td>p &gt; .1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Predictive Accuracy</td>
<td>15.773</td>
<td>1.046</td>
<td>p &gt; .1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Integration</td>
<td>15.526</td>
<td>.703</td>
<td>p &gt; .1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
principals who were born within a 50-mile radius of the school system.

rated their superintendents' leadership behavior higher in all 12

dimensions of the LBDQ-XII than principals who were born outside a

50-mile radius of the school system, they did not rate their

superintendents' leadership behavior significantly higher when tested

at the .05 level using the t-test.

H08. There will be no significant differences between how
elementary, middle, and high school principals perceive the leadership
ability of their superintendents as measured by the LBDQ-XII.

Elementary, middle, and high school principals rated the
leadership behavior of their superintendents using the LBDQ-XII.

Significant differences were found in 2 of the 12 leadership
dimensions. The dimensions were Tolerance of Freedom and Consideration.
The results of the statistical treatment of the data are revealed in
Table 8. The Newman-Keuls Procedure was applied to the two dimensions
where significant differences occurred. This procedure revealed that
middle school principals rated the leadership behavior of their
superintendents significantly higher than high school principals in the
dimension of Tolerance of Freedom. This significant difference was at
the .05 level of significance. A significant difference was also
revealed in the dimension of Consideration. The Newman-Keuls Procedure
showed that high school principals rated the leadership behavior of
their superintendents significantly higher than middle and elementary
school principals. The level of significance achieved in the
dimension of Consideration using the analysis of variance was at the
.01 level. It should be noted that elementary school principals
Table 8
Comparison Between Perceptions of Elementary, Middle, and High School Principals of Their Superintendents' Leadership Behavior
as Measured by LBDQ-XII

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Dimensions</th>
<th>N, Mean Scores, F Scores, and Levels of Significance (N=161)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elementary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Representation</td>
<td>15.894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Demand Reconciliation</td>
<td>16.182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Initiation of Structure</td>
<td>32.695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Tolerance of Freedom</td>
<td>32.043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Ritu Retention</td>
<td>32.864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Consideration</td>
<td>32.061**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Integration</td>
<td>15.833</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant difference between Middle and High School Principals

** Significant difference between Elementary, Middle and High School Principals
rated the leadership behavior of their superintendents highest in 8 of the 12 dimensions measured by the LBDQ-XII.

The null hypothesis that there would be no significant differences between how elementary, middle, and high school principals perceive the leadership ability of their superintendent was rejected for Tolerance of Freedom and Consideration. Significant differences occurred in 2 of the 12 leadership dimensions. Middle school principals rated the leadership behavior of their superintendents significantly higher than high school principals in the dimension of Tolerance of Freedom. High school principals rated the leadership behavior of their superintendents significantly higher than elementary and middle school principals in the leadership dimension of Consideration.

H$_0^9$. There will be no significant differences between principals with experience at their present schools; 0–5 years, 7–10, 11 years or more in how they perceive their superintendents' leadership ability as measured by the LBDQ-XII.

Principals grouped by years of experience at their present schools rated the leadership behavior of their superintendents using the LBDQ-XII. The analysis of variance was used to test the data for this hypothesis and the results of the statistical analysis is presented in Table 9. There were no significant differences found among the different groups of principals in any of the leadership dimensions measured by the LBDQ-XII. Although no significant differences were found among these groups of principals, it should be noted that principals with 0–5 years experience at their present schools rated the leadership behavior.
Table 9
Comparison Between Perceptions of Principals with Different Levels of Experience in the Principalship at the Present School of Their Superintendents' Leadership Behavior as Measured by the LBDQ-XII

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Dimensions</th>
<th>Mean Scores for Principals by Principalship Experience at Their Present School</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0-5 Years N=91</td>
<td>6-10 Years N=47</td>
<td>11 or More Years N=23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Representation</td>
<td>15.417</td>
<td>16.404</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Demand Reconciliation</td>
<td>15.583</td>
<td>16.182</td>
<td>16.213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Tolerance of Uncertainty</td>
<td>32.604</td>
<td>33.918</td>
<td>33.447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Persuasiveness</td>
<td>31.327</td>
<td>32.167</td>
<td>31.874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Initiation of Structure</td>
<td>33.545</td>
<td>33.496</td>
<td>33.280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Role Retention</td>
<td>32.318</td>
<td>32.485</td>
<td>31.851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Consideration</td>
<td>31.296</td>
<td>32.076</td>
<td>31.638</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
of their superintendents, lowest of all principal groups in 7 of the 12 leadership dimensions.

The null hypothesis that there will be no significant differences between principals' experience at their present schools; 0-5 years, 6-10 years, 11 years or over in how they perceive their superintendent's leadership ability was not rejected. There were no significant differences found among the groups of principals when they rated the leadership behavior of their superintendents in the twelve dimensions measured by the LBDQ-XII.

H₀10. There will be no significant differences between principals with different educational experience levels; 0-5 years, 6-10 years, 11-15 years, and 16 or more years in how they perceive their superintendents' leadership ability as measured by the LBDQ-XII.

Principals grouped by number of years experience in education rated the leadership behavior of their superintendents. The analysis of variance was used to determine if any significant differences existed between the different groups of principals. The results of the statistical analysis revealed that no significant differences existed between any of the groups of principals in the 12 leadership dimensions measured by the LBDQ-XII. These findings are further displayed in Table 10. There were no responses from principals who had 0-5 years experience in education. Principals with 11-15 years of educational experience rated the leadership behavior of their superintendents lowest of all the groups of principals in 11 of the 12 leadership dimensions measured by the LBDQ-XII.
Table 10

Comparison Between Perceptions of Principals with Different Educational Experience Levels of Their Superintendents' Leadership Behavior as Measured by the LMMQ-XII

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Dimensions</th>
<th>Mean Scores for Principals by Educational Experience Levels</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=0 6-10 years 11-15 years 16 or more years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Representation</td>
<td>16.241 15.932 16.263</td>
<td>.372</td>
<td>p &gt; .25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Demand Reconciliation</td>
<td>16.5 16.148 16.947</td>
<td>.742</td>
<td>p &gt; .25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Tolerance of Uncertainty</td>
<td>33.833 33.42 34.105</td>
<td>.308</td>
<td>p &gt; .25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Persuasiveness</td>
<td>33.889 33.58 33.947</td>
<td>.130</td>
<td>p &gt; .25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Initiation of Structure</td>
<td>34.148 33.67 34.263</td>
<td>.282</td>
<td>p &gt; .25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Tolerance of Freedom</td>
<td>33.981 33.626 34.268</td>
<td>.305</td>
<td>p &gt; .25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Role Retention</td>
<td>33.722 33.432 33.895</td>
<td>.152</td>
<td>p &gt; .25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Consideration</td>
<td>34.796 34.068 34.0</td>
<td>.127</td>
<td>p &gt; .25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Production Emphasis</td>
<td>33.852 33.5 34.053</td>
<td>.251</td>
<td>p &gt; .25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Integration</td>
<td>16.278 15.784 16.368</td>
<td>1.149</td>
<td>p &gt; .25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Superior Orientation</td>
<td>33.778 33.33 34.211</td>
<td>.606</td>
<td>p &gt; .25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The null hypothesis that there will be no significant differences between principals with different educational experience levels; 0-5 years, 6-10 years, 11-15 years, and 16 years of more in how they perceive their superintendents' leadership ability was not rejected. Principals grouped by educational experience did not rate their superintendents significantly different from any other group of principals in any of the 12 dimensions measured by the LBDQ-XII.

H011. There will be no significant differences between principals who last attended graduate school: within 1 year, 2-4 years ago, 5-8 years ago, and over 9 years ago in how they perceive their superintendents' leadership ability as measured by the LBDQ-XII.

Principals grouped by their last attendance in graduate school rated the leadership behavior of their superintendents using the LBDQ-XII. Table 11 reveals the statistical findings for the data analyzed using the analysis of variance. Significant differences were found in 2 of the 12 leadership dimensions tested. The Newman-Keuls Procedure was then utilized to determine where the significant differences existed. The first dimension where significant differences existed was Initiation of Structure. In this dimension it was found that principals who had last attended graduate school nine or more years ago rated the leadership behavior of their superintendents significantly higher than principals who last attended graduate school within one year ago. The level of significance which existed was at the .01 level for the dimension of Initiation of Structure. The second leadership dimension where significant differences occurred was in the dimension of Role Retention. In this dimension it was
Table 11

Comparison Between Perceptions of Principals with Different Last Attendance Dates in Graduate School of Their Superintendents' Leadership Behavior as Measured by the LSD-O-XIT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Dimensions</th>
<th>Mean Scores for Principals by Last Attendance of Graduate School</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>JP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within 1 year N=59</td>
<td>2-4 years ago N=64</td>
<td>5-8 years ago N=16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Representation</td>
<td>15.114</td>
<td>15.109</td>
<td>15.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Demand Reconciliation</td>
<td>15.924</td>
<td>15.984</td>
<td>15.812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Tolerance of Uncertainty</td>
<td>32.127</td>
<td>32.188</td>
<td>32.430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Persuasiveness</td>
<td>32.291</td>
<td>31.922</td>
<td>32.375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Initiation of Structure</td>
<td>31.949*</td>
<td>32.342</td>
<td>32.295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Tolerance of Freedom</td>
<td>32.848</td>
<td>32.109</td>
<td>32.625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Role Retention</td>
<td>31.962**</td>
<td>32.43**</td>
<td>33.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Consideration</td>
<td>32.023</td>
<td>32.016</td>
<td>21.938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Production Emphasis</td>
<td>32.177</td>
<td>31.984</td>
<td>32.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Integration</td>
<td>15.267</td>
<td>15.297</td>
<td>15.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Superior Orientation</td>
<td>32.519</td>
<td>32.188</td>
<td>33.062</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant difference between Principals who last attended graduate school 1 year ago and nine or more years ago

** Significant difference between principals who last attended graduate school 1 year ago, 2-4 years ago and nine or more years ago
found that principals who last attended graduate school over nine years ago rated the leadership behavior of their superintendents significantly higher than principals who attended graduate school one year ago, or 2-4 years ago. The level of significance which existed in the dimension of Role Retention was at the .01 level of significance. Only two principals responded who last attended graduate school over nine years ago. Principals who last attended graduate school nine or more years ago achieved the highest mean score among all the groups in 7 of the 12 leadership dimensions, while principals in each group achieved the lowest mean score in 3 of the 12 dimensions.

The null hypothesis that there will be no significant differences between principals who last attended graduate school: within one year, 2-4 years ago, 4-8 years ago, and over nine years ago in how they perceive their superintendents' leadership ability was rejected for Initiation of Structure and Role Retention. The hypothesis was not rejected for the other leadership dimensions. It was found that principals who last attended graduate school over nine years ago rated the leadership behavior of their superintendents significantly higher than the other principal groups. Significant differences existed in the leadership dimensions of Initiation of Structure at the .05 level of significance, and Role Retention at the .01 level of significance when statistically tested using the analysis of variance.

H₀₁₂. There will be no significant differences between how principals from east, west, and middle Tennessee perceive their superintendents' leadership ability as measured by LBDQ-XII.
Principals grouped by their school location in Tennessee rated the leadership behavior of their superintendents using the LBDQ-XII. Table 12 reports the findings of the statistical treatment of the data using the analysis of variance. No significant differences were found to exist in any of the 12 leadership dimensions measured by the LBDQ-XII. The highest F score attained in the analysis of variance occurred in the dimension of Integration. This score did not achieve significance even at the .25 level of significance. Principals from middle Tennessee rated the leadership behavior of their superintendents lowest of all principal groups in 7 of the 12 leadership dimensions measured by the LBDQ-XII.

The null hypothesis that there will be no significant differences between how principals from east, west, and middle Tennessee perceive their superintendent's leadership ability was not rejected. Principals from east, west, and middle Tennessee did not rate the leadership behavior of their superintendents significantly higher in any of the twelve dimensions of the LBDQ-XII.

$H_{013}$. There will be no significant differences between superintendents with experience levels in the present school system: 0-4 years, 5-9 years, and 10 or more years in how principals perceive their leadership ability as measured by the LBDQ-XII.

Principals grouped by these experience levels of their present school superintendents rated the leadership behavior of their superintendents using the LBDQ-XII. Table 13 illustrates the results of statistical analysis on the data in this hypothesis when tested
Table 12

Comparison Between Perceptions of Principals from East, West, and Middle Tennessee of Their Superintendents' Leadership Behavior as Measured by the LBDQ-XII

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Dimensions</th>
<th>Mean Scores for Principals by School Location in Tennessee</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>East N=85</td>
<td>Middle N=25</td>
<td>West N=51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Representation</td>
<td>16.182</td>
<td>16.17</td>
<td>15.729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Demand Reconciliation</td>
<td>15.833</td>
<td>15.583</td>
<td>15.809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Tolerance of Uncertainty</td>
<td>33.242</td>
<td>33.082</td>
<td>33.511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Persuasiveness</td>
<td>32.985</td>
<td>32.816</td>
<td>32.426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Initiation of Structure</td>
<td>32.102</td>
<td>32.447</td>
<td>33.333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Tolerance of Freedom</td>
<td>33.327</td>
<td>33.021</td>
<td>32.426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Role Retention</td>
<td>32.895</td>
<td>31.362</td>
<td>32.898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Consideration</td>
<td>33.833</td>
<td>33.979</td>
<td>33.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Integration</td>
<td>15.894</td>
<td>15.375</td>
<td>15.596</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 13
Comparison Between Perceptions of Principals Grouped by the Number of Years Their Present Superintendents Have Been in Office of Their Superintendence
Leadership Behavior as Measured by the LBDQ-XII

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Dimensions</th>
<th>N, Mean Scores, F Scores, and Levels of Significance (N=161)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean Scores for Principals by Superintendent's Number of Years in Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0-4 Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Tolerance of Uncertainty</td>
<td>32.318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Persuasiveness</td>
<td>32.076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Initiation of Structure</td>
<td>32.167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Consideration</td>
<td>33.545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Integration</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Superior Orientation</td>
<td>32.605</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
using the analysis of variance. The results of the data analysis revealed that no significant differences existed between the groups of principals when rating the leadership behavior of their superintendents. The highest F score achieved was 1.117 in the dimension of Production Emphasis. This score did not attain even a .25 level of significance when tested using the analysis of variance. Principals whose superintendents had been in office 5-9 years rated the leadership behavior of their superintendents lowest of all principal groups in all twelve dimensions measured by the LBDQ-XII.

The null hypothesis that there will be no significant differences between superintendents with experience levels in the present school system; 0-4 years, 5-9 years, and 10 or more years in how principals perceive their leadership ability was not rejected. None of the groups of principals, grouped by experience levels of their superintendents in their present school system rated the leadership behavior of their superintendents significantly higher in any of the twelve leadership dimensions measured by the LBDQ-XII.

H_{014}. There will be no significant differences between principals with different levels of principalship experience; 0-4 years, 5-9 years, 10-15 years, over 15 years in how they perceive their superintendents' leadership ability as measured by the LBDQ-XII.

Principals grouped by the number of years experience in the principalship rated the leadership behavior of their superintendents using the LBDQ-XII. Table 14 illustrates the results of statistical analysis of the treatment of data using the analysis of variance. The statistical analysis revealed that no significant differences existed
Table 14
Comparison between Perceptions of Principals with Different Levels of Experience in the Principalship of Their Superintendents' Leadership Behavior as Measured by the LOMO-XII

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Dimensions</th>
<th>N, Mean Scores, F Scores, and Levels of Significance (N=161)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean Scores for Principals by the Years of Experience in the Principalship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0-4 Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Representation</td>
<td>15.833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Initiation of Structure</td>
<td>33.227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Tolerance of Freedom</td>
<td>33.833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Role Retention</td>
<td>32.318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Consideration</td>
<td>33.333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Production Emphasis</td>
<td>32.985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Predictive Accuracy</td>
<td>15.375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Integration</td>
<td>16.182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Superior Orientation</td>
<td>33.242</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
between the groups of principals in the ratings of the leadership behavior of their superintendents in the 12 leadership dimensions of the LBDQ-XII. The highest achieved F score was 1.28, attained in the dimension of Predictive Accuracy. Principals with 10 or more years experience in the principalship rated their superintendents the lowest among all groups in 6 of the 12 dimensions of leadership behavior that were tested.

The null hypothesis that there will be no significant differences between principals with different levels of principalship experience; 0-4 years, 5-9 years, 10-15 years, and over 15 years in how they perceive their superintendents' leadership ability was not rejected. There were no significant differences found when principals grouped by the number of years experience in the principalship were compared to each other in the rating of the leadership behavior of their superintendents as measured by the LBDQ-XII.

H₀15. There will be no significant differences between principals with experience levels in the present school system; 0-4 years, 5-9 years, 10-14 years, and 15 years or more in how they perceive their superintendents' leadership ability as measured by the LBDQ-XII.

Principals grouped according to the number of years experience they have in the present school system rated the leadership behavior of their superintendents using the LBDQ-XII. Table 15 illustrates statistical findings of the data treatment using the analysis of variance. No significant differences existed between the groups in any of the 12 leadership dimensions measured by the LBDQ-XII. None of the achieved F scores were found to be at the .05 level of
### Table 15
Comparison Between Perceptions of Principals With Different Levels of Experience in the Present School System of Their Superintendents' Leadership Behavior as Measured by the LBDQ-XII

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Dimensions</th>
<th>Mean Scores for Principals by the Years of Experience in the Present School System</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=15</td>
<td>N=31</td>
<td>N=57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-4 Years</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>14.965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-9 Years</td>
<td>16.07</td>
<td>15.806</td>
<td>16.088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-14 Years</td>
<td>32.133</td>
<td>32.032</td>
<td>31.982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-15 Years or more</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>32.323</td>
<td>32.491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Representation</td>
<td>32.133</td>
<td>32.323</td>
<td>32.158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Demand Reconciliation</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>31.903</td>
<td>31.825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Tolerance of Uncertainty</td>
<td>34.133</td>
<td>33.868</td>
<td>33.965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Persuasiveness</td>
<td>33.067</td>
<td>32.966</td>
<td>32.842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Initiation of Structure</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>32.194</td>
<td>32.198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Role Retention</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>15.129</td>
<td>15.193</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
significance in any of the twelve leadership dimensions tested.

Principals with 5-9 years experience in the present school system achieved the highest mean score in 5 of the 12 leadership dimensions, while principals with 10-14 years in the present school system achieved the lowest mean score in 5 of the 12 dimensions.

The null hypothesis that there will be no significant differences between principals with experience levels in the present school system; 0-4 years, 5-9 years, 10-14 years, and 15 or more years in how they perceive their superintendents' ability was not rejected. There were no significant differences found when the principals grouped by years of experience in the present school system, rated the leadership behavior of their superintendents in the 12 dimensions of the LBDQ-XII.
CHAPTER 5
Summary, Findings, Conclusions, and Recommendations

Summary

Problem

The problem of this study was to determine whether principals' perceptions of their superintendents' leadership ability were affected by selected demographic variables.

Twelve dimensions of the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire, Form 12 (LBDQ-XII)--Representation, Demand Reconciliation, Tolerance of Uncertainty, Persuasiveness, Initiation of Structure, Tolerance of Freedom, Role Retention, Consideration, Production Emphasis, Predictive Accuracy, Integration, and Influence with Superiors were selected to assess the principals' perceptions of their superintendents' leadership ability. A demographic data sheet was also used with the LBDQ-XII to obtain the data needed to complete this study.

Procedures

A population of principals was identified by using the 1984-85 Tennessee Directory of Public Schools. A simple random sample was then drawn from this population and a total of 400 principals from across the state of Tennessee were selected to participate in this study. Each principal completed a demographic data sheet and the LBDQ-XII. A total of 161 principals responded to this study. These data were then analyzed using the unpaired t-test and the analysis of variance. The data were tested at the .05 level of significance. 
Findings

From the results of the data analysis and interpretation, the following findings are presented. Findings are reported as they pertain to each of the hypotheses originally formulated.

For Hypothesis 1, principals grouped by age rated their superintendents on their leadership behavior. There were no significant differences between the groups of principals in the ratings of the leadership behavior of their superintendents when all the dimensions of the LBDQ-XII were tested at the .05 level of significance. Principals in the age group 29 and under achieved the highest mean score among all the groups in 10 of the 12 dimensions.

For Hypothesis 2, principals grouped by sex rated the leadership behavior of their superintendents. Significant differences were found to exist in the dimensions of Tolerance of Uncertainty, Initiation of Structure, Predictive Accuracy, and Integration at the .05 level of significance. Significant differences existed at the .01 level of significance in the dimension of Role Retention, and beyond the .01 level in Consideration. Male principals achieved the highest mean scores in 10 of the 12 dimensions. These significant differences occurred when principals grouped by sex, who rated the leadership behavior of their superintendents in all twelve dimensions were tested at the .05 level of significance.

For Hypothesis 3, principals grouped by race rated the leadership behavior of their superintendents. Black principals achieved higher mean scores in 9 of the 12 dimensions when compared to white principals and significantly higher in the dimension of Demand
Reconciliation. A significant difference was found in the dimension of Demand Reconciliation at the .05 level of significance when principals grouped by race rated the leadership behavior of their superintendents using the LBDQ-XII.

For Hypothesis 4, principals grouped by their formal education levels rated the leadership behavior of their superintendents. No significant differences existed in the ratings of the leadership behavior of superintendents by principals grouped by formal education levels when all the dimensions were tested at the .05 level of significance. Principals with an Ed.D. or a Ph.D. achieved the highest mean scores in six of the twelve dimensions tested.

For Hypothesis 5, principals grouped by their school system type, rated the leadership behavior of their superintendents. Significant differences were found in the leadership dimensions of Representation and Initiation of Structure at the .05 level, Role Retention at the .025 level, Demand Reconciliation and Predictive Accuracy at the .01 level, and Persuasiveness, Production Emphasis, Integration and Superior Orientation beyond the .01 level. Principals in city school systems achieved the highest mean scores in 11 of the 12 dimensions when compared to principals from county school systems.

For Hypothesis 6, principals were grouped by their superintendents type, either appointed or elected, rated the leadership behavior of their superintendents. Significant differences were found in the leadership dimensions of Representation and Initiation of Structure at the .05 level, Role Retention at the .025 level, Demand Reconciliation and Predictive Accuracy at the .01 level, and Persuasiveness,
Production Emphasis, Integration, and Superior Orientation beyond the .01 level. Principals with appointed superintendents achieved the highest mean scores in 11 of the 12 dimensions when compared to principals with elected superintendents.

For Hypothesis 7, principals grouped by whether they were born within a 50-mile radius of their present school system or born outside a 50-mile radius of their present school system rated the leadership behavior of their superintendents. Principals born within a 50-mile radius achieved the highest mean scores in all twelve of the dimensions when compared to principals born outside a 50-mile radius of the present school system. There were no significant differences in the ratings of superintendents by principals grouped their place of birth when all the leadership dimensions were taken into consideration.

For Hypothesis 8, principals grouped by their school type: elementary, middle, or high school, rated the leadership behavior of their superintendents. Significant differences existed in two leadership dimensions of the twelve dimensions tested. It was revealed that significant differences occurred in the dimension of Tolerance of Freedom at the .05 level and at the .01 level in the dimension of Consideration. These significant differences existed between the principals grouped by school type when the data were tested at the .05 level. High school principals rated the leadership behavior of their superintendents significantly higher than did middle school principals in the dimension of Tolerance of Freedom. High school principals also rated the leadership behavior of their superintendents significantly
higher than elementary and middle school principals in the dimension of Consideration.

For Hypothesis 9, principals grouped by years of experience in the principalship in their present schools rated the leadership behavior of their superintendents. There were no significant differences in the ratings of superintendents by principals grouped by years of experience in the principalship in their present schools when all the leadership dimensions of the LBDQ-XII were taken into consideration.

For Hypothesis 10, principals grouped by years of educational experience rated the leadership behavior of their superintendents. High school principals achieved the highest mean scores in 10 of the 12 dimensions when compared to the elementary and middle school principals. There were no significant differences in the ratings of superintendents by principals grouped by years of educational experience when all the leadership dimensions of the LBDQ-XII were taken into consideration.

For Hypothesis 11, principals grouped for last attendance at graduate school rated the leadership behavior of their superintendents. Principals who last attended graduate school nine or more years ago rated the leadership behavior of their superintendents significantly higher than principals who attended graduate school one year ago in the dimension of Initiation of Structure at the .01 level. Principals who last attended graduate school nine or more years ago rated the leadership behavior of their superintendents significantly higher than principals who attended graduate school one year ago, and principals who attended graduate school two to four years ago in the dimension of Role Retention at the .01 level. These significant differences
occurred when principals grouped by last attendance of graduate school rated the leadership behavior of their superintendents.

For Hypothesis 12, principals grouped by their school location in Tennessee rated the leadership behavior of their superintendents. Principals from East Tennessee achieved the highest mean scores in 7 of the 12 dimensions when compared to principals from Middle and West Tennessee. There were no significant differences in the ratings of superintendents by principals grouped by their school location in Tennessee when all the leadership dimensions were taken into consideration.

For Hypothesis 13, principals grouped by their superintendents' educational experience in the present school system rated the leadership behavior of their superintendent. Principals whose superintendents had been in office 0 to 4 years achieved the highest mean scores in 8 of the 12 dimensions when compared to principals whose superintendents had been in office 5 to 9 years and 10 or more years. There were no significant differences in the ratings of superintendents by principals grouped by their superintendents' educational experience in the present school system when all the leadership dimensions were taken into consideration.

For Hypothesis 14, principals grouped by their years of experience in the principalship rated the leadership behavior of their superintendents. Principals with 0 to 4 years experience in the principalship achieved the highest mean scores in 8 of 12 dimensions when compared to principals with 5 to 9 years and 10 or more years experience in the principalship. There were no significant
differences in the ratings of superintendents by principals grouped by their years of experience in the principalship when all the leadership dimensions were taken into consideration.

For Hypothesis 15, principals grouped by their years of experience in their present school system rated the leadership behavior of their superintendents. Principals with 0 to 4 years experience in the present school system achieved the highest mean scores in 5 of the 12 dimensions when compared to principals with 5 to 9 years, 10 to 14 years, and 15 years of experience in the present school system. There were no significant differences in the ratings of superintendents by principals grouped by their years of experience in their present school system when all the leadership dimensions were taken into consideration.

Conclusions

The conclusions which follow were drawn from the results of this research. The sample was limited to 400 randomly selected public school principals in Tennessee. Therefore, the conclusions are applicable to the population of public school principals in Tennessee.

1. Principals of different age groups do not perceive a difference in the leadership ability of superintendents when assessing twelve dimensions of leadership behavior.

2. Male and female principals perceive a difference in the leadership ability of superintendents. Male principals rated the leadership ability of their superintendents significantly higher than
female principals in the dimensions of Tolerance of Uncertainty, Initiation of Structure, Role Retention, Consideration, Predictive Accuracy, and Integration. Male principals also gave more consideration (higher leader behavior scores) to the dimensions of Representation, Demand Reconciliation, Persuasiveness, Tolerance of Freedom, Production Emphasis, and Superior Orientation.

3. Black and white principals perceive a difference in the leadership ability of the superintendents. Black principals rate the dimension of Demand Reconciliation significantly higher than do white principals. Black principals also give more consideration (higher leader behavior scores) in Representation, Tolerance of Uncertainty, Persuasiveness, Initiation of Structure, Role Retention, Consideration, Production Emphasis, and Integration, while white principals give more consideration to Tolerance of Freedom, Predictive Accuracy, and Superior Orientation.

4. Principals with different levels of formal education do not perceive a difference in the leadership ability of superintendents when assessing twelve dimensions of leadership behavior.

5. Principals from city and county school systems do perceive a difference in the leadership ability of superintendents. Principals from city school systems rate their superintendents significantly higher in Representation, Demand Reconciliation, Persuasiveness, Initiation of Structure, Role Retention, Production Emphasis, Predictive Accuracy, Integration, and Superior Orientation. City school principals also give more consideration (higher leader behavior
scores) in Tolerance of Freedom and Consideration, while county principals give more consideration to Tolerance of Uncertainty.

6. Principals with appointed and elected superintendents do perceive a difference in the leadership ability of superintendents. Principals whose superintendents are appointed rate their superintendents significantly higher in Representation, Demand Reconciliation, Persuasiveness, Initiation of Structure, Role Retention, Production Emphasis, Predictive Accuracy, Integration, and Superior Orientation. They also give more consideration (higher leader behavior scores) in Tolerance of Freedom and Consideration, while principals, whose superintendents are elected, give more consideration to Tolerance of Uncertainty.

7. Principals born within a 50-mile radius of the present school system and principals born outside a 50-mile radius of the present school system do not perceive a difference in the leadership ability of superintendents when assessing twelve dimension of leadership behavior.

8. Elementary, middle, and high school principals do perceive a difference in the leadership ability of superintendents. Middle school principals rate their superintendents significantly higher than high school principals in Tolerance of Freedom. High school principals rate their superintendents significantly higher than elementary and middle school principals in Consideration.

9. Principals with different levels of experience in the principalship in their present schools do not perceive a difference
in the leadership ability of superintendents when assessing 12 dimensions of leadership behavior.

10. Principals with different levels of experience in education do not perceive a difference in the leadership ability of superintendents when assessing 12 dimensions of leadership behavior.

11. Principals with different last dates of attendance of graduate school do perceive a difference in the leadership ability of superintendents. Principals who last attended graduate school over nine years ago rate their superintendents significantly higher than principals who last attended graduate school one year ago in Initiation of Structure. They also rated their superintendents significantly higher than principals who last attended graduate school one year ago and principals who last attended graduate school two to four years ago in Role Retention.

12. Principals from east, west, and middle Tennessee do not perceive a difference in the leadership ability of superintendents when assessing 12 dimensions of leadership behavior.

13. Principals whose superintendents have been in office for different numbers of years do not perceive a difference in the leadership ability of superintendents when assessing 12 dimensions of leadership behavior.

14. Principals with different levels of experience in the principalship do not perceive a difference in the leadership ability of superintendents when assessing 12 dimensions of leadership behavior.
15. Principals with different levels of experience in the present school system do not perceive a difference in leadership ability of superintendents when assessing twelve dimensions of leadership behavior.

**Implications**

The findings of this study provided several implications for public school administration in general. Foremost, leadership behavior is perceived and can be measured. Superintendents need to be aware of the areas of leadership which are considered most important by the principals, teachers, and the community. This knowledge is important not only to be capable to provide leadership for a school system, but for being perceived as a leader by subordinates.

The findings that resulted from the data provided by the principals seem to imply that some demographic variables appear to have more influence on how a superintendent's leadership behavior is perceived than others. This may be due to current changes occurring in Tennessee at the present time within the public schools. In the review of literature it was pointed out that leaders and leadership behavior may be situational, and demographic variables which may affect how principals perceive their superintendents' leadership ability at the present time may not effect principals' perceptions in the near future.

Another implication from the results of this study is that city superintendents, which are all appointed in Tennessee were rated much higher than their elected county counterparts. With the current
debate in Tennessee whether superintendents should be appointed or
elected, it seems reasonable to investigate the findings of this
study concerning these two variables. Whether the superintendent
is a real leader or is perceived to be one, the image of the school
system will be reflected through the principals and the schools they
serve.

**Recommendations**

As a result of this study, it is recommended that the State
Department of Education in Tennessee and the Tennessee School Boards
Association devote more attention to the understanding of educational
leadership for superintendents, principals, and themselves.

Further research is recommended to identify other variables that
may have an impact on leadership behavior demonstrated by educational
leaders within the state.

A further recommendation is that, for future studies of this
nature, data be collected using different research techniques:

1. Within five years, a replication of this study should be
   conducted in Tennessee to ascertain the reliability of the findings.

2. A replication of this study should be conducted in other
   states in order to increase the generalizability of the findings.

3. Different research methodology such as the use of another
   evaluating instrument, or a revised demographic data sheet should be
   chosen in order to check the validity of the conclusions.
4. Different research methodology such as the development of an evaluating instrument which would identify and measure leadership dimensions which pertain specifically to the school superintendency should be developed to assist in the identification of perceived school leaders.
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APPENDICES
APPENDIX A

CORRESPONDENCE
Dear Mr./Mrs.:  

By the way of introduction, I am a doctoral student at East Tennessee State University, Department of Supervision and Administration, Johnson City, Tennessee, and am presently working on my doctoral dissertation in educational administration.

Only a few minutes of your time will be required to complete the demographic data sheet and the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire XII. All individual responses shall be strictly confidential as it is unnecessary to identify any individual principal or superintendent for the completion of this study. The responses you make will in no way be embarrassing nor derogatory to your superintendent as you will merely be reporting your perceptions of his/her leadership ability.

It is my sincere desire to conduct a study on the principal's perceptions of superintendents' leadership ability in the state of Tennessee. Your assistance in this study would be of tremendous value and significance. The results of this study would report the current perceptions that principals in Tennessee have toward the leadership ability of superintendents across the state.

Please return the demographic data sheet and the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire as promptly as possible in the enclosed stamped, self-addressed envelope. If you would like a copy of the results of this study, please place your name and address on the demographic data sheet and a copy of the results will be sent to you upon completion of this study. Your cooperation and assistance would be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Michael Aasheim  
Rt. 5, Box 208  
Warrior Lane  
Johnson City, TN 37601
APPENDIX B

LEADER BEHAVIOR DESCRIPTION QUESTIONNAIRE

FORM XII AND RELATED FORMS
STATEMENT OF POLICY

Concerning the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire and Related Forms

Permission is granted without formal request to use the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire and other related forms developed at The Ohio State University, subject to the following conditions:

1. **Use:** The forms may be used in research projects. They may not be used for promotional activities or for producing income on behalf of individuals or organizations other than The Ohio State University.

2. **Adaptation and Revision:** The directions and the form of the items may be adapted to specific situations when such steps are considered desirable.

3. **Duplication:** Sufficient copies for a specific research project may be duplicated.

4. **Inclusion in dissertations:** Copies of the questionnaire may be included in theses and dissertations. Permission is granted for the duplication of such dissertations when filed with the University Microfilms Service at Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106 U.S.A.

5. **Copyright:** In granting permission to modify or duplicate the questionnaire, we do not surrender our copyright. Duplicated questionnaires and all adaptations should contain the notation "Copyright, 19--, by the Ohio State University."

6. **Inquiries:** Communications should be addressed to:

   Administrative Science Research
   The Ohio State University
   1775 College Road
   Columbus, OH 43210

1975
LEADER BEHAVIOR DESCRIPTION QUESTIONNAIRE—Form XII

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

Purpose of the Questionnaire

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

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

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

Published by

College of Administrative Science
The Ohio State University
Columbus, Ohio

Copyright 1962, The Ohio State University
DIRECTIONS:

a. READ each item carefully

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

c. DECIDE whether he/she (A) always, (B) often, (C) occasionally, (D) seldom or (E) never acts as described by the item.

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

   A = Always
   B = Often
   C = Occasionally
   D = Seldom
   E = Never

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

Example: Often acts as described ........... A B C D E
Example: Never acts as described ........... A B C D E
Example: Occasionally acts as described ........ A B C D E

1. Acts as the spokesperson of the group ........ A B C D E
2. Waits patiently for the results of a decision ........ A B C D E
3. Makes pep talks to stimulate the group .......... A B C D E
4. Lets group members know what is expected of them .......... A B C D E
5. Allows the members complete freedom in their work .......... A B C D E
6. Is hesitant about taking initiative in the group .......... A B C D E
7. Is friendly and approachable .......... A B C D E
8. Encourages overtime work .......... A B C D E
<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10. Gets along well with the people above him/her</td>
<td>A B C D E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Publicizes the activities of the group</td>
<td>A B C D E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Becomes anxious when he/she cannot find out what is coming next</td>
<td>A B C D E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. His/her arguments are convincing</td>
<td>A B C D E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Encourages the use of uniform procedures</td>
<td>A B C D E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Permits the members to use their own judgment in solving problems</td>
<td>A B C D E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Fails to take necessary action</td>
<td>A B C D E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Does little things to make it pleasant to be a member of the group</td>
<td>A B C D E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Stresses being ahead of competing groups</td>
<td>A B C D E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Keeps the group working together as a team</td>
<td>A B C D E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Keeps the group in good standing with higher authority</td>
<td>A B C D E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Speaks as the representative of the group</td>
<td>A B C D E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Accepts defeat in stride</td>
<td>A B C D E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Argues persuasively for his/her point of view</td>
<td>A B C D E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Tries out his/her ideas in the group</td>
<td>A B C D E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Encourages initiative in the group members</td>
<td>A B C D E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Lets other persons take away his/her leadership in the group</td>
<td>A B C D E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Puts suggestions made by the group into operation</td>
<td>A B C D E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Needles members for greater effect</td>
<td>A B C D E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A = Always
B = Often
C = Occasionally
D = Seldom
E = Never

29. Seems able to predict what is coming next . . . A B C D E
30. Is working hard for a promotion . . . . . . . A B C D E
31. Speaks for the group when visitors are present . . . . . . . A B C D E
32. Accepts delays without becoming upset . . . . A B C D E
33. Is a very persuasive talker . . . . . . . . . . . A B C D E
34. Makes his/her attitudes clear to the group . . A B C D E
35. Lets the members do their work the way they think best . . . . . . . A B C D E
36. Lets some members take advantage of him/her . . . A B C D E
37. Treats all group members as his/her equals . . . A B C D E
38. Keeps the work moving at a rapid pace . . . . A B C D E
39. Settles conflicts when they occur in the group . A B C D E
40. His/her superiors act favorably on most of his/her suggestion . . . . . . . A B C D E
41. Represents the group at outside meetings . . . . A B C D E
42. Becomes anxious when waiting for new developments . . . . . . . A B C D E
43. Is very skillful in an argument . . . . . . . . . . A B C D E
44. Decides what shall be done and how it shall be done . . . . . . . A B C D E
45. Assigns a task, then lets the members handle it . . . . . . . . . A B C D E
46. Is the leader of the group in name only . . . . A B C D E
47. Gives advance notice of changes . . . . . . . . . A B C D E
48. Pushes for increased production . . . . . . . A B C D E
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A = Always
B = Often
C = Occasionally
D = Seldom
E = Never

49. Things usually turn out as he/she predicts .... A B C D E
50. Enjoys the privileges of his/her position .... A B C D E
51. Handles complex problems efficiently .... A B C D E
52. Is able to tolerate postponement and uncertainty .... A B C D E
53. Is not a very convincing talker .... A B C D E
54. Assigns group members to particular tasks .... A B C D E
55. Turns the members loose on a job, and lets them go to it .... A B C D E
56. Backs down when he/she ought to stand firm .... A B C D E
57. Keeps to himself/herself .... A B C D E
58. Asks the members to work harder .... A B C D E
59. Is accurate in predicting the trend of events .... A B C D E
60. Gets his/her superiors to act for the welfare of the group members .... A B C D E
61. Gets swamped by details .... A B C D E
62. Can wait just so long, then blows up .... A B C D E
63. Speaks from a strong inner conviction .... A B C D E
64. Makes sure that his/her part in the group is understood by the group members .... A B C D E
65. Is reluctant to allow the members any freedom of action .... A B C D E
66. Lets some members have authority that he/she should keep .... A B C D E
67. Looks out for the personal welfare of group members .... A B C D E
<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A = Always</td>
<td>B = Often</td>
<td>C = Occasionally</td>
<td>D = Seldom</td>
<td>E = Never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68. Permits the members to take it easy in their work</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69. Sees to it that the work of the group is coordinated</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70. His/her word carries weight with superiors</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71. Gets things all tangled up</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72. Remains calm when uncertain about coming events</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73. Is an inspiring talker</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74. Schedules the work to be done</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75. Allows the group a high degree of initiative</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76. Takes full charge when emergencies arise</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77. Is willing to make changes</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78. Drives hard when there is a job to be done</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79. Helps group members settle their differences</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80. Gets what he/she asks for from his/her superiors</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81. Can reduce a madhouse to system and order</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82. Is able to delay action until the proper time occurs</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83. Persuades others that his/her ideas are to their advantage</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84. Maintains definite standards of performance</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85. Trusts members to exercise good judgment</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86. Overcomes attempts made to challenge his/her leadership</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A = Always  
B = Often  
C = Occasionally  
D = Seldom  
E = Never

87. Refuses to explain his/her actions. .......... A B C D E
88. Urges the group to beat its previous record ... A B C D E
89. Anticipates problems and plans for them .... A B C D E
90. Is working his/her way to the top .......... A B C D E
91. Gets confused when too many demands are made of him/her ............... A B C D E
92. Worries about the outcome of any new procedure . A B C D E
93. Can inspire enthusiasm for a project .......... A B C D E
94. Asks that group members follow standard rules and regulations ............... A B C D E
95. Permits the group to set its own pace ........ A B C D E
96. Is easily recognized as the leader of the group . A B C D E
97. Acts without consulting the group .......... A B C D E
98. Keeps the group working up to capacity ...... A B C D E
99. Maintains a closely knit group ............. A B C D E
100. Maintains cordial relations with superiors ... A B C D E
APPENDIX C

DEMOGRAPHIC DATA SHEET
Please check one

1. Age:  ( ) 29 and under  ( ) 30-39  ( ) 40-49  ( ) 50-59  ( ) 60 and over

2. Sex:  ( ) Male  ( ) Female

3. Race:  ( ) Black  ( ) White

4. Education:  ( ) B.S.  ( ) M.A.  ( ) Ed.S.  ( ) Ed.D. or Ph.D.

5. School system type:  ( ) City  ( ) County

6. Superintendent type:  ( ) Appointed  ( ) Elected

7. Place of birth:  ( ) Within 50-mile radius of present school  ( ) Outside 50-mile radius of present school

8. Your school type:  ( ) Elementary  ( ) Middle  ( ) High

9. Last date you were enrolled in graduate school:  ( ) Last year  ( ) 2-4 years ago  ( ) 5-8 years ago  ( ) 9 or more years ago

10. Years experience as a principal:  ( ) 0-4 years  ( ) 5-9 years  ( ) 10 years or more

11. Number of years as principal at present school:  ( ) 0-5 years  ( ) 6-10 years  ( ) 11 or more years

12. School location in Tennessee:  ( ) East  ( ) Middle  ( ) West

13. Number of years present superintendent has been in office  ( ) 0-4 years  ( ) 5-9 years  ( ) 10 or more years

14. Number of years you have been involved in education:  ( ) 0-5 years  ( ) 6-10 years  ( ) 11-15 years  ( ) 16 years or more

15. Number of years you have been in your present school system:  ( ) 0-4 years  ( ) 5-9 years  ( ) 10-14 years  ( ) 15 years or more
**VITA**

MICHAEL KERRY AMSTEIN

**Personal Data:**
- Date of Birth: February 15, 1959
- Place of Birth: Des Moines, Iowa
- Marital Status: Married, 1 step daughter

**Education:**
- Public Schools, Des Moines, Iowa and Elizabethton, Tennessee.
- East Tennessee State University, Johnson City, Tennessee; health education, B.S., 1981.
- East Tennessee State University, Johnson City, Tennessee; elementary education, M.A.T., 1984.
- East Tennessee State University, Johnson City, Tennessee; educational administration, Ed.D., 1986.

**Professional Experience:**
- Instructor, Math, Science and Reading, Grades 6-8, Happy Valley Middle School, Elizabethton, Tennessee, 1983.
- Consultant to Sevier County, Tennessee Schools in School Curriculum for County High Schools, 1985.
- Assistant, Governor's Task Force Survey Project in the Carter County-Elizabethton area, 1986.

**Publications:**
- "Your Child and Safety," The Preschooler, Vol. 1, No. 5.
- "Your Child and Health." The Preschooler, Vol. 1, No. 6
Publications:
(Continued)
"Your Child and Gross and Fine Motor Skills."
The Preschooler, Vol. 1, No. 20.

Honors and Awards:
B. S. Eta Sigma Gamma
Phi Delta Kappa (Programs Vice-President)
Kappa Delta Pi
Doctoral Seminar President 1985
Outstanding Young Man 1985
Doctoral Fellowship, East Tennessee State University 1984-1986
Graduate Student Association Chairman 1985-1986

Professional Memberships:
Eta Sigma Gamma
Phi Delta Kappa
Kappa Delta Pi