ABSTRACT
        Predicated on the two basic c mensions of
leadership--concern for performance of the organization and for
relationships among individuals therein--this study investigates
differences in leadership style effectiveness of elected and
appointed superintendents as perceived by principals, school board
presidents, the superintendents themselves, and all three together.
The researchers polled all 153 Mississippi school board presidents
and superintendents and a representative sample of 44 percent of each
category of principals, using the Leader Effectiveness and
Adaptability Description, a 12-item questionnaire on leadership
behavior perceptions. The findings suggest that appointed
superintendents have a greater consensus among superiors and
subordinates on their leadership style effectiveness, whereas no
conclusive evidence was found to support the contention that a
difference exists in the leadership style effectiveness of elected
and appointed superintendents. Significant differences were observed,
however, between superintendents' self-perceptions and the
perceptions of their superiors and subordinates. The implication of
these findings is that educational administrators need to cultivate
self-awareness by means of communication and feedback with superiors
and subordinates. (TE)

Perceptions of the Leadership Style Effectiveness

of Superintendents in Mississippi

Mark Barnett

University of Southern Mississippi

Paper Presented at the Eleventh Annual Meeting of the

Mid-South Educational Research Association

New Orleans, November, 1982

Perceptions of the Leadership Style Effectiveness

of Superintendents in Mississippi

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 large part in de-
termining 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 most influential member of the
educational organization (Campbell, Cunningham, Nystrand, &
Usdan, 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 re-
quire effective leadership. To be an effective leader, one
must have the ability to diagnose his environment and adapt
his leadership style to fit the demands of the environment
(Hersey & Blanchard, 1977). As Gibb (1969) pointed out, the
traits of leadership are those personality traits which,
in any particular situation, enable an individual to contribute

signigicantly to group locomotion in the direction of a recognized goal and be perceived as doing so by fellow members.

The major purpose of the present research was to investigate the perceived differences, as indicated by principals, superintendents, and school board presidents, in the leadership style effectiveness of elected and appointed superintendents. More specifically, the purposes of this study were:

1. To investigate the differences in perceptions of secondary, elementary, and combination (K-12) school building principals regarding the leadership style effectiveness of elected and appointed superintendents.

2. To investigate the differences in perceptions of school board presidents concerning the leadership style effectiveness of elected and appointed superintendents.

3. To determine if elected and appointed superintendents perceive differences in their leadership style effectiveness.

4. To investigate the differences in leadership style effectiveness of elected and appointed superintendents as perceived by principals, superintendents, and school board presidents.

Theoretical Framework

Research and practice have demonstrated that leadership has two basic dimensions--concern for the performance of the organization and concern for the relationship needs of the persons in the organization. Several investigators have

identified these positions. Cartwright and Zander (1968)
describe these as goal achievement and group maintenance.
Amatai Etzioni (1961), in the same vein, theorizes that every
organization must solve two basic needs: (a) instrumental
needs--the mobilization of resources to achieve the task and
(b) expressive needs--the social and normative integration
of group members. Similarly, Getzels and Guba (1957) label
these aspects of leadership behavior as nomothetic and
ideographic.

The bulk of evidence indicates that no one style of leader-
ship is consistently more effective than another (Stogdill,
1974). Leaders perceived to be effective are task-oriented at
times and concerned with relationships at other times. A
plausible explanation is provided by Hersey and Blanchard's
(1977) Situa tional Leadership Theory (SLT). SLT is based
upon an interplay among the following: (a) the amount of di-
rection (task behavior) a leader gives, (b) the amount of socio-
emotional support (relationship behavior) a leader provides,
and (c) the maturity level that followers exhibit on a speci-
fic task. Maturity is defined as the capacity to set high
but attainable goals, willingness and ability to take
responsibility, and education and/or experience of an indi-
vidual of group in relation to a specific task to be performed.

According to SLT, as the level of maturity of their
followers continues to increase in terms of accomplishing
a specific task, leaders should begin to reduce their task

behavior and increase their relationship behavior. As the
followers begin to move into an above average level of
maturity, it becomes appropriate for leaders to decrease not
only task behavior but relationship behavior as well. The
individual or group at this level of maturity sees a reduction
of close supervision and an increase in delegation by the
leader as a positive indication of trust and confidence. Thus,
SLT focuses on the appropriateness or effectiveness of leader-
ship styles according to the task-relevant maturity of the
followers.

Lipham (1964) contends that a social system exists to
discharge certain institutionalized functions, and these
functions are the goals toward which the leader directs the
organization. Leader effectiveness is the relative level of
this goal achievement (Hoy & Miskel, 1978). To the practicing
administrator, effectiveness is even more complicated and
subtle than goal attainment. Perceptual evaluations by
superiors, peers, and subordinates are important outcomes.
Hersey and Blanchard have found that the closer to reality
a leader's perception is to the perceptions of others--
superiors, peers, and subordinates--the higher the probability
that the leader will be able to cope effectively with that
environment.

On the basis of this theoretical framework, the following
hypotheses have been generated:

H$_1$ There is a significant difference in the perceptions that
         secondary, elementary, and combination school building

principals have of the leadership style effectiveness of elected and appointed superintendents.

H_2 School board presidents will perceive a significant difference in the leadership style effectiveness of elected and appointed superintendents.

H_3 There is a significant difference in the perceptions that appointed and elected superintendents have of their leadership style effectiveness.

H_4 Principals, superintendents, and school board presidents will perceive a significant difference in the leadership style effectiveness of elected and appointed superintendents.

Method

Subjects

The population investigated in this study consisted of all school board presidents and superintendents and all principals of secondary, elementary, and combination schools in the state of Mississippi. Mississippi has 153 school districts that operate schools, and each district has a board of education and a superintendent. The president of each school board was included in this study. Of the 153 superintendents, 67 (44%) are elected by popular vote of the electors of that district, and 86 (56%) are appointed by the local board of education. All superintendents were included in this study.

Principals were catagorized first into secondary, elementary, or combination school principals. They were

further categorized as being subordinate to an elected or
an appointed superintendent. In order to obtain a sample
that was representative of the 810 pricipals in the pop-
ulation, 44% of each category of principals--secondary,
elementary, and combination--under elected superintendents
was randomly selected. Fifty-six percent of the secondary
and elementary principals under appointed superintendents
was randomly selected. Due to the small number of combination
principals under appointed superintendents, all combination
principals in this category were included in the study.

Instrumentation

The Leader Effectiveness and Adaptability Description
(LEAD) provides a technique whereby group members may de-
scribe the leadership style effectiveness of designated
leaders. The LEAD consists of 12 items to which the leader
and members of his/her immediate work-group are asked to
respond. Each item is a situation with four alternative
actions. The respondents are asked to select the action
that they feel is most representative of the leader's
behavior in that type of situation.

The leader behavior with the highest probability of
success, based on Situational Leadership Theory, is weighted
+2. The behavior alternative with the lowest probability
of success is weighted -2. The second best alternative
is weighted +1, and the third, -1. The range of scores
is ±24, with zero being the reference point for determining
effectiveness. Hersey and Blanchard (1977) report that
the effectiveness scores for the LEAD usually fall between

± 6. This is based on a sample of over 20,000 middle managers from a variety of organizations and cultures who have responded to the LEAD.

Procedure

The subjects of this study were divided into three principal groups: principals, superintendents, and school board presidents. Each group was then subdivided into the method of selecting the superintendent (elected or appointed). Principals were further divided into three levels: secondary, elementary, or combination.

A packet containing the LEAD, a cover letter explaining the study and insuring anonymity, and a pre-addressed, stamped envelope was mailed to each subject. An accurate account of the replies from the subjects was maintained, and approximately one month after the initial mail-out, a second packet was mailed to each subject who had not responded. The initial response accounted for approximately 83% of the total number who participated in the study. The second mail-out increased the number of subjects who participated in the study to 385--a total return of 53%. As reported in Table 1, 232 (55%) principals, 52 (34%) school board presidents, and 101 (66%) superintendents participated in the study.

Table 1

Number and Percent of Subjects Responding

Group	Sample Size	First Return	Second Return	Total Response	% Return
Districts with Elected Superintendents					
Principals					
Secondary	32	14	3	17	53
Elementary	71	31	6	37	52
Combination	40	14	8	22	55
Total	143	59	17	76	53
Board Presidents	67	15	8	23	34
Superintendents	67	34	7	41	61
Districts with Appointed Superintendents					
Principals					
Secondary	94	53	5	58	62
Elementary	171	74	13	87	51
Combination	13	2	9	11	85
Total	278	129	27	156	56
Board Presidents	86	23	6	29	34
Superintendents	86	58	2	60	70

First Hypothesis

Hypothesis one stated: There is a statistically significant difference in the perceptions that secondary, elementary, and combination school building principals have of the leadership style effectiveness of elected and appointed superintendents. The LEAD scores were analyzed by means of a 2 x 3 analysis of variance (method of selection x level of principal). The results, reported in Table 2, revealed a significant interaction (F [2, 226] = 3.12, p<.05); therefore, the research by hypothesis was accepted.

The mean scores for each cell (Table 3) were compared using the Newman-Keuls technique (Table 4). The Newman-Keuls analyses indicated significant differences in the perceptions of the three levels of principals who were sub-ordinate to elected superintendents. No differences were observed among principals who served under an appointed superintendent. Analysis across method of selection indicated significant differences among secondary principals and among combination principals.

Second Hypothesis

Hypothesis two stated: School board presidents will perceive a statistically significant difference in the leadership style effectiveness of elected and appointed superinten-dents. The scores for the two groups (board presidents superior to an elected superintendent and those superior to an appointed superintendent) were compared by means of an

11

Table 2

Summary of Analysis of Variance of

Principal's LEAD Scores

Source	df	MS	F
Method of Selection	1	24.97	.52
Level of Principal	2	61.00	1.28
Interaction	2	148.70	3.12*
Residual	226	47.66	

*$p < .05$

Table 3

Cell Means:

Method of Selection by Level of Principal

Method of Selection	Level of Principal		
	S^a	E^b	C^c
Elected	1.85	4.32	8.15
Appointed	5.38	6.08	3.80

[a]Secondary

[b]Elementary

[c]Combination

Table 4

Summary of Newman-Keuls Comparisons

Comparisons	
Across Levels of Principals	
Elected Superintendents	
Secondary vs Elementary	2.47*
Secondary vs Combination	6.30**
Elementary vs Combination	3.83**
Appointed Superintendents	
Secondary vs Elementary	.70
Secondary vs Combination	1.58
Elementary vs Combination	2.28
Across Method of Selection	
Elected vs Appointed	
Secondary	3.53**
Elementary	1.76
Combination	4.35**

*$p < .05$

**$p < .01$

independent group t-test. The t, reported in Table 5, was nonsignificant (t [50] = 1.84, ns); therefore, the research hypothesis was rejected. These results should, however, be interpreted with caution. Two scores in one distribution were very extreme--2.29 standard deviations above the mean-- while all other scores were within one standard deviation of the mean. The researcher investigated by removing the two outlayers and recalculating the t. Significance was found at the .01 level. It appears likely, then, that a Type II error might have been committed.

Third Hypothesis

Hypothesis three stated: There is a statistically significant difference in the perceptions that appointed and elected superintendents have of their leadership style effectiveness. To test the hypothesis, the scores of the two groups of superintendents were subjected to an independent group t-test. The t value, reported in Table 6, indicates that the means of the two groups were not significantly different (t [99] = .12, ns). Therefore, the research hypothesis was rejected.

Fourth Hypothesis

Hypothesis four stated: Principals, superintendents, and school board presidents will perceive a significant difference in the leadership style effectiveness of elected and appointed superintendents. The three levels of principals (secondary, elementary, and combination) were placed in one group designated "principals." A 2 x 3 analysis of variance

Table 5

Means, Standard Deviations, and $\underline{t}$ for

School Board Presidents on the LEAD

Board Presidents	$\overline{X}$	SD	df	t
Elected	7.09	4.60	50	1.84, ns
Appointed	4.07	6.52		

Note. Board presidents are superior to either elected or
appointed superintendents and were groups accordingly.

Table 6

Means, Standard Deviations, and $\underline{t}$ for

Elected and Appointed Superintendents

Superintendents	$\overline{X}$	SD	df	t
Elected	9.73	4.45	99	.12, ns
Appointed	9.62	4.88		

was utilized to test the hypothesis. The results, displayed

in Table 7, yielded no significant interaction; however,

significant main effects for position were revealed, which

indicates that principals, superintendents, and school board

presidents viewed the leadership style effectiveness of super-

intendents differently (F [2, 382] = 16.75, p<.01). Inspection

of the column means, reported in Table 8, indicates that

superintendents percieved themselves to be significantly

more effective than do their subordinates or superiors.

Discussion

This study was predicated on the supposition that differences

exist in the leadership style effectiveness of elected and

appointed superintendents, and, since a leader is often blind

to his own "leadership personality," differences exist in

the way a leader percieves himself and the way his superiors

and subordinates perceive him. Differences were observed

in the perceptions of secondary, elementary, and combination

school principals regarding the leadership style effectiveness

of elected and appointed superintendents. In districts with

elected superintendents, elementary principals perceived the

superintendent to be more effective than did secondary

principals. Combination principals viewed the superintendent

to be more effective than did either secondary or elementary

principals. These differences were not observed in districts

with appointed superintendents. Evidently, district organi-

zation, district size, or a combination of these may con-

tribute to these differences. More research is needed in this

Table 7

Summary of Analysis of Variance of

LEAD Scores for Principals, Superintendents, and Board Presidents

Source	df	MS	F
Method of Selection	1	5.19	.13
Position	2	668.83	16.75*
Interaction	2	59.90	1.50
Residual	379	39.93	

*$p < .01$

Table 8

Mean Scores for Main Effects:

Position and Method of Selection

Main Effects	$\overline{X}$
Position	
Principals	5.42
Superintendents	9.66
Board Presidents	5.40
Method of Selection	
Elected	6.69
Appointed	6.44

area since these factor

This finding does sugge

appointed superintenden

the perceptions that su

style effectiveness of

No conclusive evid

tention that a differen

effectiveness of electe

seems likely that this

by the homogeneity of t

Superintendents in Miss

operate in a similar ma

often. It would be rea

superintendents, as the

havior patterns of each

sophistication and trai

contribute to the simil

graduate coursework, in

of the literature, supe

of behaviors they shoul

Significant differ

of the superintendents

As Hoy and Miskel (1978

tions are important out

individual is the behav

ting to influence the a

those others. It would

ere beyond the scope of this study.

however, that districts with

nay be more stable with regard to

linates have of the leadership

erintendents.

a was found to support the con-

exists in the leadership style

id appointed superintendents. It

xpected finding may be explained

superintendents as a group.

ippi, whether elected or appointed,

r and interact with each other

able to assume, then, that the

iteract, begin to adopt the be-

ier. The administrative

g of the superintendents may also

ty of the two groups. Through

rvice training, and perusal

tendents are exposed to the kinds

anifest.

as were observed between perceptions

their superiors and subordinates.

oint out, these perceptual evalua-

es. The leadership style of an

that person exhibits when attemp-

vities of others--as perceived by

possible, then, for a leader to

perceive himself as exhibiting an effective leadership style, when, in fact, this perception may not reflect the actual leader behavior, depending upon the extent to which a leader's self-perception is consistent with that of his superiors and subordinates.

This may be explained by the idea that there are some behaviors engaged in by leaders that are known to the leaders, while other behaviors may not be known. That is, leaders may not be aware of portions of their personality that are exhibited when dealing with others. It seems this could result from poor communication habits and a lack of feedback between the leader and his associates.

University departments of educational administration need to be cognizant of these potential stumbling blocks to effective leader behavior. By offering in-service training and workshops in areas such as self-concept and sensitivity, and through programs that develop effective communication techniques and those that investigate leadership theories, departments of educational administration can train leaders to analyze themselves and their situation to resolve the kinds of differences that were portrayed in the findings of this study.

References

American Association of School Administrators. On selecting
a superintendent of schools. Washington, D.C.: AASA, 1962

Campbell, R. F., Cunningham, L. L., Nystrand, R. O. , & Usdan,
M. D. The organization and control of American Schools
(4th ed.). Columbus, OH: Charles E. Merrill, 1980.

Cartwright, C., & Zander, A. Group dynamics. New York, NY:
Harper & Row. 1968.

Etz; ni, A. A comparative analysis of complex organizations.
New York, NY: McGraw-Hill, 1967.

Getzels, J., & Guba, E. Social behavior and the administrative
process. School Review, 1957. 65, 423-441.

Gibb, C. A. Leadership. In G. Lindzey & E. Aronson (Eds.),
The handbook of social psychology (Vol. 4). Reading, MA:
Addison-Wesley, 1969.

Gilchrist, R. S. Instructional leadership comes first! Did
the superintendent develop teamwork for learning? Nations
Schools, 1961, 68 (5), 63.

Hersey, P., & Blanchard, K. H. Management of organizational
behavior: Utilizing human resources (4th ed.). Englewood
Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1982.

Hersey, P., & Blanchard, K. H. Management of organizational
behavior (3rd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1977.

Hoy, W. K., & Miskel, C. G. Educational administration:
Theory, research, and practice. New York, NY: Random
House, 1978.

Lipham, J. M. Leadership and administration. In D. F.

Griffiths (ed.), Behavioral science and educational

administration. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago

Press, 1964.

Stogdill, R. M. Handbook of leadership. New York, NY:

Free Press, 1974

21