Fall 12-1-2014

A Study of Effective Characteristics Most Valued In Superintendents by Principals

Camille Goldman
Indiana State University

VITA

Camille Goldman

EDUCATION

2014	Indiana State University, Terre Haute, Indiana Ph.D. in Education Leadership
2011	Indiana University Southeast, New Albany, Indiana Educational Leadership in Administration
2008	Indiana University Southeast, New Albany, Indiana Special Education
2004	University of Arkansas, Pine Bluff, Arkansas M.S. in Education
1999	University of Arkansas, Little Rock, Arkansas B.S. in Speech Pathology
1997	University of Arkansas, Monticello, Arkansas Pre-Medicine Studies

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

2011	New Albany Floyd County Schools, New Albany, Indiana Assistant Principal, Prosser Career Education Center
2006	New Albany Floyd County Schools, New Albany, Indiana Biology Teacher, New Albany High School
2005	Jefferson County Public Schools, Louisville, Kentucky Biology and Chemistry Teacher, Seneca High School
2001	White Hall Public School District, White Hall, Arkansas Science Teacher, White Hall Junior High
2000	Little Rock Public School District, Little Rock, Arkansas Science Teacher, Horace Mann Magnet School
1999	Little Rock Public School District, Little Rock, Arkansas Speech Pathologist, Wilson Elementary School

A STUDY OF EFFECTIVE CHARACTERISTICS MOST VALUED IN SUPERINTENDENTS BY PRINCIPALS

A Dissertation

Presented to

The College of Graduate and Professional Studies

Department of Educational Leadership

Indiana State University

Terre Haute, Indiana

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Philosophy

---

by

Camille Goldman

December 2014

Keywords: Superintendent, principal, leadership, theorist, characteristics

COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Committee Chair: Terry McDaniel, Ph.D.

Associate Professor of Educational Leadership

Indiana State University

Committee Member: Steve Gruenert, Ph.D.

Associate Professor and Chairperson of Educational Leadership

Indiana State University

Committee Member: Todd Bess, Ph.D.

Executive Director, Indiana Association of School Principals

Indiana State University

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to examine the effective characteristics of superintendents through the principal's perception. The perceptions of principals were compared to those of superintendents. A one-way ANOVA was used to interpret and analyze the data for this study. All superintendents and principals in public schools in Indiana were invited to participate in this study. This study was conducted by administering a survey to public school district superintendents and principals in Indiana. The Effective Characteristics of Superintendents survey was developed by me to quantitatively measure the perceptions of superintendents and principals with research from the ISLLC standards, theorists, educational paradigms, and research of best practices. Superintendents' and principals' perceptions were measured on how likely they agreed with the practice. A total of 119 superintendents and 256 principals submitted complete responses to the Effective Characteristics survey. Other variables measured were demographic location and population size of the school district. Data were analyzed through one-way ANOVA testing and the null hypotheses were tested at the .05 probability level or better. As a result of the research and subsequent data analysis, the following conclusions are proposed. For the descriptive data both superintendents and principals rated the three most frequent responses for vision as trust, implementation and development, and setting high goals. The highest rated three responses for management placed higher value on making genuine decisions, analyzing data, and inspiring others to follow goals. Highest rated responses for collaboration were working with the principal, communicating with stakeholders, and creating a

collaboration culture. The three highest ratings for instructional leadership skills were professional development, develop skills to be globally competitive, and challenge staff members as the highest rated characteristics for instructional leadership skills.

Principals' perceptions were different with the descriptive data in the area of vision. Principals perceived setting high goals and expectations as higher, whereas superintendents rated a safe learning environment. Both perceived implementation and development and trust as effective characteristics of superintendents. Significant differences existed in Research Question 2 and 11 for vision and instructional leadership skills with location. The examination of the results of the one-way ANOVA on the whole sample population determined that significant differences with the model existed with the location types. Rural locations scored the importance of vision and instructional leadership skills significantly lower than urban and suburban respondents. There were no differences in position type on principals and superintendent's perceptions on the effective characteristics for vision, collaboration, and instructional leadership skills. No significant difference was found in the independent sample *t* test regarding effective characteristics for superintendents in these three areas based on position type. The examination of the results of the one-way ANOVA determined that no significant differences regarding effective characteristics for superintendents in the area of collaboration and management. These results suggest that principals did not perceive any differences from superintendents among these effective characteristics in the areas of vision, management, collaboration, and instructional leadership skills.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I am extremely blessed to have received great support from so many people throughout my pursuit of a career in education. Over this journey, I have had excellent mentors and companions guide me along the way. They all have helped my developing to become the leader I am today. I thank each and every one of you for your advice and encouragement.

I could not ask for a better dissertation chair than Dr. Terry McDaniel. He taught me to not give up and keep striving for my goals. He assisted me in more ways than I can express. I am thankful for my dissertation committee members, Dr. Todd Bess and Dr. Steve Gruenert. I am thankful for them for taking the time to give me feedback and serve on my committee. Other Indiana State University faculty also assisted in helping me.

The New Albany Floyd County cohort was a big contributor in learning to collaborate and work together to achieve goals together. The hours spent together studying, sharing, preparing, and laughing to get through the program will never be forgotten.

I must thank Dr. Michael Langevin and Mrs. Judy Barnes for their assistance in helping me prepare my dissertation.

I am appreciative of the support of the New Albany Floyd County School District for supporting me through this program.

My deepest appreciation to my children, family, and friends who patiently encouraged and supported me. My children have motivated me with words of encouragement, helping me

study, and with their patience. I would like to thank my Dad for always believing in me and knowing one day I would complete this process.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Background

DuPree (1992) stated, “I learned that if you are a leader and you’re not sick and tired of communicating, you probably aren’t doing a good enough job” (p. 100). This research involved the study of the effective leadership practices of the school superintendent through the principal’s perception. This study explored the perceptions of Indiana superintendents and principals on effective characteristics of superintendents. These perceptions were studied to determine if the superintendents’ perceptions were different from the principals’ perceptions.

The evolving role of the superintendent has changed as the educational process continues to prepare students for the 21st century. The American Association of School Administrators (AASA) and the National School Board Association (NSBA) have defined the role of the superintendent.

> The superintendent is hired to provide professional educational advice on policy development and implement the policies the board adopts. The job description calls for the performance of the following duties: prepare the agenda for each meeting; prepare the annual budget for board consideration; prepare and submit state and federal applications and reports; recommends the appointment and termination of all personnel; is responsible for the instructional programs; maintains a continuous study of current problems; and

> determines the emergency discontinuance of the school district. Other duties that are inherent in providing educational leadership for the school district includes the following: keeping board members informed about the needs of the district about school operations and programs; provide for the continuous improvement of all facets of the school district operations, especially as it relates to teaching and learning; encourage long-range and strategic planning; ensure that professional development opportunities are available for district employees; develop a public relations program and to assure that all decisions are made with the best interests of students in mind. (Harris & Hopson, 2011, para.1)

These roles produce demands of a superintendent that require a leader to possess strong skills to lead a successful school district. "Research on educational leadership shows a strong correlation between the quality of the district leadership and achievement of the school district" (Waters & Marzano, 2006, p. 11).

The role of the superintendent has evolved throughout history from manager to collaborator. Instead of managing finances and balancing resources, the shift has been directed towards a vision of student achievement in the district. "The superintendent must be relationship-centered, focused on a vision of student achievement, have involvement with stakeholders, fosters teamwork, and builds strong relationships" (Phillips & Phillips, 2007, p. 42). Superintendents must commit to create strong collaborative relationships with the leaders in the district to create systematic plans. The responsibility of teaching and learning for students and what goes on in classrooms is no longer just the building leader's responsibility (Fullan, 2011).

Conceptual Underpinnings for the Study

The research on effective characteristics of superintendents revolves around the education

reform process and the need for improving student achievement. The need to increase accountability for school districts started with *A Nation at Risk* (National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983), which showed declines and gaps in student achievement in school districts across the United States. This report called for areas of growth that would improve student achievement. One such recommendation was the superintendent must develop intentional interactions on teaming.

The Wallace Foundation (2003) surveyed 1,000 superintendents and principals on their priorities and concerns. In the study, six aspects of leadership were surveyed:

- concerns of the daily life of a principal,
- finances,
- politics and bureaucracy,
- how to find effective teachers,
- time spent in classrooms, and
- everyday emergencies.

When superintendents were asked if they believed a principal could save a struggling school, 78% felt they could. Superintendents felt like having a quality principal who holds teachers accountable for instruction and student achievement increases a school's success (Wallace Foundation, 2003). However, principal's views did not reflect this; only 41% felt they could save a struggling school. Superintendents believed that principals should be held accountable, but felt principals struggled with holding teachers accountable (Wallace Foundation, 2003).

Increased student achievement starts with good instructional leadership (Waters & Marzano, 2006). Waters and Marzano's (2006) study on school districts showed increases in student achievement were linked to having effective superintendents. Four thousand

superintendents were surveyed and three million student achievement scores were considered. The study concluded

> a .24 correlation is considered to be an average superintendent who is at the 50th percentile in terms of leadership abilities, where average student achievement is at the 50th percentile. If a superintendent improves leadership abilities by one standard deviation (rising to the 84th percentile), the prediction would be that the average student achievement in the district would increase by 9.5 percentile points. The average student achievement in the district would rise to the 59.5th percentile. (Waters & Marzano, 2006, p. 10)

These findings show that effective characteristics of superintendents correlate to positive gains in student achievement in school districts (Waters & Marzano, 2006). Identified specific leadership responsibilities in the study that produce gains in student achievement were goal-setting and monitoring for instruction to improve student achievement, communication with the principal, and the use of resources (Waters & Marzano, 2006).

Statement of the Problem

Principals need leadership and guidance to lead a school to the best of their ability. Superintendents must recognize their evolving role as students are prepared to enter the 21st century. The role of the superintendent is no longer just the Bs—buses, budgets, and buildings—but the evolving responsibilities of the Cs—curriculum, classroom, and collaboration (Education Writers Association, 2003). The effective characteristics of superintendents must be understood to determine the leadership needed to have an impact on student achievement. Providing this information to principals and superintendents will help to strengthen the support needed by principals from the superintendent (Elmore, 2000).

Purpose of the Study

Increased student achievement starts with good instructional leadership (Waters & Marzano, 2006). This study analyzed the differences between the principals' and superintendents' perceptions of effective characteristics of superintendents most valued by principals. Other variables that were controlled were school demographic location type (rural, urban, or suburban) and years of experience in the position. The leadership of the principal is the key variable in making sure that effective teaching is the focus of improvement in a school (Saphier, 2009). This research can provide information to allow for extended studies on the topic of the relationship between principals and superintendents.

Research Questions

The study was guided by the following questions:

1. Is there a significant difference of perceptions between superintendents and principals regarding effective characteristics for superintendents in the area of vision, values, and goals based on position type?
2. Is there a significant difference of perceptions between superintendents and principals regarding effective characteristics for superintendents in the area of vision, values, and goals based on location type?
3. Is there a significant difference of perceptions between superintendents and principals regarding effective characteristics for superintendents in the area of vision, values, and goals based on respondent's years of employment in current position?
4. Is there a significant difference of perceptions between superintendents and principals regarding effective characteristics for superintendents in the area of management skills based on position type?

5. Is there a significant difference of perceptions between superintendents and principals regarding effective characteristics for superintendents in the area of management skills based on location type?
6. Is there a significant difference of perceptions between superintendents and principals regarding effective characteristics for superintendents in the area of management skills based on respondent's years of employment in current position?
7. Is there a significant difference of perceptions between superintendents and principals regarding effective characteristics for superintendents in the area of collaboration skills based on position type?
8. Is there a significant difference of perceptions between superintendents and principals regarding effective characteristics for superintendents in the area of collaboration skills based on location type?
9. Is there a significant difference of perceptions between superintendents and principals regarding effective characteristics for superintendents in the area of collaboration skills based on respondent's years of employment in current position?
10. Is there a significant difference of perceptions between superintendents and principals between superintendents and principals regarding effective characteristics for superintendents in the area of instructional leadership skills based on position type?
11. Is there a significant difference of perceptions between superintendents and principals regarding effective characteristics for superintendents in the area of instructional leadership skills based on location type?
12. Is there a significant difference of perceptions between superintendents and principals regarding effective characteristics for superintendents in the area of instructional

leadership skills based on respondent's years of employment in current position?

Null Hypotheses

$H_0$1. There is no statistically significant difference of perceptions between superintendents and principals regarding effective characteristics for superintendents in the area of vision, values, and goals based on position type.

$H_0$2. There is no statistically significant difference of perceptions between superintendents and principals regarding effective characteristics for superintendents in the area of vision, values, and goals based on location type.

$H_0$3. There is no statistically significant difference of perceptions between superintendents and principals regarding effective characteristics for superintendents in the area of vision, values, and goals based on respondent's years of employment in current position.

$H_0$4. There is no statistically significant difference of perceptions between superintendents and principals regarding effective characteristics for superintendents in the area of management skills based on position type.

$H_0$5. There is no statistically significant difference of perceptions between superintendents and principals regarding effective characteristics for superintendents in the area of management skills based on location type.

$H_0$6. There is no statistically significant difference of perceptions between superintendents and principals regarding effective characteristics for superintendents in the area of management skills based on respondent's years of employment in current position.

$H_0$7. There is no statistically significant difference of perceptions between superintendents and principals regarding effective characteristics for superintendents in the area of collaboration skills based on position type.

$H_0$8. There is no statistically significant difference of perceptions between superintendents and principals regarding effective characteristics for superintendents in the area of collaboration skills based on location type.

$H_0$9. There is no statistically significant difference of perceptions between superintendents and principals regarding effective characteristics for superintendents in the area of collaboration skills based on respondent's years of employment in current position.

$H_0$10. There is no statistically significant difference of perceptions between superintendents and principals regarding effective characteristics for superintendents in the area of instructional leadership skills based on position type.

$H_0$11. There is no statistically significant difference of perceptions between superintendents and principals regarding effective characteristics for superintendents in the area of instructional leadership skills based on location type.

$H_0$12. There is no statistically significant difference of perceptions between superintendents and principals regarding effective characteristics for superintendents in the area of instructional leadership skills based on respondent's years of employment in current position.

Definition of Terms

The following terms are defined for clarification in understanding this study:

Leadership is defined as having a focus on the skills and behaviors that have proven to be effective and support school reforms. "Perspectives, actions and communication needed to be effective are often referred to as competencies" (U.S. Department of Education, 2014, para. 12).

Principal is defined as a leader whose students, overall and for each subgroup, achieve acceptable rates of growth. "Supplemental measures may include, for example, high

school graduation rates and college enrollment rates, as well as evidence of providing supportive teaching and learning conditions, strong instructional leadership, and positive family and community engagement" (U.S. Department of Education, 2014, para. 16).

Student achievement is defined as "change in data for an individual student such as, 1) a student's score on assessments (2) other measures of student learning, provided they are rigorous, such as student results on pre-tests, end-of-course tests, and objective performance-based assessments; performance against student learning objectives; student performance on English language proficiency assessments; and other measures of student achievement that are rigorous and comparable across schools" (U.S. Department of Education, 2014, para. 22).

Suburban is defined as areas in central counties of a large city and the outlying counties that have close economic and social ties to the central city. "A territory that is outside a principal city and inside an urbanized area with population of 2,501 to 250,000 or more" (U.S. Department of Education, 2014, para. 3).

Superintendent of schools is defined as the "chief executive officer" of the board of education, who "shall have executive authority over the school system and the responsibility for its supervision" (U.S. Department of Education, 2014, para. 4).

Rural is defined as "a place with less than 2,500 people or a place with a zip code designated as rural by the Census Bureau" (U.S. Department of Education, 2014, para. 4).

Urban is defined as "a place with populations inside a principal city with a population of 250,001 or more" (U.S. Department of Education, 2014, para. 2).

Limitations of the Study

These are a number of limitations that the reader should be aware of with this study.

1. This study was limited based on the sample size. A small sample size might not be a true representation on the population of principals and superintendents in the state of Indiana.
2. This study may include personal bias and variances in individuals' interpretations of the survey which could have affected the accuracy of the results.
3. It cannot be guaranteed that all the surveyed respondents were a sample representative of the population with regard to gender, age, and ethnicity.
4. Principals in the study could have felt uncomfortable in rating their perceptions of their direct supervisors and not as superintendents as a population.

Delimitations of the Study

1. The study was limited to participants in public schools in the state of Indiana.
2. The study surveyed principals and superintendents who were in the profession at the time of the study.
3. The study consisted of a higher sample population of principals than superintendents based on the number of positions in the state.
4. The study was limited to the time constraint of the survey being open for responses.

Summary and Organization of the Study

Effective school research dates back to the work of Ron Edmonds in the 1960s, which continued to find a strong relationship between effective instructional leadership of schools and high levels of student achievement. Leading schools and districts have become more complex than ever before, due to increased pressures, and an unstable political environment within which schools must operate (Education Policy and Leadership Center, 2006). All the responsibilities of a superintendent can seem endless, but the greatest way to have an impact on student

achievement is to identify characteristics to improve classroom instruction. The American Association of School Administrators (AASA & NSBA, 2007) stated that

> Our schools are the foundation of our democracy. They keep hope alive, and they open a world of possibility for our entire society. In fact our nation has survived and prospered precisely because it is firmly grounded in the concept of equal educational opportunity for all. Ultimately, the effectiveness of our public schools will determine our ability to sustain a free and democratic society. (para. 6)

Summary

Chapter 1 provided an introduction, statement of the problem, purpose of the study, research questions, limitations and delimitations, and definition of terms. Chapter 2 presents a current literature review and topical research. Chapter 3 provides information regarding the study methodology, the population sample, survey development, and statistical analysis of the survey. Chapter 4 presents study findings and addresses the study's research questions. Chapter 5 provides a summary of the findings, results, implications, discussion of the findings, conclusions, and recommendations for further study.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

The history of the superintendent's roles and responsibilities has changed in three different ways since the first superintendent. In the era of the Common School Movement, the superintendent built a state system of elementary and secondary schools. The Civil Rights era marked the professional superintendent focusing on human relations. Future roles of the superintendent require a focus on instruction in the classroom. This shift from managing organizational structure to a student-centered learning environment leaves the roles and responsibilities of what principals need from the superintendent to be more defined in order to improve classroom instruction (Hunt, Carper, Lasley, & Raisch, 2010).

A school superintendent is the leader and spokesperson for the school district. AASA conducts a study every decade on the perspectives and roles of school district superintendents. "The roles of the superintendent have evolved as the country has gone through historical changes" (AASA, 1993, p. 6). Superintendents must have soft interpersonal skills such as honesty, trust, flexibility, listening, vision, and forward thinking. However, the managerial to collaborator shift from the Bs to the Cs is one of the major noticeable changes in the successes of superintendents within school districts. "The shift has gone from the B's of the district: buildings, buses, books, budgets, and bonds to the C's: connection, communication,

collaboration, community building, child advocacy, and curricular choices" (Education Writers Association [EWA], 2003, pp. 5-6).

The literature review looks at the history of the superintendent and research on characteristics that are effective in superintendents. The focus included characteristics principals need as leaders in the district. Chapter 2 includes the evolution of the superintendent position, effective characteristics of superintendents, characteristics principals desire, educational leadership standards, authentic leadership, leading as a manager, Machiavellian leadership practices, leadership theorist and paradigms, and best practices used by superintendents.

History of the Evolution of the Superintendent Position

"School boards are looking for God–on a good day," said the "Atlanta-based superintendent recruiter, as quoted in the New York Times" (EWA, 2003, para. 1). Principals depend on effective characteristics in superintendents for guidance to carry out the goals of the district. Superintendents that have effective leadership characteristics can provide support to keep school districts on track with academic goals (Hall & Hord, 1987). The literature reviews effective leadership characteristics that can improve the roles and responsibilities of the superintendent in relationship to assisting the principal. Hawley, the first superintendent of New York in 1812, handled mostly duties that included funding. Controversial and political concerns left the superintendent position open until 1854 (Carter & Cunningham, 1997). The very first district superintendents were appointed in Buffalo, New York, and Louisville, Kentucky. By the 1900s most urban school districts had established a superintendent (Grieder, Pierce, & Jordan, 1969).

The Common School Movement was a turning point in education. The Puritans and the New England colonies saw the need for children to be educated and mandated for families to provide literacy to their own children (Billet, 1978). The American Revolution introduced

education from the former responsibility of the churches and religion. (Glass, 2003) indicated that widespread economic growth resulted in superintendents needing to have more responsibilities of running a successful school district. Horace Mann, father of the Common School Movement, concluded that private schools did not serve the bulk of the children and poor children should also receive an education (Filion & Wolfskill, 2004). Superintendents became school reformers spreading the word of public education to the public (Glass, 2003). The American Revolution and the rise of industry led to challenges as leaders looked to expand the education process. Superintendents devoted their time supervising and assisting with the passage of compulsory attendance laws (Spring, 1994).

Professional superintendent. Responsibilities of the superintendent continued to increase and develop in the 1900s, including time management, employee specialization, and a top-down management structure (Glass, 2003). "The goal was efficiency—a desirable objective for large city superintendents besieged by rapid enrollment growth, construction of new schools, and the management of public tax dollars" (Glass, 2003, p. 12).

Research in the 1930s focused on superintendent qualifications, educational problems, and studies of successful school districts (Glass, 2003). The role of the superintendent was changing and effective leadership traits needed to be identified (Glass, 2003). "Superintendent responsibilities included overseeing of certifications, textbooks, and assisting with the establishment of the American Association of School Administrators" (Glass, 2003, p. 20).

In the 1960s and 1970s, the superintendent's roles became more involved in decision making, encouraging community support, and communicating with school boards. Increase in the number of public school students and funding for education created new challenges for superintendents within the communities and many were blamed for the poor economy (Mazzeo,

2001). Conflicts existed for superintendents regarding equal opportunity.

> Little Rock was thrust into the national and global spotlight over the issue of integration. After the *Brown v. Board of Education* ruling in 1954, which stated that "separate but equal" was not providing an equal education for African-American students, the Little Rock Board of Education decided to integrate its schools. In September 1957, hostilities arose over the admission of nine African-American students to Little Rock Central High School. (Garvey, 2012, para. 10)

Handling equal opportunities created a new focus of attention on schools. Court rulings related to equal education for all, new legislative mandates, and the Civil Rights Act of 1964 had an impact on the superintendent's role (Chapman, 1997). America's public schools in this challenging time caused the targeting and firing of many superintendents (Cuban, 1988).

The modern superintendent. Twentieth century superintendents have more pressures and responsibilities to prepare students for the upcoming competitive global society. The Coleman (1966) survey reported what should dominate school improvement and assisted in creating the effective schools movement. The effective school movement supported the idea of "all children could learn," and school districts were responsible in ensuring this happens. The movement prompted an examination of the importance of the superintendent as the school district leader (Coleman, 1966).

Criticism of failing public school districts began with The National Commission on Excellence in Education's (1983) *A Nation at Risk* report. Headlines such as "Failing Schools Have Nowhere to Hide" had spread throughout the nation (Butcher, 2011). The report indicated the United States was behind in several areas because schools were "generally encouraging mediocre and undemanding work, and more intellectually challenging instruction would be

needed to make students more academically and economically competitive" (Cohen, 1995, p. 740). The report made it clear that the failure of America's educational system was planted squarely at the feet of school superintendents (Cohen, 1995).

The requirements of No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB; 2002) increased the workload and added stress to superintendents. Legislative accountability that labeled school districts with testing data instead of measurements of improvement also added to the challenges of superintendents (Bracey, 2005). The NCLB act has motivated a vast number of research programs to study the effects of test-based accountability on student performance in U.S. public schools (NCLB, 2002). Reback, Rockoff, and Schwartz (2011) found,

> the NCLB act has led to increased scrutiny of disadvantaged schools, and principal's pay has not always adjusted to compensate. This change in the "risk-reward structure" of low versus high performing schools raised the concern that the NCLB act might not induce effective principals at low performing schools. (p. 15)

The goals of NCLB include (a) all students reach high standards attaining proficiency in reading and mathematics by 2013-2014,)b) all limited English proficient students become proficient in English, (c) by 2005-2006 all students be taught by highly qualified teachers, (d) all students be educated in learning environments that are safe and conducive to learning, and (e) all students graduate from high school (NCLB, 2002). If superintendents do not establish and use certain effective characteristics to develop and support effective principals, the pattern that exists with finding and retaining effective teachers could soon be in leadership (Reback et al., 2011).

College and career readiness became a focus of national policymakers due to reports that affirmed students are unprepared (Achieve, 2010). In 2006, the National Center on Education and the Economy (NCEE) published *Tough Choices or Tough Times: The Report of the New*

Commission on the Skills of the American Workforce. The report noted American students' scores were below other students in other nations in mathematics, science, and literacy on international academic assessments. American youth need to improve their academic skills to compete in the global market, and educational reform is necessary (NCEE, 2006). "In March of 2010, the Obama Administration sent to Congress, *The Blueprint for Reform of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act* to continue to work to close the achievement gap" (U.S. Department of Education, 2010, p. 15).

The establishment and implementation of the Common Core State Standards (CCSS) added to the roles and responsibilities of educational leaders. Two organizations spearheading this broad education reform effort, National Governors Association Center for Best Practices (NGA) and the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO), unveiled standards for two content areas: mathematics and English/language arts (NGA & CCSSO, 2010). Georgia Governor Sonny Perdue commented,

> American competitiveness relies on an education system that can adequately prepare our youth for college and the workforce. When American students have the skills and knowledge needed in today's jobs, our communities will be positioned to compete successfully in the global economy. (NGA & CCSSO, 2010, para. 4)

Philosophers Pave the Way

Philosophical foundations and theories are the center of teaching and learning in school districts due to having a direct impact on instruction in the classroom (Northouse, 2010). The function of a theory is to provide a framework for educational leadership practices. Gunter (2001) described these practices as the language and foundation needed to describe what is needed in the classroom, and to provide suggestions for improving instruction. The role of the

superintendent transformed into becoming the master teacher, and serve as the school district's instructional and curriculum leader (Carter & Cunningham, 1997). This transformation was a direct result of pedagogy becoming more important and difficult to define. Educational reform and the introduction of Taylor's (1911) principles of scientific management assisted in this transformation of the superintendent. The growth and demand of education called for superintendents to be both instructional leaders and business managers (Callahan, 1962).

The 21st century's challenges caused the learning in education to focus more on being ready for a global competitive society rather than rote memorization. Using more metacognitive skills should be a part of the teaching and learning process (Cookson, 2009). Superintendents, as instructional leaders, need to be aware of early philosophers such as the Socratic methods that allows for student knowledge to be demonstrated. Socrates believed that the teacher and the student both held knowledge and ignorance within themselves. His form of questioning was designed to release the knowledge from within the student so that he could find the answers he needed (Monroe, 1925). This method of inquiry is seen in classrooms today as a teacher and student have dialogue about what is being learned (Northouse, 2010). Aristotle's views on education were that people should act as they were expected to act and to be happy. The teacher held the key to knowledge and would lead students to the correct way to live. Practice would be done to behave properly until students could make those choices themselves (Sergiovanni, 1990). Discipline and behavior is still managed in the classroom today this way (M. M. Murphy, 2006). Educational philosophical concepts for what students need for success involve a progressive approach (Darling-Hammond & Bransford, 2005). J. Locke (1975) described the learning process with his idea of *tabula rasa*, meaning individuals are born without any prior knowledge but learn from their social environment. Individuals learn by their surrounding environments

with reading, writing, and speaking (J. Locke, 1975). Students should be involved in real life experiences of education (Dewey, 1938).

Research on Effective Superintendents

"Recent studies seeking to quantify the impact of the principal leadership on student learning have placed the impact second to that of the classroom teacher" (Leithwood, Seashore, Anderson, & Wahlstrom, 2004, p. 2). "Superintendents must recognize having an effective principal in every school is essential to improving student learning" (Elmore, 2000, p. 2). The standards-based reform movement has changed the way that leaders set goals for improvement and redefines what effective leadership is in the modern educational organization (Elmore, 2000). Elmore (2000) "was not convinced that the development of standards would in itself be enough to overcome an institutional history of loose coupling that sought to place the responsibility for what was learned at the classroom level" (p. 6).

A study by Forner, Bierlein-Palmer, & Reeves (2012) examined leadership practices of seven superintendents that had effects on improving student achievement. These researchers examined how practices of these superintendents were similar to Waters and Marzano's (2006) six effective leadership practices (Forner et al., 2012). The practices superintendents used that increased student achievement were goal-setting, building support for reform movements, personal conversations, using constructive confrontations to assist struggling students and teachers, removing low-performing teachers, leveraging close working relationships with building principals, taking a hard line in union contract negotiations, and ensuring financial commitments to match district goals and student outcomes for success. Among those practices, building relationships with principals was cited the highest number of 27 times and as one of the 10 most frequent effective leadership practices by these selected superintendents (Forner et al.,

2012).

> As the superintendent encourages the administrators to assume a more proactive leadership responsibility, he or she is also encouraging the principal to embrace the established goals of the board and superintendent and in the process; effective learning environments are improved for students. (Waters & Marzano, 2006, p. 6)

In 2001, a study completed by 18 members of the Superintendents Leadership Network (SLN) engaged in an intensive inquiry around the following question:

> What are the new roles and relationships that need to emerge between the superintendent and principals if principals are to become leaders in a district where the core business is to ensure that all students are provided high-content, engaging schoolwork? (BellSouth Foundation [BSF], Schlechty Center for Leadership in School Reform [SCLSR], & SLN, 2001, p. 1)

This study showed what principals perceive as effective leadership in superintendents. Principals responded on the following eight statements on a scale from 1 to 5. Principals' responses rated Statement 1, 72%; Statement 2, 76%; Statement 3, 82%; Statement 4, 73%; Statement 5, 66%; Statement 6, 79%; Statement 7, 69%; and Statement 8, 72%. Those statements are

1. The superintendent and district staff is committed to schoolhouse innovations that are aligned with the core business of schools, the beliefs and vision of the district, and achieving desired results.
2. The superintendent is clear about what she/he believes is the purpose of schools.
3. The superintendent develops a relationship with building principals.
4. The superintendent communicates and clarifies the vision of the district regularly.

5. The superintendent organizes and unifies the central office staff in a manner that is consistent with the beliefs, vision, the core purpose of schools, and with achieving desired results.
6. The superintendent causes the system to think and act strategically—knowing how and when to deploy resources (time, people, space, information, and technology).
7. The superintendent builds system capacity so that schools can start and sustain school improvements.
8. The superintendent creates an overall design to engage principals in learning. These characteristics of a superintendent show being committed, sharing of the vision, systematic thinking, building capacity in others, and developing a relationship with the building principal. (BSF & SCLSR, 2001, p. 2)

Effective Characteristics Principals Desire

Leadership should give support to principals to better assist in improving instruction for students (Wells, Maxfield, Klocko, & Feun, 2010). The effective teacher is responsible for making this happen ultimately, but all the right people have to be in the right place for the system to work (Fullan, 2011). Often superintendents are not involved in hiring and overseeing of principals and should be involved in all processes of building a leadership team (Wells et al., 2010). According to Saphier and Durkin (2012), the items listed in Table 1 are steps that lead to superintendents being better coaches.

Table 1

Steps to Superintendent Coaching

Item	Step
1	The superintendent focuses on the principals as his or her most important leverage for change in the district.
2	The superintendent plans his/her schedule and structures time with principals *first***,** keeping in mind that one of the best antidotes for a superintendent's tough day is getting out of the office and going to a school and visiting classrooms.
3	The superintendent schedules school visits and lets others know that these visits are very important and considered "sacred time" by the superintendent. Just as principals need to be in classrooms, superintendents need to be in schools.
4	The superintendent prioritizes how s/he will manage the set of school visits (new principals, underperforming principals, district and school-level data, etc.), remembering to validate high performers as well as to support those who are struggling.
5	The superintendent uses internal district resources as well as external resources to supplement his/her own efforts by coordinating others to help improve the instructional leadership of principals.
6	The superintendent keeps track of this work so that clear messages and expectations are sent to principals without the confusion of too many voices.

Source. Saphier and Durkin, 2012, p. 2

School systems must *reinvent the principalship* to meet the needs of schools in the 21st century (Institute for Educational Leadership [IEL], 2000). Principals guide student learning and need to be aware of the pedagogical techniques to ensure learning takes place. Principals are facing demands and pressures of high enrollment, accountability, lack of support, tension, and the strain of juggling all the responsibilities. Many of America's 93,000 principals are effective leaders, but some are not. The superintendent must provide assistance to the principal for a successful learning environment (IEL, 2000).

A study conducted by Forner et al. (2012) on effective leadership practices surveyed 17

of the top U.S. superintendents. The skills in the study are important to a superintendent having communication with the principal, including having a vision, being a strategic thinker/problem solver; leading the organization in the right direction; increasing teaching and learning; having interpersonal skills; good communication skills; building collaborative relationships; providing professional development; finance skills, allocating resources; making data-driven decisions; curriculum designing and development; and building community relationships. The superintendents in this survey discussed the importance of having communication and listening skills with the principal.

Responding and communicating with the building level principals is a vital trait in superintendents (Forner et al., 2012). Schlechty (2009) stated that

> in order to lead we must read. Reading, planned dialogue and interactions, and other forms of learning must be planned and given top priority by principals. But developing others is not always formal; it is also personal and done in-formally. (p. 37)

When comparing these effective traits to what principals need from superintendents, there is value in the phrase *when one stops learning one stops growing*. Education values continuous learning as a leadership characteristic (Schlechty, 2009).

Petersen's (1999) survey revealed that superintendents perceived these four characteristics were essential in the ability to be an effective superintendent: possession and articulation of an instructional vision, development of an organizational structure that supports the instructional vision, assessment and evaluation of personnel and instructional programs, and an organization that builds collaborative relationships. Jones, Goodwin, and Cunningham (2003) investigated 18 district-level administrators who had received the "Leadership for Learning Award" from the AASA. This study compared the effective characteristics of effective

superintendents. The characteristics that showed the most increase in success of superintendents in school districts were: curriculum, finance, professional development, principal relations, and setting a vision (Jones et al., 2003).

The Educational Leadership Standards

The leadership traits drawn from the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) standards give an interpretation of what is needed in preparing students for the 21st century. The Educational Leadership Policy Standards approved by the National Policy Board for Educational Administration and the Educational Leadership Constituent Council created the standards to address the leadership roles and responsibilities with curriculum, instruction, and running a district as a whole to ensure success (National Policy Board for Educational Association, 2011). According to J. Murphy (2003), the need to develop a set of standards to guide the work of school administrators has evolved with the growing question of how schools should be managed. An emphasis on scientific thought replaced the ideas that schools were best managed under a business model, and was used create safe and stable schools (J. Murphy, 2003). An extensive review of the literature was conducted to develop these new standards to create the administrative competencies. The outcome of this work was to reject the old ways of thinking that had guided the field of educational administration during the past century (J. Murphy, 2003). Appendix A contains a full outlined listing of the ISLLC standards with the associated functions.

Servant Leadership

"Robert K. Greenleaf proposed servant-leadership, the 'at your service' theoretical framework in 1970" (Greenleaf, 1996, p. 9). Greenleaf's servant leadership explored service to others, a holistic approach to work, promoting a sense of community, and a sharing of power in decision-making (Crippen, 2010). Servant leadership has many attributes such as: listening,

empathy, healing, awareness, persuasion, conceptualization, foresight, stewardship, growth of people, and building a community (Crippen, 2010). Servant leadership in schools requires listening to students, parents, community stakeholders, staff, and actions for individuals to be accountable. Leaders with success will need the characteristic of being a servant leader (Sturnick, 1997). Servant-leaders have the potential to heal both themselves and others to allow for a positive school environment with followers (Sturnick, 1998). According to Covey (2004), servant-leadership provides an unusual bond for leaders to consistently assist others to be successful. Spears (1995) stated,

> You may be able to buy someone's hand and back, but you cannot buy their heart, mind, and spirit. In the competitive reality of today's global marketplace, it will be only those organizations whose people not only willingly volunteer their tremendous creative talent, commitment, and loyalty, but whose organizations align their structures, systems, and management style to support the empowerment of their people that will survive and thrive as market leaders. (p. 47)

Blanchard viewed servant-leadership with the analogy of the traditional pyramid (Spears, 1995). The boss is always responsible and staff should report to the top of the pyramid. Turn the pyramid upside down the staff become responsible; the roles get reversed creating a different structure of leadership (Spears, 1995).

Authentic Leadership

Northouse (2010) explained that great leaders have five different characteristics that are innate, and include extraversion, conscientiousness, openness, low neuroticism, and agreeableness. Northouse also suggested that authentic leadership is one of the newest and most genuine areas of leadership: understanding the purpose and mission, inspiring and empowering

others, having strong values, having faith and commitment, trusting relationships, having self-discipline, and acting on values. Shamir and Eliam (2005) argued that authentic leadership rests heavily on self-relevant meanings and a leader attaches his or her life experiences to their leadership style. Leadership is based on self-concepts and how they relate to actions.

> Authentic leaders are being themselves, as opposed to conforming to others' expectations. They do not take on a leadership role for status, honor or other personal rewards. Rather, they lead from a conviction. They have a value based cause or a mission they want to promote. (Shamir & Eliam, 2005, p. 397)

Principles of Management

Fayol and Weber, early management theorists, combined theory with practice, and their ideas still have an influence on education today (as cited in Wren & Bedeian, 2009). Fayol and Weber attempted to develop methods for managing organizations. Fayol stressed education for management rather than technical training, and also the importance of planning, organizing, commanding, and coordinating (as cited in Wren & Bedeian, 2009). Drucker (1988), "father of management", put the focus on people and the organization. In education, the theory was to manage by objectives and have management strategies such as strategic planning, ethics and integrity, model the military (commitment to people), motivation, treat people like volunteers, leaders as marketers, and be the best representative for the organization (Drucker, 1988). Drucker identified five principles of management: setting objectives, organizing, motivating and communicating, establishing measurements of performance, and developing the best in people (Byrne & Gerdes, 2005). His performance-based leadership in schools is the difference between effective and less effective institutions (S. M. Sundre & Raish, 2002). Performance-oriented schools are those that are safe, orderly, focused on learning, nurturing, exciting, and engaging.

Creating and sustaining that environment requires a leadership style that fosters actions rather than demanding results, opportunities rather than dictate activities, and treasures diversity rather than demand uniformity (S. M. Sundre & Raish, 2002).

Empirical evidence supports the applicability of the goal theory in public administration (Rodgers & Hunter, 1992). The motivational explanation for the variation in employee performance is not due to ability or situation, but some employees perform better than others because they have different performance goals (E. A. Locke & Latham, 1990). According to the social cognitive theory, it is not the goals themselves, but rather the discrepancies created by individuals on how they perform that influences motivating behavior (Bandura, 1986). In a 1987 study of federal, state, and local government employees in the Atlanta area, Baldwin and Farley (1991) found that organizational goals had a beneficial effect on employee motivation.

Machiavellism

Machiavelli's effective characteristics of leadership came from the review of the Borgia family members in seizing and maintaining power. Part of the theory stated that good rulers sometimes have to learn *not to be good*; they have to be willing to set aside ethical concerns of justice, honesty, and kindness in order to maintain the stability of the state (Wheeler, 2011). "Machiavelli's immortal . . . phrase,

> "It is better to be feared than loved," is another pillar of effective leadership. While it is often the easier path to be friends with employees, it is hardly ever the effective path. . . . Managers who wish to avoid confrontations will also "butter up" their employees by downplaying transgressions, a poor leadership choice which often compromises the leader's managing power. (Sundre, n.d., para. 4)

Machiavelli argued that the most successful leaders were not the ones who acted

according to dictates of law or justice, but those who were willing to do whatever was necessary to preserve power for the good of everyone (Machiavelli, 1999/1513). Machiavelli (1999/1513) stated how to gain and keep power in his literary work *The Prince*. The characteristics addressed are necessary for leaders such as being severe, gracious, magnanimous, determined and diplomatic, capable of protection from enemies, winning friends, conquering either by force or by fraud, and being loved (Machiavelli, 1999/1513). Machiavelli warned leaders that vices can be virtues and looking to be the favorite leader will have drawbacks. Finances should be generous, but not to put the organization in a strain. Leaders should arm themselves with loyal employees, letting people go is sometimes needed, keep employees updated to avoid misunderstandings, communicate with the community stakeholders, provide employees all the tools necessary to be effective, and give professional development time (Machiavelli, 1999/1513).

Tzu was a master of leadership with knowing and applying the basics of being an effective leader. According to Sun Tzu, high morale and consistency are the keys to the success of leadership decisions (L. Sundre, n.d.).

> Sun Tzu's quote, "If troops lay siege to a walled city, their strength will be exhausted" is also of primary importance to effective leaders. Effective leaders do not waste their resources on unattainable goals. They set realistic goals and centralize priorities for employees. If your employees are "laying siege to a walled city" by either taking on too high of a workload or pursuing dead end projects, morale will plummet. (L. Sundre, n.d., para. 4)

Leadership Practices

Kouzes and Posner (2007) identified five practices of leadership that were researched to

be effective: model the way, inspire a shared vision, challenge the process, enable others to act, and encourage the heart. School districts across the country have reported principal shortages, especially in high-need areas. These shortages are a result of accountability pressures, long working hours, and lack of appreciation (Kouzes & Posner, 2014). Sweeney (2000) compared the leadership of the school district superintendent to the job satisfaction and efficacy of principals. Using the Superintendent Understanding of Principals' Educational Responsibilities (SUPER) survey instrument, 119 principals rated their superintendents on leadership practices (Kouzes & Posner, 2014). The results of the analysis showed statistically significant relationships between superintendent leadership practices and job satisfaction on the efficacy of principals. Principals who rated their own job satisfaction and efficacy as high also gave their superintendent a high rating on each of the five leadership practices. The strongest correlation occurred between job satisfaction of principals and the *enable others to act* leadership practice of their superintendents. This study demonstrated that superintendent leadership is an important factor in the job satisfaction and efficacy of their principals (Sweeney, 2000). Using Kouzes and Posner's (2008) model of the five practices of exemplary leadership, superintendents should develop leadership practices that increase the satisfaction and effectiveness of their principals. Superintendents who use these leadership characteristics help alleviate pressure on principals and increase the likelihood of retaining good principals (Kouzes & Posner, 2007).

Emotional Intelligence

Zhao's (2010) research on globalization and technology in education focuses on the future skills necessary for the 21st century learner to realize his or her potential. Zhao recommended that leaders should encourage learning to include creativity, new skills and knowledge for the global virtual world, cognitive skills, problem solving, and emotional

intelligence. Increasing rigor and teaching more standards is not the correct way to educate. Other countries have grown to be at the top on testing accountability results by reducing their standards and looking at ways to be more innovative and creative (Zhao, 2012). IQ and work ethic are important, but effective leadership characteristics need more. Leaders need emotional intelligence (EQ) to manage their emotions in interactions with others (Goleman, 2005). EQ can be applied to leadership, classroom instruction, learning confidence, working towards goals, and recovering from stress (Goleman, 2005).

Egan (2008) researched the history of education and imagines public schools in the future. Egan offered this description of the history of school:

> Twenty first century seems now just another of history's cruel jokes on our human forebears. All that boredom and pain, that half-learned and barely understood knowledge, which engaged the imaginations of the tiniest minority of people, the ill-directed energy of teachers, and the resentment of so many students. After more than a decade of their lives spent in these schools, most students could recall pitifully little of what they had been taught and had read; they knew by heart nothing more than the clichéd words of some pop song. The wonder of the world around them, the passion of their history, the possibilities of human experience were things of which they glimpsed only the most fleeting sense. After they left school most students never read anything but mental pablum again. Schooling during this time seems to have been a massive and clumsy industry poorly designed to carry the experience of life and the accumulation of technological skills across the generations. (p. 180)

Egan (2008) supported the idea of *learning-to-learning* and not rote memorization. He summarized his theory on emotional intelligence with this passage:

> All knowledge is human knowledge and all knowledge is a product of human hopes, fears, and passions. To bring knowledge to life in students' minds we must introduce it to students in the context of the human hopes, fears, and passions in which it finds its fullest meaning. The best tool for doing this is the imagination. (Egan, 2008, p. xii-xiii)

Leadership Paradigms

The great man theory of the 1900s defined leaders as "born and not made", (Bolden, Gosling, Marturano, & Dennison, 2003, p. 6). The great man theory, developed by Carlyle and Spencer, was based on heroes in history (Carlyle, 1988). Leadership theories have developed and grown into a process and include multiple descriptions such as trait theory (Stogdill, 1974), behavioral theory of roles (McGregor, 1960) and the managerial grid (Blake & Mouton, 1972), situational leadership (Hersey & Blanchard, 1982), contingency theory (Fiedler, 1964), transactional leadership, and transformational leadership (Bolden et al., 2003). Table 2 shows the list of the traits in the skills theory developed by Stogdill (1974). This list of traits is associated with human attributes.

Table 2

Traits and Skills of Leadership

Traits	Skills
- Adaptable to situations	- Clever (intelligent)
- Alert to social environment	- Conceptually skilled
- Ambitious and achievement-orientated	- Creative
- Assertive	- Diplomatic and tactful
- Cooperative	- Fluent in speaking
- Decisive	- Knowledgeable about group task
- Dependable	- Organized (administrative ability)
- Dominant (desire to influence others)	- Persuasive
- Energetic (high activity level)	- Socially skilled
- Persistent	
- Self-confident	
- Tolerant of stress	

- Willing to assume responsibility skills

Note. Adapted from Stogdill (1974)

The behavior theory concentrates on what leaders do rather than the traits they exhibit. McGregor (1960) wrote a book based on Maslow's hierarchy of needs and came up with two leadership management styles Theory X (authoritarian) and Theory Y (participative). The managerial grid developed by Blake and Mouton (1972) focused on task (production) and employee (people) as managers, as well as combinations of the two extremes. The situational leadership theory (Hersey & Blanchard, 1982) requires certain leadership styles to match the organization, such as autocratic or democratic. Contingency theory refines situations to identify the situation and variable to predict the effective leadership style to match the circumstance (Bolden et al., 2003). Table 3 provides a synthesis of the framework for transactional and transformational leadership.

Table 3

Leadership and Management as Transactional and Transformational

Framework	Transactional	Transformational
Role of Manager and Leader	Planner Organizer Controller Monitor Coordinator Producer Director	Visionary Innovator Influencer Mentor Facilitator Coach and Guide Moral, Ethical Leader
Overlap of Management and Leadership	Gets things done, i.e., accomplishes goals through people – influences plans, organizes, builds systems to encourage successful performance. Integrity, professionalism, and innovation reflect values of the organization and influence actions.	Gets things done, i.e., accomplishes goals through people – influences plans, organizes, builds systems to encourage successful performance. Integrity, professionalism, and innovation reflect values of the organization and influence actions.

Note. Adapted from Womack (n.d.)

Leadership possesses a little of all the theories, but transformational leadership shows the importance of the relationships.

Best Practices of Superintendents

Marzano (2012) identified five domains of effective leadership practices that include: data-driven focus on student achievement, continuous improvement of instruction, viable curriculum, cooperation and collaboration, and a positive school climate. Some high performing schools included improved quality teaching and learning, support for a system type model, and clear and collaborative relationships (Shannon & Bylsma, 2004). Effective school leadership responsibilities include the traditional task of efficiently managing students and staff with instructional strategies and improved community involvement (Whitaker, 2002).

Collaboration that is strengthened between the superintendent and the principal can lead to data-driven decisions (West, 2011). Researchers such as DuFour, who created a framework centered on three big ideas along with four questions of collaboration, have developed a system that many schools use to guide the collaborative process. The three big ideas include: clarity of purpose, collaborative school culture, and a focus on results. The four critical questions of the PLC model drive the conversations of the meetings. What do we want students to learn? (Planning and pacing instruction); How will we know if they have learned it? (Collect data); What do we do if they do not learn it? (Intervention); and, What do we do if they do learn it? (Enrichment; DuFour, DuFour, Eaker, & Karhanek, 2004).

The professional learning community (PLC) gives schools a process to build teacher capacity as collaborative teams that focus on improving student learning. According to Eaker, DuFour, and DuFour (2002), the framework of the PLC model has schools focused on having a

shared mission, vision, values, and goals; collaborative teams that work interdependently to achieve common goals; and a focus on results for continuous improvement (Eaker et al., 2002). Schools using the PLC model work to have a focus with a collaborative culture and use results to improve instructional strategies. During collaborative team meetings, teachers share concerns, reflect on teaching strategies, and make decisions based on data. Marzano (2012) stated the collaboration process has five responsibilities on district leadership from managing organizations, building capacity in others, results-driven decisions, creating values in the culture, defining a clear instructional focus, and ensuring accountability.

Improving the collaboration process with principals can provide them support needed. Principals need leadership support with the demands of preparing students for the 21st century (Zhao, 2012). If a principal feels a sense of direction, then they are getting direct support (Cudeiro, 2005). Principals need ongoing support, high-quality mentoring, and professional development to create growth in their own career with the evolving needs of schools (Hesbol, 2012).

In 2011, the *American School Board Journal* identified best practices with today's superintendents. The primary goal and mission of schools is student achievement and this focus is a challenge for superintendents due to the time-consuming nature of the job (Harris & Hopson, 2011). These best practices include team building, responding to changing times, understanding school reform, action for student results, and understanding people are more important than programs (Harris & Hopson, 2011).

Conclusion

The history and process of how the superintendent position was formed can assist in better understanding the leadership roles and responsibilities of collaboration rather than

management. The literature review offered research for future superintendents on effective characteristics for a successful school district. America's schools depend on the effectiveness of school superintendents. The superintendent position requires a creative and visionary person who can adapt to social change and diversity in the populations (AASA, 1993). Limited information exists on the relationship needed to best prepare students for the 21st century between the principals and the superintendent. Fullan (2005) discussed the professional learning culture in which "teams of people create and drive a clear, coherent strategy" (p. 43). He suggested that "collective moral purpose" (p. 43) is essential to sustained reform.

> The moral imperative means that everyone has a responsibility for changing the larger education context for the better. District leaders must foster a culture in which school principals are concerned about the success of every school in the district, not just their own. (Fullan, 2005 p. 43)

Leadership of school districts has been proven that it is no longer just top down management. Decision making among teachers, administrators, community members, and businesses is crucial for creating and sustaining a successful school system. Leadership must be effective at all levels starting with collaboration between superintendent and principal (Kowalski, 2010). Superintendents should lead through value teaching (Cunningham, 1985). Simpson (2004) identified education in this statement:

> Public education reduces opposition to wealth transfers by teaching students that redistribution, public works, and democracy are the American way. War and crisis increases the size of government. Public education tells us we need government all the time. Public education introduces the mantras of democracy to the young. (para. 15)

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

This chapter discusses the research methodology including the problem, research questions, null hypotheses, research design and data sources, populations of the study, the data collection process, instruments used, and the statistical analysis. The purpose of this study was to identify differences in principal and superintendent perceptions on effective characteristics of superintendents. The effective characteristics were identified through the literature review. The collaborative relationship between superintendents and principals is imperative for maximum student achievement in school districts (Leithwood et al., 2004). The principal needs guidance and training from the superintendent in order to make effective change (Hord & Czerwinski, 1991).

Problem

This study researched effective characteristics that principals and superintendents most value in superintendents. The role of the superintendent has changed from manager to collaborator to improve the success of schools. Research on school leadership showed that effective characteristics that appeared to maximize student achievement were collaboration and intentional interaction between the superintendent and the principal. Schools needed to have not only the leadership of knowledgeable, highly skilled, and visionary superintendents, but principals as well. Exceptional school leadership does not develop by working in isolation

(West, 2011). Research on identifying these effective characteristics in this study includes the 2011 ISLLC standards, major leadership theorist, leadership paradigms, and best practices, such as the five identified domains of effective leadership practices: data-driven focus on student achievement, continuous improvement of instruction, viable curriculum, cooperation and collaboration, and a positive school climate (Marzano, 2012).

Research Questions

The study was guided by the following questions. These questions were tested using the electronic website Qualtrics survey instrument.

1. Is there a significant difference of perceptions between superintendents and principals regarding effective characteristics for superintendents in the area of vision, values, and goals based on position type?
2. Is there a significant difference of perceptions between superintendents and principals regarding effective characteristics for superintendents in the area of vision, values, and goals based on location type?
3. Is there a significant difference of perceptions between superintendents and principals regarding effective characteristics for superintendents in the area of vision, values, and goals based on respondent's years of employment in current position?
4. Is there a significant difference of perceptions between superintendents and principals regarding effective characteristics for superintendents in the area of management skills based on position type?
5. Is there a significant difference of perceptions between superintendents and principals regarding effective characteristics for superintendents in the area of management skills based on location type?

6. Is there a significant difference of perceptions between superintendents and principals regarding effective characteristics for superintendents in the area of management skills based on respondent's years of employment in current position?
7. Is there a significant difference of perceptions between superintendents and principals regarding effective characteristics for superintendents in the area of collaboration skills based on position type?
8. Is there a significant difference of perceptions between superintendents and principals regarding effective characteristics for superintendents in the area of collaboration skills based on location type?
9. Is there a significant difference of perceptions between superintendents and principals regarding effective characteristics for superintendents in the area of collaboration skills based on respondent's years of employment in current position?
10. Is there a significant difference of perceptions between superintendents and principals between superintendents and principals regarding effective characteristics for superintendents in the area of instructional leadership skills based on position type?
11. Is there a significant difference of perceptions between superintendents and principals regarding effective characteristics for superintendents in the area of instructional leadership skills based on location type?
12. Is there a significant difference of perceptions between superintendents and principals regarding effective characteristics for superintendents in the area of instructional leadership skills based on respondent's years of employment in current position?

Null Hypotheses

$H_0$1. There is no statistically significant difference of perceptions between

superintendents and principals regarding effective characteristics for superintendents in the area of vision, values, and goals based on position type.

$H_0$2. There is no statistically significant difference of perceptions between superintendents and principals regarding effective characteristics for superintendents in the area of vision, values, and goals based on location type.

$H_0$3. There is no statistically significant difference of perceptions between superintendents and principals regarding effective characteristics for superintendents in the area of vision, values, and goals based on respondent's years of employment in current position.

$H_0$4. There is no statistically significant difference of perceptions between superintendents and principals regarding effective characteristics for superintendents in the area of management skills based on position type.

$H_0$5. There is no statistically significant difference of perceptions between superintendents and principals regarding effective characteristics for superintendents in the area of management skills based on location type.

$H_0$6. There is no statistically significant difference of perceptions between superintendents and principals regarding effective characteristics for superintendents in the area of management skills based on respondent's years of employment in current position.

$H_0$7. There is no statistically significant difference of perceptions between superintendents and principals regarding effective characteristics for superintendents in the area of collaboration skills based on position type.

$H_0$8. There is no statistically significant difference of perceptions between superintendents and principals regarding effective characteristics for superintendents in the area of collaboration skills based on location type.

$H_0$9. There is no statistically significant difference of perceptions between superintendents and principals regarding effective characteristics for superintendents in the area of collaboration skills based on respondent's years of employment in current position.

$H_0$10. There is no statistically significant difference of perceptions between superintendents and principals regarding effective characteristics for superintendents in the area of instructional leadership skills based on position type.

$H_0$11. There is no statistically significant difference of perceptions between superintendents and principals regarding effective characteristics for superintendents in the area of instructional leadership skills based on location type.

$H_0$12. There is no statistically significant difference of perceptions between superintendents and principals regarding effective characteristics for superintendents in the area of instructional leadership skills based on respondent's years of employment in current position.

Research Design

According to Creswell (2011), a quantitative design utilizes a survey or experimental instrument to gain information. Creswell stated that a quantitative design is "an inquiry into a social or human problem based on testing a theory composed of variables, measured with numbers, and analyzed with statistical procedures, in order to determine whether the predictive generalizations of the theory hold true" (p. 101). The literature research contained in Chapter 2 contributed to the framework for this inquiry. This study was conducted using an electronic website-based Qualtrics survey instrument. Indiana public school superintendents and principals were surveyed to determine their perceptions of effective characteristics of superintendents. Submissions of individual's perceptions remained confidential.

Population of Study

Principals and superintendents of the 288 Indiana public school corporations were surveyed for this study (Indiana Department of Education, 2014). Each school district had one superintendent and 2,300 principals employed in the state of Indiana who were eligible to participate in the survey for the data collection process (Indiana Department of Education, 2014).

Instrumentation and Data Sources

The survey was developed based on a review of the literature identified effective characteristics of superintendents. The participants were asked to complete a Likert-type scale survey framed around the effective characteristics of superintendents. The Likert scale is attributed to Rensis Likert, who developed this technique for the assessment of attitudes (Gliem & Gliem, 2003). McIver and Carmines (1981) described the Likert scale as

> a set of items, composed of approximately an equal number of favorable and unfavorable statements concerning the attitude object, is given to a group of subjects. They are asked to respond to each statement in terms of their own degree of agreement or disagreement. Typically, they are instructed to select one of five responses: strongly agree, agree, undecided, disagree, or strongly disagree. The specific responses to the items are combined so that individuals with the most favorable attitudes will have the highest scores while individuals with the least favorable (or unfavorable) attitudes will have the lowest scores. While not all summated scales are created according to Likert's specific procedures, all such scales share the basic logic associated with Likert scaling. (pp. 22-23)

The surveys consisted of two sections—one section asked demographic information and the other was perceptions of effective characteristics, see Appendix B. The effective characteristics

stem from the review of the literature on best practices, to include, leadership theories and leadership paradigms. The 2011 ISLLC standards also informed the contents of the survey.

Data Collection Process

Each of the 288 Indiana public school district superintendents was contacted to participate in this survey. An electronic letter (Appendix C) outlining this study was sent to the superintendents of each school district in Indiana and each principal requesting they complete the study. Principal e-mail addresses were obtained through the Indiana Department of Education (2014). The survey was conducted in the summer of 2014. An e-mail with a cover letter (Appendix C) linking the Qualtrics electronic survey website was sent to all the superintendents and principals to participate in this study. The letter explained the purpose of the study and contain directions about how to access the survey via the electronic website Qualtrics survey instrument. The letter further explained that the respondent's identity would be kept confidential. No record of a participant's I.P. address was kept. Participants were also informed that their participation would be voluntary and they could discontinue participating in the survey at any time. A follow-up e-mail was sent 10 days after the survey was initially distributed to remind the potential participants to complete the survey (Appendix D).

Content Validity

The survey's ability to accurately assess the importance of each factor in the four sections was validated. Creswell (1994) recommended several ways to establish validity to ensure the study measures what it is intended to measure. Content validity is the ability to measure the content that is to be studied by the researcher (Creswell, 1994). Content validity was established by surveying several leaders outside of the sample population mentioned in this study. These individuals reviewed the survey questions to determine if the purpose of the study was

addressed. Content validity for this study was also established through a review of research related to the topic as found in Chapter 2.

Survey Reliability

Survey reliability is used to look for consistency and stability of the research instrument. A study is said to be high in reliability if it produces similar results under consistent conditions (Creswell, 1994). The results of the survey responses were analyzed to determine reliability. Cronbach developed the alpha construct in 1951 to provide a measure of the internal consistency of a test or scale (Tavakol & Dennick, 2011). Internal consistency describes the extent to which all the items in a test measure the same concept. When using Likert-type scales, it is imperative to calculate and report Cronbach's alpha coefficient for internal consistency reliability for any scales or subscales. Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient normally ranges between 0 and 1. The closer Cronbach's alpha coefficient is to 1.0 the greater the internal consistency of the items in the scale (Gliem & Gliem, 2003).

Statistical Analysis

For each of the research questions found within this study, the analysis of variance (ANOVA) results provided evidence whether significant differences exist on the dependent variables among different groups (independent variables). The dependent variables were perceptions of the effective characteristics of each of the four sections: vision, values, and goals, collaboration skills, management skills, and instructional leadership. These four areas were developed from the research of the ISLLC standards, characteristics of the leadership theorist, characteristics of leadership paradigms, characteristics of best practices of school leadership. In order to examine these dependent variables for inferential testing, the Likert values of the five questions from the survey were combined into a composite score for each area. These composite

scores were used as the dependent variables for the inferential tests.

The independent variable of position type had two levels: principal or superintendent. The independent variable of demographic location had three levels: suburban, urban, or rural. The independent variable of experience in the position had four levels: 1-5 years, 6-10 years, 11-15 years, and 16+ years. ANOVA inferential test was used to analyze the data from the study. Before conducting an ANOVA, the sample was evaluated to verify that all of the assumptions of ANOVA (independent observations, normally distributed populations, and homogeneous variances) were satisfied.

Summary

A quantitative study was conducted to address the research questions focusing on the effective characteristics of the superintendent through the principals' perception. Indiana public school superintendents and principals were identified for potential participation and an electronic website survey collection was provided to those participants. All ANOVA results are provided in Chapter 4.

CHAPTER 4

ANALYSIS OF DATA

The main purpose of this quantitative study was to determine the effective characteristics that principals most value in superintendents. Principals need leadership and guidance to lead a school to the best of their ability. The effective characteristics of superintendents in this study consisted of research of the ISLLC standards, leadership theorist, paradigms, and best practices. "Research on educational leadership shows a strong correlation between the quality of the district leadership and achievement of the school district" (Waters & Marzano, 2006, p. 11). The role of the superintendent has evolved throughout history from manager to collaborator. Instead of managing finances and balancing resources, the shift has directed towards a vision of student achievement in the district. "The superintendent must be relationship-centered, focused on a vision of student achievement, have involvement with stakeholders, foster teamwork, and build strong relationships" (Phillips & Phillips, 2007, p. 42). Superintendents must commit to create strong collaborative relationships with the leaders in the district to create systematic plans. The responsibility of teaching and learning for students and what goes on in classrooms is no longer just the building leader's responsibility (Fullan, 2011).

This study used survey methodology to gather data from superintendents and principals working within public school corporations in the state of Indiana. Superintendents and principals were asked what their perceptions were regarding effective characteristics of superintendents.

I developed the Effective Characteristics Survey to quantitatively measure the perceptions of superintendents and principals on effective characteristics of superintendents. The survey components of the ISSLC standards (ISSLC standards, 2011), educational theories, paradigms, and researched best practices were developed from the review of the literature from previous similar research.

The Effective Characteristics Survey consisted of 23 items and was organized into two parts. Part I asked respondents to identify if they were a superintendent or principal, the number of years of experience in education, the enrollment of the district, and the demographic location of the school district. Part II asked the respondents their perceptions of 20 effective characteristics of superintendents. Each question was constructed from research from the four areas of vision, management, collaboration, and instruction. For each characteristic, the respondents were asked to mark the level of the significance on a Likert-like scale of 1-6. A mark of a 1 on the Likert scale reflected the survey participant strongly disagreed that the characteristic was effective for superintendents. A mark of a 6 on the Likert scale reflected the survey participant strongly agreed that the characteristic was needed in order to be an effective superintendent.

The sampling protocol was followed as described in Chapter 3. E-mail invitations to participate were sent every superintendent and principal in all public schools in the state of Indiana. The e-mail addresses of public school superintendents and principals were obtained from the Indiana Department of Education. A total of 2,307 surveys were distributed with 383 sent to superintendents and 1,924 to principals. Out of 2,307 surveys e-mailed, 373 were completed utilizing the online survey created in the Qualtrics software.

To estimate the reliability of the four dependent variables found within the inferential

test, a Cronbach's alpha was utilized. The test requires an alpha value of at least .6 in order to demonstrate internal consistency among the questions for each area (King, Rosopa, & Minium, 2011). If the dependent variables did not reach this .6 threshold, they were removed from inferential testing. Among the questions in the survey that dealt with the area of vision, the Cronbach's alpha score was .660. The management score was .539, thus, the inferential questions within this study were not tested due to the low level of internal consistency. The collaboration score was .609. The instruction value was .710. The inferential tests that were planned within this study were conducted for vision, collaboration, and instruction. The descriptive data for management is provided within the next section to provide some insight into the area, but conclusions from this area cannot be formulated due to a lack of reliability in this section of the survey.

Descriptive Analysis

Data were collected and then entered into SPSS software to report the perceptions of superintendents and principals on effective characteristics of superintendents. An analysis of the data was conducted on the perceptions based on position type, demographics, and level of experience. For the sampling population for this study, the data analysis showed total respondents. Within the total respondents, 117 (31.4%) were superintendents, and 256 (68.6%) were principals. For location type, 182 (48.8%) respondents reported rural, 154 (41.3%) reported suburban, and 37 (9.9%) reported urban. For years of experience, 137 (36.7%) reported 1-5 years, 120 (32.2%) 6-10 years, 46 (12.3%) 11-15 years, and 70 (18.8%) reported 16 or more years.

Vision Descriptive (Whole Sample Data)

Respondents had six choices to select from when responding to each question. The

choices were 1 = *Strongly Disagree,* 2 = *Disagree,* 3 = *Somewhat Disagree,* 4 = *Agree,* 5 = *Somewhat Agree,* 6 = *Strongly Agree*. An analysis was conducted to determine the perceptions on characteristics of superintendents with vision. The five survey questions on vision focused on

- implementation and development,
- building trust,
- structuring a safe learning environment, and
- having set goals, and possess leadership traits.

The highest rated three whole sample responses were trust, $M = 5.75$, $SD = .615$; implementation and development of the vision, $M = 5.62$, $SD = 7.18$; and setting high goals, $M = 5.61$, $SD = .627$. Overall, the vision composite score ranged from a minimum of 11 and a maximum of 30, $M = 28.14$, $SD = 2.09$.

Management Descriptive (Whole Sample Data)

Respondents had six choices to select from when responding to each question. The choices were 1 = *Strongly Disagree,* 2 = *Disagree,* 3 = *Somewhat Disagree,* 4 = *Agree,* 5 = *Somewhat Agree,* 6 = *Strongly Agree*. In the descriptive whole sample, data for the management sample were listed in response to the questions. An analysis was conducted to determine the perceptions on characteristics of superintendents with regard to management. The five survey questions on management focused on

- analyzing data,
- making genuine decisions,
- adjust leadership style based on situations,
- setting objectives to organize with, and
- inspiring others to follow goals.

The highest rated whole sample responses were making genuine decisions, *M* = 5.52, *SD* = .724; analyzing data, *M* = 5.27, *SD* = .788; and inspiring others to follow goals, *M* = 5.09, *SD* = .918. Overall the management composite score ranged from a minimum of 15 to a maximum of 30, *M* = 25.32, *SD* = 2.74.

Collaboration Descriptive (Whole Sample Data)

Respondents had six choices to select from when responding to each question. The choices were 1 = *Strongly Disagree,* 2 = *Disagree,* 3 = *Somewhat Disagree,* 4 = *Agree,* 5 = *Somewhat Agree,* 6 = *Strongly Agree*. In the descriptive whole sample, data for the collaboration sample were listed in response to the questions. An analysis was conducted to determine the perceptions on characteristics of superintendents with collaboration. The five survey questions on collaboration focused on

- having a servant leadership style,
- communicating with stakeholders,
- good working relationship with the principal, and
- visibility among schools and the community, and create a culture of collaboration.

The highest rated whole sample responses were good working relationship with the principal, *M* = 5.72, *SD* = .513; communicating with stakeholders, *M* = 5.53, *SD* = .662; and creating a collaboration culture, *M* = 5.48, *SD* = .625. Overall, the collaboration composite score ranged from a minimum of 18 to a maximum of 30, *M* = 27.57, *SD* = 2.09.

Instructional Leadership Skills Descriptive (Whole Sample Data)

Respondents had six choices to select from when responding to each question. The choices were 1 = *Strongly Disagree,* 2 = *Disagree,* 3 = *Somewhat Disagree,* 4 = *Agree,* 5 = *Somewhat Agree,* 6 = *Strongly Agree*. In the descriptive whole sample, data for the sample were

listed in response to the questions. An analysis was conducted to determine the perceptions on characteristics of superintendents with instructional leadership skills. The five survey questions on instructional strategies focused on

- developing skills in order to be globally competitive in the world,
- provide professional development around district goals,
- involve rewards and recognition with staff,
- challenge all staff members, and
- improve instructional strategies used in the classroom.

The highest rated whole sample responses were provide professional development, *M* = 5.41, *SD* = .707; develop skills to be globally competitive, *M* = 4.99, *SD* = .786; and challenge staff members, *M* = 4.81, *SD* = .934. Overall the instructional leadership skills composite score ranged from a minimum of 14 to a maximum of 30, *M* = 24.28, *SD* = 2.98.

Descriptive Analysis Position Type

Descriptive Data (Superintendents)

A total of 117 superintendents were included in the sample. The sample was filtered so only superintendent's responses were examined. Within the superintendent responses, there were 70 rural (59.8%), 43 suburban (36.8%), and four urban (3.4%). Superintendent participants were also filtered by years of experience, with 53 reporting 1-5 years (45.3%), 35 with 6-10 years (29.9%), three reporting 11-15 years (11.1%), and 16 with 16 or more years of experience of experience (13.7%).

Vision Descriptive Data (Superintendents)

Table 4 lists the responses of the descriptive data for the superintendents' sample in relation to vision. The highest rated three superintendent sample responses were trust, *M* = 5.75,

SD = .615; implementation, *M* = 5.62, *SD* = 7.18; and safety *M* = 5.61, *SD* = .601. Overall the vision composite score range was from a minimum of 19 to a maximum of 30 with *M* = 28.15, *SD* = 1.86. When comparing the superintendent highest rated responses to the whole sample, both perceived trust and implementation of a vision scored the highest. However, superintendents perceived a safe learning environment as an effective characteristic compared to the whole sample of setting high goals as the third highest.

Table 4

Superintendent Views on Vision

Vision	*M*	*SD*
Implementation and development	5.65	.674
Increase trust	5.74	.607
Structure safe learning environment	5.61	.601
Set high goals and expectations	5.60	.631
Possess strong leadership traits	5.56	.579
Composite	28.15	1.860

Management Descriptive Data (Superintendents)

Table 5 lists the responses of the descriptive data for the superintendent's sample in relation to management. The highest rated superintendent sample responses were genuine decisions, *M* = 5.46, *SD* = .760; data, *M* = 5.33, *SD* = .731; and inspire others, *M* = 5.00, *SD* = .881. Overall the management composite score range was from a minimum of 17 to a maximum of 30, *M* = 24.97, *SD* = 2.88. When comparing the superintendent highest rated responses to the

whole sample, both perceived genuine decision-making, data analysis, and inspiring others as the highest rated three highest characteristics needed.

Table 5

Superintendent Views on Management

Management	*M*	*SD*
Analyzing data	5.33	.731
Making genuine decisions	5.46	.760
Adjust leadership style for situations	4.74	1.210
Set objectives for organization	4.44	1.130
Inspire others to follow goals	5.00	.881
Composite	24.97	2.880

Collaboration Descriptive Data (Superintendents)

The lists in Table 6 contain the responses of the descriptive data for the superintendent sample with regard to collaboration. The highest rated three superintendent sample responses were relationship with the principal, $M = 5.63$, $SD = .551$; communicating with stakeholders, $M = 5.44$, $SD = .700$; and collaboration culture, $M = 5.44$, $SD = .636$. Overall the collaboration composite score range was from a minimum of 20 to a maximum of 30, $M = 27.30$, $SD = 2.05$. When comparing the superintendent highest rated responses to the whole sample, both perceived working with the principal, communicating with stakeholders, and creating a collaboration culture as the highest rated three highest characteristics needed.

Table 6

Superintendent Views on Collaboration

Collaboration	*M*	*SD*
Having a servant leadership style	5.35	.834
Communicating with stakeholders	5.44	.700
Good working relationship with the principal	5.63	.551
Visibility among schools	5.44	.662
Creating a culture of collaboration	5.44	.636
Composite	27.30	2.050

Instructional Leadership Skills Descriptive Data (Superintendents)

The responses listed in Table 7 of the descriptive data for the superintendent sample regarding instructional leadership skills. The highest rated three superintendent sample responses were provide professional development, $M = 5.30$, $SD = .660$; develop skills to be globally competitive, $M = 4.93$, $SD = .848$; and challenge staff members, $M = 4.79$, $SD = .963$. Overall the instructional leadership skills composite score range was from a minimum of 15 and a maximum of 30, $M = 24.00$, $SD = 3.07$. When comparing the superintendent highest rated responses to the whole sample, both perceived professional development, developing skills to be globally competitive, and challenge staff as the three highest characteristics needed.

Table 7

Superintendent Views on Instructional Leadership Skills

Instructional Leadership Skills	*M*	*SD*
Develop skills to be globally competitive	4.93	.848
Provide professional development	5.30	.660
Rewards and recognition with staff	4.44	1.070
Challenge staff members	4.79	.963
Classroom instructional strategies	4.50	.943
Composite	24.00	3.070

Descriptive Data (Principals)

A total of 256 principals participated in the study. The sample was filtered so only principal's responses were examined. Within the principal's responses, there were 112 suburban (43.8%), 111 suburban (43.4%), and 33 urban (12.9%). The sample of the principals was also broken up by years of experience, 84 reported 1-5 years (32.8%), 85 reported 6-10 years (33.2%), 33 reported 11-15 years (12.9%), and 54 reported 16 or more years (21.1%).

Vision Descriptive Data (Principals)

The descriptive data in Table 8 lists the responses for the principal's sample in relation to vision. The highest rated three principal sample responses were trust, $M = 5.75$, $SD = .620$; goals and expectations, $M = 5.62$, $SD = .627$; and implement the vision, $M = 5.61$, $SD = .738$. Overall, the vision composite score ranged from a minimum of 11 to a maximum of 30, $M = 28.15$, $SD =$

1.86. When comparing the principal highest rated responses to the whole sample, both perceived trust, setting high goals and expectations, and implementation and development of the vision as the three highest characteristics needed.

Table 8

Principal Views on Vision

Vision	*M*	*SD*
Implementation and development	5.61	.738
Increase trust	5.75	.620
Structure safe learning environment	5.55	.667
Set high goals and expectations	5.62	.627
Possess strong leadership traits	5.60	.612
Composite	28.13	2.819

Management Descriptive Data (Principals)

Table 9 lists the responses of the descriptive data for the principal's sample in relation to management. The three highest rated principal sample responses were making genuine decisions, *M* = 5.46, *SD* = .760; analyzing data, *M* = 5.33, *SD* = .731; and inspire others to follow goals, *M* = 5.00, *SD* = .881. Overall, the management composite score ranged from a minimum of 17 to a maximum of 30, *M* = 24.97, *SD* = 2.88. When comparing the principal highest rated responses to the whole sample, both perceived making genuine decisions, analyzing data, and inspiring others to follow goals as the three highest characteristics needed.

Table 9

Principal Views on Management

Management	*M*	*SD*
Analyzing data	5.33	.731
Making genuine decisions	5.46	.760
Adjust leadership style for situations	4.74	1.210
Set objectives for organization	4.44	1.130
Inspire others to follow goals	5.00	.881
Composite	24.97	2.880

Collaboration Descriptive Data (Principals)

The lists of the responses in Table 10 contain the descriptive data for the principal's sample in relation to collaboration. The highest rated three principal sample responses were good working relationship with the principal, *M* = 5.63, *SD* = .551; communicating with stakeholders, *M* = 5.44, *SD* = .700; and creating a culture of collaboration, *M* = 5.44, *SD* = .636. Overall, the collaboration composite score ranged from a minimum of 20 to a maximum of 30, *M* = 27.30, *SD* = 2.05. When comparing the highest rated principal responses to the whole sample, both perceived good working relationship with the principal, communicating with stakeholders, and creating a culture of collaboration as the three highest characteristics needed.

Table 10

Principal Views on Collaboration

Collaboration	*M*	*SD*
Having a servant leadership style	5.35	.834
Communicating with stakeholders	5.44	.700
Good working relationship with the principal	5.63	.551
Visibility among schools	5.44	.662
Creating a culture of collaboration	5.44	.636
Composite	27.30	2.050

Instructional Leadership Skills Descriptive Data (Principals)

Table 11 lists the responses of the descriptive data for the principal's sample in relation to instructional leadership skills. The highest rated principal sample responses were provide professional development, $M = 5.30$, $SD = .660$; develop skills to be globally competitive, $M = 4.93$, $SD = .848$; and challenge staff members, $M = 4.79$, $SD = .963$. Overall, the instructional leadership skills composite score ranged from a minimum of 15 to a maximum of 30, $M = 24.00$, $SD = 3.07$. When comparing the principal responses to the whole sample, both perceived professional development, develop skills to be globally competitive, and challenge staff members as the three highest characteristics needed.

Table 11

Principal Views on Instructional Leadership Skills

Instructional Leadership Skills	*M*	*SD*
Develop skills to be globally competitive	4.93	.848
Provide professional development	5.30	.660
Rewards and recognition with staff	4.44	1.070
Challenge staff members	4.79	.963
Classroom instructional strategies	4.50	.943
Composite	24.00	3.070

Descriptive Analysis by Location

Descriptive Data for Location

Data were collected and entered into SPSS software for the total number of respondents by location to report the perceptions of superintendents and principals on effective characteristics of superintendents. The sample was filtered by demographic location of rural (less than 2,500), suburban (2,501-250,000), and urban (250,001 or more). For the whole sample of location, 182 respondents reported rural (48.8%), 154 reported suburban (41.3%), and 37 reported urban (9.9%). Of the superintendents who responded, 70 were from rural locations (59.8%), 43 were from suburban locations (36.8%), and four were from urban locations (3.4%). The total number of principals that responded by location were 112 rural (38.5%), 111 suburban (72.1%), and 33

urban (89.2%). For years of experience by those in suburban locations, the total whole sample respondents totaled 154. For levels of experience in the suburban location, 55 reported 1-5 years (35.7%), 46 reported 6-10 years (29.9%), 22 reported 11-15 years (14.3%), and 31 reported 16 or more years (20.1%). For years of experience of urban respondents by location, the total whole sample respondents were 37. For experience levels of the respondents for the urban location, 13 reported 1-5 years (35.1%), 15 reported 6-10 years (40.5%), 2 reported 11-15 years (5.4%), and seven reported 16 or more years (18.9%). For years of experience by rural location, the total whole sample respondents totaled 182. For experience levels of rural respondents 69 reported 1-5 years (37.9%), 59 reported 6-10 years (32.4%), 22 reported 11-15 years (12.1%), and 32 reported 16 or more years (17.6%).

Vision Descriptive Data by Location (Rural)

Table 12 lists the superintendent's and principal's responses of the descriptive data by location for rural respondents in relation to vision. The highest rated sample responses of superintendents and principals were trust, $M = 5.75$, $SD = .659$; implementation and development, $M = 5.57$, $SD = .659$; and possess strong leadership traits, $M = 5.53$, $SD = .628$. Overall, the vision composite score ranged from a minimum of 19 to a maximum of 30, $M = 27.8$, $SD = 1.91$. When comparing the superintendent's and principal's location of rural respondents to the whole sample of superintendents and principals responses each perceived trust as the highest effective characteristic needed. The perceived differences were in the superintendent's and principal's location of rural that rated implementation and development and possess strong leadership traits as the most important characteristics needed; however, the whole sample of superintendents and principals perceived implementation and development of the vision and setting high goals as the predominant characteristics needed.

Table 12

Views on Vision by Location for Rural Respondents

Vision	*M*	*SD*
Implementation and development	5.57	.659
Increase trust	5.75	.556
Structure safe learning environment	5.51	.646
Set high goals and expectations	5.52	.610
Possess strong leadership traits	5.53	.628
Composite	27.88	3.020

Management Descriptive Data by Location (Rural)

Table 13 lists the superintendents and principals descriptive data by location for management. The most highly rated sample responses of superintendents and principals were making genuine decisions, *M* = 5.54, *SD* = .799; analyzing data, *M* = 5.20, *SD* = .799; and inspire others to follow goals, *M* = 5.01, *SD* = .898. Overall, the management composite score ranged from a minimum of 15 to a maximum of 30, *M* = 25.07, *SD* = 2.78. When comparing superintendent's and principal's location of rural responses to the whole sample of superintendents and principals both perceived making genuine decisions, analyzing data, and inspiring others to follow goals as the most highly effective characteristics needed.

Table 13

Views on Management by Location of Rural Respondents

Management	*M*	*SD*
Analyzing data	5.20	.799
Making genuine decisions	5.54	.591
Adjust leadership style for situations	4.74	1.180
Set objectives for organization	4.58	1.020
Inspire others to follow goals	5.01	.898
Composite	25.07	2.780

Collaboration Descriptive Data by Location (Rural)

Descriptive data in Table 14 reflects the responses of superintendent's and principal's location of rural in relation to collaboration. The most highly rated sample responses of superintendents and principals were good working relationship with the principal, *M* = 5.74, *SD* = .463; visibility among schools, *M* = 5.48, *SD* = .671; and communicating with stakeholders, *M* = 5.45, *SD* = .609. Overall, the collaboration composite score ranged from a minimum of 20 to a maximum of 30, *M* = 27.46, *SD* = 1.98. When comparing the superintendents' and principals' location of rural responses to the whole sample of superintendents and principals both perceived good working relationship with the principal and communicating with stakeholders as the most highly rated highest characteristics needed. The perceived differences of superintendents and principals by location of rural respondents rated visibility as the characteristics needed; however,

the whole sample of superintendents and principals perceived creating a collaboration culture as the most highly valued characteristic needed.

Table 14

Views on Collaboration by Location of Rural Respondents

Collaboration	*M*	*SD*
Having a servant leadership style	5.44	.797
Communicating with stakeholders	5.45	.609
Good working relationship with the principal	5.74	.463
Visibility among schools	5.48	.671
Creating a culture of collaboration	5.35	.671
Composite	27.46	1.980

Instructional Descriptive Data by Location (Rural)

Table 15 lists the superintendent's and principal's responses of the descriptive data by location. The most highly rated sample responses of superintendents and principals were provide professional development, $M = 5.37$, $SD = .623$; develop skills to be globally competitive, $M = 4.86$, $SD = .848$; and challenge staff members, $M = 4.72$, $SD = .960$. Overall, the instructional strategies composite score ranged from a minimum of 15 to a maximum of 30, $M = 23.82$, $SD = 3.02$. Superintendents and principals in the location of rural both rated the three most important effective characteristics in the area of instruction professional development, develop skills to be globally competitive, and challenge staff members.

Table 15

Views on Instructional Leadership Skills by Location of Rural Respondents

Instructional Leadership Skills	*M*	*SD*
Develop skills to be globally competitive	4.86	.795
Provide professional development	5.37	.623
Rewards and recognition with staff	4.56	1.020
Challenge staff members	4.72	.960
Classroom instructional strategies	4.31	.944
Composite	23.82	3.020

Vision Descriptive Data by Location (Suburban)

Table 16 lists the superintendents and principals responses of the descriptive data by location of suburban respondents in relation to vision. The three most chosen sample responses of superintendents and principals were trust, $M = 5.75$, $SD = .659$; implementation and development, $M = 5.57$, $SD = .659$; and possess strong leadership traits, $M = 5.53$, $SD = .628$. Overall, the vision composite score ranged from a minimum of 11 to a maximum of 30. $M = 27.8$, $SD = 1.91$. When comparing the superintendents' and principals' location of suburban to the whole sample of superintendents and principals both perceived trust as the most important characteristic needed. The perceived differences were in the superintendents and principals sample by location of suburban rated implementation and development and possess strong leadership traits as the most critical characteristics needed; however, the whole sample of

superintendents and principals perceived implementation and development of the vision and setting high goals as the most critical characteristics needed.

Table 16

Views on Vision by Location of Suburban Respondents

Vision	*M*	*SD*
Implementation and development	5.69	.719
Increase trust	5.69	.726
Structure safe learning environment	5.58	.674
Set high goals and expectations	5.71	.656
Possess strong leadership traits	5.64	.579
Composite	28.31	2.360

Management Descriptive Data by Location (Suburban)

Table 17 lists the responses of suburban respondents of superintendents and principals for the descriptive data by location in relation to management. The three most frequent sample responses by superintendents and principals were making genuine decisions, $M = 5.29$, $SD = .812$; analyzing data, $M = 5.29$, $SD = .812$; and inspire others to follow goals, $M = 5.10$, $SD = .916$. Overall, the management composite score ranged from a minimum of 17 to a maximum of 30, $M = 25.41$, $SD = 2.77$. When comparing the location of suburban respondents' of superintendents and principals to the whole sample of superintendents and principal, both perceived making genuine decisions, analyzing data, and inspiring others to follow goals as the most common three highest characteristics needed.

Table 17

Views on Management by Location of Suburban

Management	*M*	*SD*
Analyzing data	5.29	.812
Making genuine decisions	5.54	.818
Adjust leadership style for situations	4.86	1.080
Set objectives for organization	4.64	1.020
Inspire others to follow goals	5.10	.916
Composite	25.41	2.770

Collaboration Descriptive Data by Location (Suburban)

Table 18 lists the superintendent's and principal's responses of the descriptive data of suburban relation to collaboration. The three most highly chosen responses of the superintendents and principals were good working relationship with the principal, *M* = 5.66, *SD* = .574; creating a collaboration culture, *M* = 5.60, *SD* = .566; and communicating with stakeholders, *M* = 5.58, *SD* = .711. Overall, the collaboration composite score ranged from a minimum of 18 to a maximum of 30, *M* = 27.46, *SD* = 1.98. When comparing the superintendents' and principals' location of suburban responses to the whole sample of superintendents and principals both perceived good working relationship with the principal, creating a collaboration culture, and communicating with stakeholders, as the three most needed characteristics needed.

Table 18

Views on Collaboration by Location of Suburban

Collaboration	*M*	*SD*
Having a servant leadership style	5.28	.882
Communicating with stakeholders	5.58	.711
Good working relationship with the principal	5.66	.574
Visibility among schools	5.42	.703
Creating a culture of collaboration	5.60	.566
Composite	27.54	2.250

Instructional Leadership Skills Descriptive Data by Location (Suburban)

Table 19 lists the superintendent's and principal's location of suburban respondents in relation to instructional leadership skills. The most chosen three sample responses of superintendents and principals were provide professional development, $M = 5.44$, $SD = .792$; develop skills to be globally competitive, $M = 5.14$, $SD = .795$; and challenge staff members, $M = 4.86$, $SD = 1.08$. Overall, the instructional leadership skills composite score ranged from a minimum of 14 to a maximum of 30, $M = 24.63$, $SD = 2.88$. When comparing superintendents' and principals' location of suburban responses to the whole sample of superintendents and principals both perceived professional development, develop skills to be globally competitive, and challenge staff members as the three highest characteristics needed.

Table 19

Views on Instructional Leadership Skills by Location of Suburban

Instructional Leadership Skills	*M*	*SD*
Develop skills to be globally competitive	5.14	.795
Provide professional development	5.44	.792
Rewards and recognition with staff	4.64	.941
Challenge staff members	4.86	1.080
Classroom instructional strategies	4.56	.944
Composite	24.63	2.880

Vision Descriptive Data by Location (Urban)

Vision data analyzed in Table 20 lists the superintendent's and principal's responses of location of urban. The predominant chosen three sample responses by superintendents and principals were trust, $M = 5.78$, $SD = .479$; implementation and development, $M = 5.78$, $SD = .277$; and set high goals and expectations, $M = 5.70$, $SD = .520$. Overall, the vision composite score ranged from a minimum of 25 to a maximum of 30, $M = 27.88$, $SD = 3.02$. When comparing the location of urban respondents of superintendents and principals to the highest responses of the whole sample of superintendents and principals both perceived trust, implementation and development, and setting high goals and expectations as the three characteristics needed.

Table 20

Views on Vision by Location of Urban

Vision	*M*	*SD*
Implementation and development	5.59	.956
Increase trust	5.78	.277
Structure safe learning environment	5.78	.479
Set high goals and expectations	5.70	.520
Possess strong leadership traits	5.65	.538
Composite	28.65	1.640

Management Descriptive Data by Location (Urban)

Table 21 lists the superintendent's and principal's responses of the descriptive data by location of urban in relation to management. The three most important rated responses of superintendents and principals were analyzing data, $M = 5.49$, $SD = .559$; making genuine decisions, $M = 5.46$, $SD = .900$; and inspire others to follow goals, $M = 5.38$, $SD = 2.23$. Overall, the management composite score ranged from a minimum of 22 to a maximum of 30, $M = 25.07$, $SD = 2.78$. When comparing the location of urban respondents' superintendents and principals to the whole sample of superintendents and principals both perceived making genuine decisions, analyzing data, and inspiring others to follow goals as the most frequent three highest characteristics needed.

Table 21

Views on Management by Location of Urban

Management	*M*	*SD*
Analyzing data	5.49	.559
Making genuine decisions	5.46	.900
Adjust leadership style for situations	4.89	1.220
Set objectives for organization	5.00	.782
Inspire others to follow goals	5.38	.982
Composite	26.22	2.230

Collaboration Descriptive Data by Location (Urban)

In Table 22 are the lists of the superintendent's and principal's responses of location of urban for collaboration. The predominant three highest sample responses of superintendents and principals were good working relationship with the principal, $M = 5.81$, $SD = .462$; communicating with stakeholders, $M = 5.65$, $SD = .676$; and visibility among schools $M = 5.65$, $SD = .538$. Overall, the collaboration composite score ranged from a minimum of 23 to a maximum of 30, $M = 27.46$, $SD = 1.98$. When comparing the location of urban superintendents' and principals' responses to the whole sample of superintendents and principals both perceived good working relationship with the principal and communicating with stakeholders as the two highest characteristics needed. The perceived differences were in the superintendents and principals sample by location of urban respondents who rated visibility as the effective

characteristics needed; however, the superintendents and principals whole sample perceived creating a collaboration culture as the effective characteristic needed.

Table 22

Views on Collaboration by Location of Urban

Collaboration	*M*	*SD*
Having a servant leadership style	5.41	.832
Communicating with stakeholders	5.65	.676
Good working relationship with the principal	5.81	.462
Visibility among schools	5.65	.538
Creating a culture of collaboration	5.65	.484
Composite	28.16	1.890

Instructional Leadership Skills Descriptive Data by Location (Urban)

The descriptive data in Table 23 lists the superintendent's and principal's responses by location of urban in relation to instructional. The predominate three chosen sample responses of superintendents and principals were provide professional development, $M = 5.46$, $SD = .730$; develop skills to be globally competitive, $M = 5.08$, $SD = .795$; and challenge staff members, $M = 5.08$, $SD = .795$. Overall, the instructional leadership skills composite score ranged from a minimum of 18 to a maximum of 30, $M = 23.82$, $SD = 3.02$. When comparing superintendents' and principals' location of urban respondents' responses to the whole sample of superintendents and principals both perceived professional development, develop skills to be globally competitive, and challenge staff members as the three highest effective characteristics needed.

Table 23

Views on Instructional Leadership Skills by Location of Urban

Instructional Leadership Skills	*M*	*SD*
Develop skills to be globally competitive	5.08	.795
Provide professional development	5.46	.730
Rewards and recognition with staff	4.76	.895
Challenge staff members	5.08	.795
Classroom instructional strategies	4.70	.996
Composite	25.08	2.870

Descriptive Data for Experience

Data was collected and entered into SPSS software by experience level to report the perceptions of superintendents and principals on effective characteristics of superintendents. The total number of respondents reporting having 1-5 years of experience was 137-53 superintendents (38.7%) and 84 principals (61.3%). Out of the 137 total respondents for 1-5 years of experience it was reported that 69 were from rural locations (50.4%), 55 were from suburban locations (40.1%), and 13 were from urban locations (9.5%). The level of 6-10 years of experience had a total number of respondents of 120. Thirty-five of those respondents were superintendents (29.2%) and 85 were principals (70.8%). Of the 120 total respondents having 6-10 years of experience, 59 were from rural locations (49.2%), 46 were from suburban locations (38.3%), and 15 were from urban locations (12.5%). For 11-15 years of experience, the total

number of respondents was 46, of which, 13 were superintendents (28.3%) and 33 were principals (71.7%). Of the 46 total respondents with 11-15 years of experience, 22 were from rural locations (47.8%), 22 were from suburban locations (47.8%), and 2 were from urban locations (4.3%). For 16 or more years of experience, the total number of respondents was 70, of which, 16 were superintendents (22.9%) and 54 were principals (77.1%). Of the 70 total respondents for 16 or more years of experience, 32 were from rural locations (45.7%), 31 were from suburban locations (44.3%), and 7 were from urban locations (10.0%).

Vision Descriptive Data by Experience Level (1-5 Years)

Table 24 lists the superintendents and principals descriptive data responses by experience level 1-5 years. The three highest sample responses of superintendents and principals were trust, $M = 5.72$, $SD = .593$; set high goals and expectations, $M = 5.66$, $SD = .574$; and possess strong leadership traits, $M = 5.60$, $SD = .575$. Overall, the vision composite score ranged from a minimum of 19 to a maximum of 30, $M = 28.07$, $SD = 1.92$. When comparing superintendents' and principals' experience level of 1-5 years most common responses to the whole sample of superintendents and principals both perceived trust and implementation and development were reported as the two most effective characteristics needed. The perceived differences of superintendents' and principals' experience level of 1-5 years rated possessing strong leadership traits as the characteristic needed; however, the whole sample of superintendents and principals perceived setting high goals and expectations.

Table 24

Views on Vision by Experience Level 1-5 Years

Vision	*M*	*SD*
Implementation and development	5.54	.805
Increase trust	5.72	.593
Structure safe learning environment	5.55	.617
Set high goals and expectations	5.66	.574
Possess strong leadership traits	5.60	.575
Composite	28.07	1.920

Management Descriptive Data by Experience Level (1-5 Years)

Table 25 presents superintendent's and principal's responses by those with 1-5 years of experience in relation to management. The most frequent rated three sample responses of superintendents and principals were making genuine decisions, $M = 5.47$, $SD = .665$; analyzing data, $M = 5.31$, $SD = .763$; and inspire others to follow goals, $M = 5.06$, $SD = .976$. Overall, the management composite score ranged from a minimum of 15 to a maximum of 30, $M = 25.18$, $SD = 2.74$. When comparing superintendents' and principals' experience level of 1-5 years responses to the whole sample of superintendents and principals both perceived making genuine decisions, analyzing data, and inspiring others to follow goals as the three highest characteristics needed.

Table 25

Views on Management by Experience Level 1-5 Years

Management	*M*	*SD*
Analyzing data	5.31	.763
Making genuine decisions	5.47	.665
Adjust leadership style for situations	4.72	1.100
Set objectives for organization	4.63	.955
Inspire others to follow goals	5.06	.976
Composite	25.18	2.740

Collaboration Descriptive Data by Experience Level (1-5 Years)

Table 26 lists superintendents' and principals' responses by experience level (1-5 years) in relation to collaboration. The most prevalent three sample responses of superintendents and principals were good working relationship with the principal, $M = 5.71$, $SD = .502$; visibility among schools $M = 5.52$, $SD = .631$; and communicating with stakeholders $M = 5.50$, $SD = .596$. Overall, the collaboration composite score ranged from a minimum of 23 to a maximum of 30. $M = 27.49$, $SD = 2.87$. When comparing the superintendent's and principal's experience level of 1-5 years responses to the whole sample of superintendents and principals both perceived good working relationship with the principal and communicating with stakeholders as the two highest characteristics needed. The perceived differences were in the sample of superintendents' and principals' experience level of 1-5 years that rated visibility as the top characteristic needed;

however, the whole sample of superintendents and principals perceived creating a collaboration culture as the effective characteristic needed

Table 26

Views on Collaboration by Experience Level 1-5 Years

Collaboration	*M*	*SD*
Having a servant leadership style	5.28	.874
Communicating with stakeholders	5.50	.596
Good working relationship with the principal	5.71	.502
Visibility among schools	5.52	.631
Creating a culture of collaboration	5.48	.595
Composite	27.49	2.870

Instructional Leadership Skills Descriptive Data by Experience Level (1-5 Years)

Table 27 lists the descriptive data of superintendents and principals by experience level (1-5 years) in relation to instructional leadership skills. The most chosen three sample responses of superintendents and principals were to provide professional development, $M = 5.47$, $SD = .642$; develop skills to be globally competitive, $M = 5.01$, $SD = .707$; and challenge staff members, $M = 4.77$, $SD = .934$. Overall, the instructional leadership skills composite score ranged from a minimum of 15 to a maximum of 30, $M = 24.29$, $SD = 2.87$. When comparing the superintendents' and principals' experience level 1-5 years responses to the whole sample of superintendents and principals both perceived professional development, develop skills to be globally competitive, and challenge staff members as the three highest characteristics needed.

Table 27

Views on Instructional Leadership Skills by Experience Level 1-5 Years

Instructional Leadership Skills	*M*	*SD*
Develop skills to be globally competitive	5.01	.707
Provide professional development	5.47	.642
Rewards and recognition with staff	4.55	.931
Challenge staff members	4.77	.934
Classroom instructional strategies	4.49	.993
Composite	24.29	2.870

Vision Descriptive Data by Experience Level (6-10 Years)

Table 28 lists the superintendents and principals responses by experience level (6-10 years) in relation to vision. The most frequently rated three sample responses of superintendents and principals were trust, *M* = 5.70, *SD* = .784; implementation and development, *M* = 5.68, *SD* = .769; and possess strong leadership traits, *M* = 5.60, *SD* = .640. Overall, the vision composite score ranged from a minimum of 11 to a maximum of 30, *M* = 28.11, *SD* = 2.52. When comparing the superintendents' and principals experience level 6-10 years to the superintendents and principals responses of the whole sample' both perceived trust and implementation and development as the two effective characteristics needed. The perceived differences were in the superintendents and principals sample by experience level 6-10 years that rated possessing strong

leadership traits as the characteristic needed, however the whole sample of superintendents and principals perceived setting high goals and expectations

Table 28

Views on Vision by Experience Level 6-10 Years

Vision	*M*	*SD*
Implementation and development	5.68	.769
Increase trust	5.70	.784
Structure safe learning environment	5.56	.719
Set high goals and expectations	5.58	.729
Possess strong leadership traits	5.60	.640
Composite	28.11	2.520

Management Descriptive Data by Experience Level (6-10 Years)

Table 29 lists the descriptive data of superintendents and principals by experience level 6-10 years in relation to management. The most common three sample responses of superintendents and principals were making genuine decisions, $M = 5.53$, $SD = .755$; analyzing data, $M = 5.23$, $SD = .867$; and inspire others to follow goals, $M = 5.18$, $SD = .866$. Overall, the management composite score ranged from a minimum of 18 to a maximum of 30, $M = 25.46$, $SD = 2.83$. When comparing the superintendents' and principals' experience level 6-10 years responses to the whole sample of superintendents and principals both perceived making genuine decisions, analyzing data, and inspiring others to follow goals as the three highest effective characteristics needed.

Table 29

Views on Management by Experience Level 6-10 Years

Management	*M*	*SD*
Analyzing data	5.23	.867
Making genuine decisions	5.53	.755
Adjust leadership style for situations	4.88	1.160
Set objectives for organization	4.63	1.080
Inspire others to follow goals	5.18	.866
Composite	25.46	2.830

Collaboration Descriptive Data by Experience Level (6-10 Years)

Collaboration data in Table 30 lists the superintendents and principals responses by experience level of 6-10 years. The dominant chosen three sample responses of superintendents and principals were good working relationship with the principal, *M* = 5.69, *SD* = .577; communicating with stakeholders *M* = 5.58, *SD* = .705; and visibility among schools *M* = 5.47, *SD* = .685. Overall, the collaboration composite score ranged from a minimum of 18 to a maximum of 30, *M* = 27.58, *SD* = 2.31. When comparing the superintendents' and principals' experience level 6-10 years responses to the whole sample of superintendents and principals both perceived good working relationship with the principal and communicating with stakeholders as the two highest effective characteristics needed. The perceived differences were in the sample of

superintendents' and principals' experience level of 6-10 years that rated visibility as the effective characteristic needed; however, the whole sample of superintendents and principals perceived creating a collaboration culture as the effective characteristic needed.

Table 30

Views on Collaboration by Experience Level 6-10 Years

Collaboration	*M*	*SD*
Having a servant leadership style	5.39	.863
Communicating with stakeholders	5.58	.705
Good working relationship with the principal	5.69	.577
Visibility among schools	5.47	.685
Creating a culture of collaboration	5.45	.659
Composite	27.58	2.310

Instructional Leadership Skills Descriptive Data by Experience Level (6-10 Years)

Table 31 contains the descriptive data of superintendents' and principals' experience level 6-10 years in relation to instructional leadership skills. The most common rated three sample responses of superintendents and principals were provide professional development, M = 5.40, SD = .824; develop skills to be globally competitive, M = 4.93, SD = .877; and challenge staff members, M = 4.79, SD = .916. Overall, the instructional leadership skills composite scores ranged from a minimum of 14 to a maximum of 30, with an M = 24.25, SD = 3.21. When comparing superintendents' and principals' experience level 6-10 years responses to the whole sample of superintendents and principals both perceived professional development, develop

skills to be globally competitive, and challenge staff members as the three highest characteristics needed.

Table 31

Views on Instructional Leadership Skills by Experience Level 6-10 Years

Instructional Leadership Skills	*M*	*SD*
Develop skills to be globally competitive	4.93	.877
Provide professional development	5.40	.824
Rewards and recognition with staff	4.69	.994
Challenge staff members	4.79	.916
Classroom instructional strategies	4.43	.976
Composite	24.25	3.210

Vision Descriptive Data by Experience Level (11-15 Years)

Vision data analyzed in Table 32 lists the superintendent's and principal's responses of the descriptive data by experience level of 11-15 years. The three most common chosen sample responses of superintendents and principals were trust, $M = 5.89$, $SD = .315$; implementation and development, $M = 5.74$, $SD = .444$; and structure a safe learning environment, $M = 5.57$, $SD = .655$. Overall, the vision composite score ranged from a minimum of 24 to a maximum of 30, $M = 28.11$, $SD = 1.65$. When comparing the superintendents' and principals' experience level (11-15 years) to the responses to the whole sample of superintendents and principals both perceived trust and implementation and development as the two effective characteristics needed. The

perceived differences of superintendents' and principals' experience level (11-15 years) rated providing a safe learning environment as the effective characteristics needed; however, the whole sample of superintendents and principals perceived setting high goals and expectations.

Table 32

Views on Vision by Experience Level 11-15 Years

Vision	*M*	*SD*
Implementation and development	5.74	.444
Increase trust	5.89	.315
Structure safe learning environment	5.57	.655
Set high goals and expectations	5.41	.652
Possess strong leadership traits	5.50	.587
Composite	28.11	1.650

Management Descriptive Data by Experience Level (11-15 Years)

Table 33 lists superintendents' and principals' responses of the descriptive data by experience level of 11-15 years. The predominant chosen three sample responses of superintendents and principals were making genuine decisions, $M = 5.30$, $SD = 1.01$; analyzing data, $M = 5.17$, $SD = .677$; and inspire others to follow goals, $M = 4.98$, $SD = .931$. Overall, the management composite score ranged from a minimum of 17 to a maximum of 30, $M = 24.65$, $SD = 2.78$. When comparing the superintendents' and principals' experience level 11-15 years

responses to the whole sample of superintendents and principals both perceived making genuine decisions, analyzing data, and inspiring others to follow goals as the three highest effective characteristics needed.

Table 33

Views on Management by Experience Level 11-15 Years

Management	*M*	*SD*
Analyzing data	5.17	.677
Making genuine decisions	5.30	1.010
Adjust leadership style for situations	4.70	1.280
Set objectives for organization	4.50	1.020
Inspire others to follow goals	4.98	.931
Composite	24.65	2.780

Collaboration Descriptive Data by Experience Level (11-15 Years)

Table 34 lists the superintendent's and principal's responses of the descriptive data by experience level of 11-15 years. The most selected three responses of superintendents and principals were good working relationship with the principal, $M = 5.72$, $SD = .455$; communicating with stakeholders, $M = 5.54$, $SD = .585$; and creating a collaboration culture, $M = 5.46$, $SD = .721$. Overall, the collaboration composite score ranged from a minimum of 23 to a maximum of 30, $M = 27.48$, $SD = 1.99$. When comparing the superintendents' and principals' experience level 11-15 years responses to the whole sample of superintendents and principals

both perceived good working relationship with the principal, communicating with stakeholders, and creating a collaboration culture as the three highest effective characteristics needed.

Table 34

Views on Collaboration by Experience Level 11-15 Years

Collaboration	*M*	*SD*
Having a servant leadership style	5.35	.766
Communicating with stakeholders	5.54	.585
Good working relationship with the principal	5.72	.455
Visibility among schools	5.41	.748
Creating a culture of collaboration	5.46	.721
Composite	27.48	1.990

Instructional Leadership Skills Descriptive Data by Experience Level (11-15 Years)

Table 35 lists the superintendents' and principals' responses by experience level of 11-15 years. The three highest sample responses of superintendents and principals were provide professional development, $M = 5.33$, $SD = .668$; develop skills to be globally competitive, $M = 4.87$, $SD = .668$; and challenge staff members, $M = 4.63$, $SD = 1.10$. Overall, the instructional strategies composite score ranged from a minimum of 15 to maximum of 30, $M = 23.39$, $SD = 2.71$. When comparing superintendents' and principals' experience level 11-15 years responses to the whole sample of superintendents and principals both perceived professional development,

develop skills to be globally competitive, and challenge staff members as the three highest effective characteristics needed.

Table 35

Views on Instructional Leadership Skills by Experience Level 11-15 Years

Instructional Leadership Skills	*M*	*SD*
Develop skills to be globally competitive	4.87	.668
Provide professional development	5.33	.668
Rewards and recognition with staff	4.30	.963
Challenge staff members	4.63	1.100
Classroom instructional strategies	4.26	.801
Composite	23.39	2.710

Vision Descriptive Data by Experience Level (16 or More Years)

Table 36 lists the superintendents' and principals' responses by experience level of 16 or more years. The most common selected three sample responses of superintendents and principals were trust, $M = 5.79$, $SD = .447$; set high goals and expectations, $M = 5.71$, $SD = .486$; and implementation and development of the vision, $M = 5.62$, $SD = .572$. Overall, the vision composite score ranged from a minimum of 21 and a maximum of 30, $M = 28.33$, $SD = 1.89$. When comparing the superintendents' and principals' experience level 16 or more years to responses to the whole sample of superintendents and principals both perceived trust, setting

high goals and expectations, and implementation and development of the vision as the three effective characteristics needed.

Table 36

Views on Vision by Experience Level 16 or more Years

Vision	*M*	*SD*
Implementation and development	5.62	.572
Increase trust	5.79	.447
Structure safe learning environment	5.61	.572
Set high goals and expectations	5.71	.486
Possess strong leadership traits	5.60	.600
Composite	28.33	1.890

Management Descriptive Data by Experience Level (16 or More Years)

Table 37 lists the superintendents' and principals' responses by experience level 16 or more years. The predominant chosen three sample responses of superintendents and principals were making genuine decisions, $M = 5.76$, $SD = .464$; analyzing data, $M = 5.31$, $SD = .772$; and inspire others to follow goals, $M = 5.06$, $SD = .883$. Overall, the management composite score ranged from a minimum of 18 and a maximum of 30, $M = 25.84$, $SD = 2.50$. When comparing the superintendents' and principals' experience level 16 or more years responses to the whole

sample of superintendents and principals both perceived making genuine decisions, analyzing data, and inspiring others to follow goals as the three highest effective characteristics needed.

Table 37

Views on Management by Experience Level 16 or More Years

Management	*M*	*SD*
Analyzing data	5.31	.772
Making genuine decisions	5.76	.464
Adjust leadership style for situations	4.91	1.070
Set objectives for organization	4.80	.910
Inspire others to follow goals	5.06	.883
Composite	25.84	2.50

Collaboration Descriptive Data by Experience Level (16+ Years)

Table 38 lists the superintendents' and principals' responses of the descriptive data by experience level 16 or more years. The three common chosen sample responses of superintendents and principals were good working relationship with the principal, *M* = 5.77, *SD* = .456; creating a collaboration culture, *M* = 5.56, *SD* = .555; and having a servant leadership style, *M* = 5.71, *SD* = .756. Overall, the collaboration composite score ranged from a minimum of 20 to a maximum of 30, *M* = 27.74, *SD* = 2.05. When comparing the superintendents' and

principals' experience level 16 or more years responses to the whole sample of superintendents and principals both perceived good working relationship with the principal and creating collaboration culture as the two effective characteristics needed. The perceived differences were in the superintendents' and principals' sample experience level of 16 or more years rated having a servant leadership style as the effective characteristics needed; however, the whole sample of superintendents and principals perceived communicating with stakeholders as the effective characteristics needed.

Table 38

Views on Collaboration by Experience Level 16 or More Years

Collaboration	*M*	*SD*
Having a servant leadership style	5.51	.756
Communicating with stakeholders	5.47	.756
Good working relationship with the principal	5.77	.456
Visibility among schools	5.43	.693
Creating a culture of collaboration	5.56	.555
Composite	27.74	2.050

Instructional Leadership Skills Descriptive Data by Experience Level (16 or More Years)

Table 39 lists the superintendents' and principals' responses of the descriptive data by experience level of 16 or more years in relation to instructional skills. The highest rated three sample responses of superintendents and principals were provide professional development, M = 5.36, SD = .638; develop skills to be globally competitive, M = 5.14, SD = .687; and challenge staff members, M = 5.06, SD = .814. Overall, the instructional strategies composite score ranged

from a minimum of 18 and maximum of 30, *M* = 24.90, *SD* = 2.84. When comparing superintendents' and principals' experience level 16 or more years responses to the whole sample of superintendents and principals both perceived professional development, develop skills to be globally competitive, and challenge staff members as the three highest effective characteristics needed.

Table 39

Views on Instructional Leadership Skills by Experience Level 16 or More Years

Instructional Leadership Skills	*M*	*SD*
Develop skills to be globally competitive	5.14	.687
Provide professional development	5.36	.638
Rewards and recognition with staff	4.80	1.000
Challenge staff members	5.06	.814
Classroom instructional strategies	4.54	.863
Composite	24.90	2.840

Inferential Test Results

The purpose of this study was to identify effective characteristics of superintendents through the principal's perception. This study explored the perceptions of Indiana superintendents and principals on effective characteristics of superintendents. These perceptions were studied to determine if the superintendents' perceptions were different from the principals' perceptions. For the research questions for location and level of years of experience, a one-way ANOVA test was used to measure the significant differences. The superintendents' and principals' perceptions were measured with an independent *t* test. The one-way ANOVA test

was selected because there was one dependent variable and the independent variable had more than two levels for each of the null hypothesis. For the research questions on position type, an independent *t* test was conducted. The 12 research questions sought to determine if there were significant differences in perceptions in four areas of vision, management, collaboration and instructional leadership skills. Each area had an independent variable of position type for the two levels of principal or superintendent. The independent variable of demographic location has three levels of suburban, urban, or rural. The independent variable of experience in the position has four levels, including 1-5 years, 6-10 years, 11-15 years, and 16 or more years. If there were significant differences, a post hoc test was conducted to identify where differences occurred.

The sample was evaluated to verify that all of the assumptions of the one-way ANOVA (independent observations, normally distributed populations, and homogeneous variances) were satisfied. The assumption of variance was examined using Levene's test of equality of variances to ensure that all variances on the dependent variable were equal for all groups. The assumption of normality was examined using the Shapiro-Wilk's test to determine if the scores on the dependent variable were normally distributed for all groups. The .05 level was used to determine significance.

Research Question 1

The null hypothesis for Research Question 1 was, "There were no statistically significant differences on perceptions regarding effective characteristics for superintendents in the area of vision, values, and goals based on position type." The research question was examined to determine if there were differences in perceptions in the area of vision between superintendents and principals. An independent sample *t* test was conducted for the position type to determine if significant differences and the assumptions were tested to ensure validity of the results.

The dependent variables were examined to determine if any external factors or outliers existed. Box plots were created and examined to identify outliers. This assumption was met as there were no data points more than 1.5 standard deviations away from the edge within the box plots. The assumption of normality was examined using Shapiro-Wilk's test to determine if the scores on the dependent variable were normally distributed for both groups. This assumption was met as the significance value was greater than .05. The assumption of homogeneity of variance was examined using Levene's test of equality to ensure that all variances of the dependent variable were equal for all groups. This assumption was met as the significance value was greater than .05, $F = .297$, $p = .586$.

Superintendent responses ($M = 28.14$, $SD = 1.87$) were tested to determine whether significant differences on the vision composition score existed when compared to the principal responses ($M = 28.13$, $SD = 2.19$). There was no significant difference found in the independent sample t test, $t(371)=.053$, $p = .957$, two-tailed. As evident of the inferential test findings, any potential differences were not statically proven, thus the null hypothesis was retained.

Research Question 2

The null hypothesis for Research Question 2 was, "There is no statistically significant difference on perceptions regarding effective characteristics for superintendents in the area of vision, values, and goals based on location type." The research question was examined to determine if there were differences in perceptions in the area of vision between superintendents and principals with regard to location of rural, suburban, and urban. A one-way ANOVA using SPSS was used to test for significant differences and the assumptions were tested to ensure validity of the results.

The dependent variables were examined to determine if any external factors or outliers

existed. Box plots were created to identify any outliers. This assumption was met as there were no data points more than 1.5 standard deviations outside the box plots. The assumption of normality was examined using Shapiro-Wilk's test to determine if the scores on the dependent variable were normally distributed for both groups. This assumption was met as the significance value was greater than .05. The assumption of homogeneity of variance was examined using Levene's test of equality to ensure that all variances of the dependent variable were equal for all groups. This assumption was met as the significance value was greater than .05, $F = .154$, $p = .857$.

The results for rural ($M = 27.88$, $SD = 1.91$), suburban ($M = 28.31$, $SD = 2.35$), and urban ($M = 28.65$, $SD = 1.64$) were tested to determine whether differences existed. Through examination of the results of the one-way ANOVA, it was determined that significant differences with the model existed within the location types, $F(2, 370) = 3.098$, $p = .046$. As evident of the inferential test findings, the null hypothesis was rejected showing a significant difference.

Due to the significant difference found with the model, a Tukey HSD post hoc test was conducted to determine where a significance difference existed. This was the appropriate post hoc test since there was no violation for the assumption of homogeneity of variance; thus, equal variance was assumed. Respondents from rural locations scored the importance of vision significantly lower than urban respondents, $p = .037$. No other comparisons were significant.

Research Question 3

The null hypothesis for Research Question 3 was, "There is no statistically significant difference on perceptions regarding effective characteristics for superintendents in the area of vision, values, and goals based on respondent's years of employment in current position." The research question was examined to determine if there were differences in perceptions in the area

of vision between superintendents and principals with regard to years of experience. A one-way ANOVA using SPSS was used to test for significant difference and the assumptions were tested to ensure validity of the results.

The dependent variables were examined to determine if any external factors or outliers existed. Examination of box plots did not reveal any outliers. This assumption was met as no data points existed more than 1.5 standard deviations from the edges of the box plots. The assumption of normality was examined using Shapiro-Wilk's test to determine if the scores on the dependent variable were normally distributed for both groups. This assumption was met as the significance value was greater than .05. The assumption of homogeneity of variance was examined using Levene's test of equality to ensure that all variances of the dependent variable were equal for all groups. This assumption was met as the significance value was greater than .05, $F = .544$, $p = .653$.

The results for years of experience were compared to determine whether significant differences on any following levels: 1-5 years ($M = 28.07$, $SD = 1.92$), 6-10 years ($M = 28.12$, $SD = 2.51$), 11-15 years ($M = 28.11$, $SD = 1.65$), 16+ years ($M = 28.33$, $SD = 1.89$), and total $M = 28.14$, $SD = 2.09$). A significant difference based on years of experience for the respondents was not present. The results of the one-way ANOVA demonstrated this lack of significant differences, $F(3, 369) = .253$, $p = .859$. As evident of the inferential test findings, any potential differences were not statically proven; thus, the null hypothesis was retained.

Research Questions 4 through 6

The null hypotheses for Research Question 4 through 6 were not tested due to the lack of internal consistency among the questions in this area of the survey. The composite score would not serve as a true indicator of the management level within the survey responses due to the low

value on the Cronbach's alpha. The descriptive results were still included within the study in previous sections.

Research Question 7

Investigation of the null hypothesis for Research Question 7 indicated no statistically significant difference on perceptions regarding effective characteristics for superintendents in the area of collaboration skills based on position type. The research question was surveyed to determine if there were differences in perceptions in the area of collaboration between superintendents and principals. An independent sample *t* test was conducted for the position type to determine significant differences and the assumptions were tested to ensure validity of the results.

The dependent variables were examined to determine if any external factors or outliers existed. An examination of the box plots was conducted to identify if any outliers existed. This assumption was met as there were no data points more than 1.5 standard deviations away from the edge within the box plots. The assumption of normality was examined using Shapiro-Wilk's test to determine if the scores on the dependent variable were normally distributed for both groups. This assumption was met as the significance value was greater than .05. The assumption of homogeneity of variance was examined using Levene's test of equality to ensure that all variances of the dependent variable were equal for all groups. This assumption was met as the significance value was greater than .05, $F = .043$, $p = .836$.

Superintendent responses ($M = 27.30$, $SD = 2.05$) were tested to determine whether significant differences on the collaboration composition score existed when compared to the principal responses ($M = 27.69$, $SD = 2.10$). There was no significant difference found in the independent sample *t* test, $t(371) = .-1.67$, $p = .096$, two-tailed. As evident of the inferential test

findings, any potential differences were not statically proven; thus, the null hypothesis was retained.

Research Question 8

An examination of the null null hypothesis for Research Question 8 revealed no statistically significant difference on perceptions regarding effective characteristics for superintendents in the area of collaboration skills based on location type. The research question was surveyed to determine if there were differences in perceptions in the area of collaboration between superintendents and principals in regard to location of rural, suburban, and urban. A one-way ANOVA using SPSS was used to test for significant difference and the assumptions were tested to ensure validity of the results.

The dependent variables were examined to determine if any external factors or outliers existed. Examination of the box plots was conducted to identify if any outliers existed. This assumption was met as there were no data points more than 1.5 standard deviations away from the edge within the box plots. The assumption of normality was examined using Shapiro-Wilk's test to determine if the scores on the dependent variable were normally distributed for both groups. This assumption was met as the significance value was greater than .05. The assumption of homogeneity of variance was examined using Levene's test of equality to ensure that all variances of the dependent variable were equal for all groups. This assumption was met as the significance value was greater than .05, $F = 2.18$, $p = .115$.

The descriptive responses of collaboration for rural ($M = 27.46$, $SD = 1.98$), suburban ($M = 27.54$, $SD = 2.25$), urban ($M = 28.16$, $SD = 1.89$), and total ($M = 27.57$, $SD = 2.09$) were examined. Results of the one-way ANOVA indicated no significant differences with the model existed with the location types, $F(2, 370) = 1.74$, $p = .177$. As evident of the inferential test

findings, no statistical differences were proven; thus, the null hypothesis was retained.

Research Question 9

Results of an examination of the null hypothesis for Research Question 9 indicated indicated no statistically significant difference on perceptions regarding effective characteristics for superintendents in the area of collaboration skills based on respondent's years of employment in current position. The research question was surveyed to determine if there were differences in perceptions in the area of collaboration between superintendents and principals with regard to years of experience. A one-way ANOVA using SPSS was used to test for significant difference, and the assumptions were tested to ensure validity of the results.

The dependent variables were examined to determine if any external factors or outliers existed. Examination of the box plots was conducted to identify if any outliers existed. This assumption was met as there were no data points more than 1.5 standard deviations away from the edge within the box plots. The assumption of normality was examined using Shapiro-Wilk's test to determine if the scores on the dependent variable were normally distributed for both groups. This assumption was met as the significance value was greater than .05. The assumption of homogeneity of variance was examined using Levene's test of equality to ensure that all variances of the dependent variable were equal for all groups. This assumption was met as the significance value was greater than .05, $F = .192$, $p = .902$.

The descriptive responses for years of experience for management were level 1-5 years ($M = 27.49$, $SD = 1.96$), level 6-10 years ($M = 27.58$, $SD = 2.31$), level 11-15 years ($M = 27.48$, $SD = 1.99$), level 16+ years ($M = 27.74$, $SD = 2.05$, and total ($M = 27.57$, $SD = 2.09$). A significant difference based on years of experience for the respondents was not present. The results of the one-way ANOVA demonstrated this lack of significant differences, $F(3, 369) =$

2.56, $p = .857$. As evident of the inferential test findings, any potential differences were not statically proven; thus, the null hypothesis was retained.

Research Question 10

The null hypothesis for Research Question 10 was, "There is no statistically significant difference on perceptions regarding effective characteristics for superintendents in the area of instructional leadership skills based on position type." The research question was surveyed to determine if there were differences in perceptions in the area of instructional leadership skills between superintendents and principals. An independent sample *t* test was conducted for the position type to determine if significant differences were revealed, and the assumptions were tested to ensure validity of the results.

The dependent variables were examined through box plots determine if any external factors or outliers existed. This assumption was met as there were no data points more than 1.5 standard deviations away from the edge within the box plots. The assumption of normality was examined using Shapiro-Wilk's test to determine if the scores on the dependent variable were normally distributed for both groups. This assumption was met as the significance value was greater than .05. The assumption of homogeneity of variance was examined using Levene's test of equality to ensure that all variances of the dependent variable were equal for all groups. This assumption was met as the significance value was greater than .05, $F = .319$, $p = .573$.

Superintendent responses ($M = 23.96$, $SD = 3.07$) were tested to determine whether significant differences on the instructional leadership skills composition score existed when compared to the principal responses ($M = 24.43$, $SD = 2.93$). There was no significant difference found in the two-tailed independent sample *t* test, $t(371) = .-1.42$, $p = .155$. No statistically significant findings were revealed, thus, the null hypothesis was retained.

Research Question 11

The null hypothesis for Research Question 11 was, "There is no statistically significant difference on perceptions regarding effective characteristics for superintendents in the area of instructional leadership skills based on location type." The research question was surveyed to determine if there were differences in perceptions in the area of instructional leadership skills between superintendents and principals with regard to rural, suburban, or urban locations. A one-way ANOVA using SPSS was used to test for significant differences, and the assumptions were tested to ensure validity of the results.

The dependent variables were examined to determine if any external factors or outliers existed. Examination of box plots was conducted to identify if any outliers existed. This assumption was met as there were no data points more than 1.5 standard deviations away from the edge within the box plots. The assumption of normality was examined using Shapiro-Wilk's test to determine if the scores on the dependent variable were normally distributed for both groups. This assumption was met as the significance value was greater than .05. The assumption of homogeneity of variance was examined using Levene's test of equality to ensure that all variances of the dependent variable were equal for all groups. This assumption was met as the significance value was greater than .05, $F = .066$, $p = .936$.

The descriptive responses of vision for rural ($M = 23.82$, $SD = 3.02$), suburban ($M = 24.64$, $SD = 2.88$), urban ($M = 25.08$, $SD = 2.87$), and the total ($M = 24.28$, $SD = 2.98$). Through examination of the results of the one-way ANOVA, it was determined that significant differences with the model existed with the location types, $F(2, 370) = 4.72$, $p = .009$. As evident of the inferential test findings, the null hypothesis was rejected showing a significant difference.

Due to the significant difference being found with the model, a Tukey's HSD post hoc

test was conducted to determine where the significance difference existed. Since there was no violation for the assumption of homogeneity of variance, equal variance can be assumed. Respondents from rural locations scored the importance of instructional leadership skills significantly lower than suburban respondents, $p = .031$.

Research Question 12

The null hypothesis for Research Question 12 was, "There is no statistically significant difference on perceptions regarding effective characteristics for superintendents in the area of instructional leadership skills based on respondent's years of employment in current position." The research question was surveyed to determine if there were differences in perceptions in the area of instructional leadership skills between superintendents and principals with regard to years of experience. A one-way ANOVA using SPSS was used to test for significant difference and the assumptions were tested to ensure validity of the results.

The dependent variables were examined to determine if any external factors or outliers existed. An examination of box plots was conducted to identify if any outliers existed. This assumption was met as there were no data points more than 1.5 standard deviations away from the edge within the box plots. The assumption of normality was examined using Shapiro-Wilk's test to determine if the scores on the dependent variable were normally distributed for both groups. This assumption was met as the significance value was greater than .05. The assumption of homogeneity of variance was examined using Levene's test of equality to ensure that all variances of the dependent variable were equal for all groups. This assumption was met as the significance value was greater than .05, $F = 1.52$, $p = .209$.

The descriptive responses for years of experience for instructional leadership skills were level 1-5 years ($M = 24.29$, $SD = 2.87$), level 6-10 years ($M = 24.25$, $SD = 3.21$), level 11-15

years (M = 23.39, SD = 2.71), level 16+ years (M = 24.90, SD = 2.84, and total (M = 24.28, SD = 2.98). A significant difference based on years of experience for the respondents was not present. The results of the one-way ANOVA demonstrated this lack of significant differences, $F(3, 369) = 2.41$, $p = .067$. As evident of the inferential test findings, any potential differences were not statically proven; thus, the null hypothesis was retained.

Conclusion

An analysis of the collected data was entered into SPSS software to examine the perceptions of superintendents and principals on effective characteristics of superintendents. The perceptions of superintendents and principals on these effective characteristics were grouped into four areas: (a) vision, (b) management, (c) collaboration, and (d) instructional leadership skills. An analysis of the whole sample frequency data was conducted to determine different perceptions for these four areas based on position type, demographics, and experience level. An inferential analysis was conducted for vision, collaboration and instruction leadership skills. The management area of the survey lacked internal consistency, so these null hypotheses were not tested. For the research questions on location and level of years of experience, a one-way ANOVA test was used to measure the significant differences. Position type of superintendent's and principal's perception was measured with an independent t test. The sample was evaluated to verify that all of the assumptions of the one-way ANOVA (independent observations, normally distributed populations, and homogeneous variances) were satisfied.

A Tukey HSD post hoc test was run to determine where the significance differences existed. There were statistically significant differences on perceptions regarding effective characteristics for superintendents in the area of vision, values, and goals based on location type. Respondents from rural locations scored the importance of vision significantly lower than urban

respondents. There were also statistically significant differences on perceptions regarding effective characteristics for superintendents in the area of instructional leadership skills based on location type. Rural locations scored the importance of instructional significantly lower than suburban respondents.

CHAPTER 5

RESULTS, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Chapter 5 is divided into five sections, including introduction, results, implications, discussion, conclusions, and recommendations for further research. The introduction contains information about the study and survey components. The results section contains a summary of the descriptive and inferential data for each of the four areas of vision, management, collaboration, and instructional leadership skills. The data results were analyzed by position type, location, and level of experiences. Implications will present results and a conclusion regarding the study. The conclusion suggests why these findings are important and how they can be used with regard to improving communication between principals and superintendents. This study also provides recommendations for building upon this information and questions for potential future investigation.

Increased student achievement starts with good instructional leadership (Waters & Marzano, 2006). This study analyzed the differences between principals' and superintendents' perceptions of effective characteristics of superintendents. Other variables included school demographic location type (rural, urban, or suburban), years of experience, and position type. For this study, demographic location was defined as rural (less than 2,500), suburban (2,501-

250,000), and urban (250,001 or more). Years of experience for this study was separated into levels of 1-5 years, 6-10 years, 11-15 years, and 16 or more years. Position type was identified as either superintendent or principal. The literature review revealed the need to examine, four major areas in determining the different perceptions of effective characteristics between superintendents and principals. The survey questions were composed through an extensive literature review of the ISLLC standards, leadership theories, leadership paradigms, and best practices.

This study was conducted by administering a survey to 383 Indiana public school superintendents and 2307 principals. The survey was developed for this study to quantitatively measure the perceptions of superintendents and principals on the effective characteristics of superintendents. The Effective Characteristics Survey asked the respondents to report their perceptions of 20 effective characteristics of superintendents. For each characteristic, the respondents were asked to report how strongly they agreed or disagreed on a Likert-like scale of 1 to 6. A mark of 1 on the scale reflected the survey participant strongly disagreed that the characteristic was needed in order for the superintendent to effective, while a mark of 6 reflected the survey participant strongly agreed that the characteristic was needed in order to be an effective superintendent. The six choices for each question were 1 = *Strongly Disagree*, 2 = *Disagree*, 3 = *Somewhat Disagree*, 4 = *Agree*, 5 = *Somewhat Agree*, and 6 = *Strongly Agree*.

Descriptive Data Results

The findings of this study were presented in Chapter 4. The findings reported results for the four areas (a) vision, (b) management, (c) collaboration, and (d) instructional leadership skills. Each area was examined to determine differences with the variables of position type, demographic location (rural, suburban, and urban), and level of experience (1-5 years, 6-10

years, 11-15 years, and 16 or more). Twelve research questions were analyzed statistically. Position type was analyzed with an independent *t* test. Demographic location and years of experience were analyzed with a one-way ANOVA. Respondents included 117 superintendents and 256 principals. For location type, 182 reported rural, 154 reported suburban, and 37 reported urban. For years of experience, 137 reported 1-5 years, 120 6-10 years, 46 11-15 years, and 70 had 16 or more years.

Vision

The Effective Characteristics Survey sought to collect data regarding superintendents' and principals' perceptions in the area of vision. For the descriptive data the three highest rated responses were trust, implementation and development of the vision, and setting high goals. According to J. Murphy (2003), the need to develop a set of standards to guide the work of school administrators has evolved with the growing question of how schools should be managed. Many superintendents may find it interesting that a higher rating was placed on trust. Spillane and Thompson (1997) commented the districts that

> had made the greatest strides in reforming their mathematics and science programs were also ones with a strong sense of trust among educators within the district. Trust was crucial because it facilitated conversations about instructional reform among local educators. . . . Trust was also essential for genuine collaboration among educators, enabling them to work together to develop a shared understanding of the reforms. Moreover, trust created an environment in which local educators were comfortable discussing their understandings of and reservations about new instructional approaches, conversations that were essential for reconstructive learning. (p. 195)

Principals perceived trust, setting high goals and expectations, and implementation and

development of vision as the three highest characteristics needed. Superintendents' responses placed a higher value on trust and implementation, but perceived a safe learning environment as higher. Principals and superintendents both perceived trust and implementation as effective characteristics. Principals perceived setting high goals and expectations higher than superintendents, whereas superintendents rated a safe learning environment as higher.

In the area of vision for demographic location, principals and superintendents placed a higher rating on trust, implementation and development, and setting high goals and expectations as the three highest effective characteristics. Principals and superintendents in the two demographic location areas of rural (less than 2,500) and suburban (2,501-250,000) placed a higher value on implementation and development and indicated possessing strong leadership traits as the effective characteristics needed. A study conducted by Louise and Reidy (2006) on eight superintendents conducted by the National School Public Relations Association reported that all eight saw the need for good communications as vital characteristic in success over trust and vision of goals.

Superintendents and principals for level of experience (1-5 years) placed a higher value on setting high goals and expectations, trust, and safe learning environment. Superintendents and principals for level of experience (6-10 years) placed a higher value on implementation and development, trust, and setting high goals as the three effective characteristics needed. Superintendents and principals level of experience (11-15 years) placed a higher value on providing a safe learning environment, trust, implementation and development. Superintendents and principals with an experience level of 16 or more years placed a higher value on implementation and development, trust, and setting high goals and expectations. However, superintendents and principals with more than 16 years of rated setting goals and expectations

higher.

Management

There were no differences in the descriptive data on perceptions between superintendents and principals regarding management. Both placed a higher value on making genuine decisions, analyzing data, and inspiring others to follow goals. The most common chosen three responses of both groups' whole sample population and in all other variables including demographic location and years of experience also placed a higher value on making genuine decisions, analyzing data, and inspiring others to follow goals over adjusting leadership style for situations and setting objectives. These perceptions, as Drucker (1988) identified, have a focus on people and the organization. Kouzes and Posner (2007) identified five practices of leadership that were researched to be effective: model the way, inspire a shared vision, challenge the process, enable others to act, and encourage the heart. The high rating in the descriptive data of inspiring others demonstrates that challenging the process identified by Kouzes and Posner was valued by leaders in this study. According to Marzano and Waters, superintendents who use data are able to implementing best evidence-based practices with accountability (Waters & Marzano, 2006).

Collaboration

Both superintendents and principals placed a higher value on working with the principal, communicating with stakeholders, and creating a collaboration culture. Also, in the demographic location of suburban and levels of experience (11-15 years) the predominant three choices were good working relationships with the principal, communicating with stakeholders, and creating a collaboration culture. There were no differences in the descriptive data on principal's perceptions compared to superintendents. Eaker et al. (2002) created the framework of the PLC model, having schools identify a shared mission, vision, values, and goals. In

addition collaborative teams work interdependently to achieve common goals to focus on results for continuous improvement. As schools move toward a collaborative approach, principals will need the support of the superintendent.

A difference in the descriptive data analysis results existed for superintendents and principals demographic location of rural (less than 2,500), urban (250,001 or more), levels of experience (1-5 years) and (6-10 years) in the area of visibility. This perception suggested that the characteristic of visibility is seen as an important characteristic among location and experience levels for superintendents and principals. Other perceived differences between superintendents and principals existed with those having 16 or more years' experience placing a higher rating on having a servant leadership style.

Instructional Leadership Skills

Principals and superintendents reported professional development, develop skills to be globally competitive, and challenge staff members as the effective characteristics for instructional leadership skills. There were no differences in perceptions among principals' perceptions compared to superintendents in the area of instructional leadership skills within the descriptive data and no differences were revealed between location and level of experience. This perception suggested that principals value school superintendents who place emphasis on professional development to challenge staff for today's globally competitive world in improving the teaching and learning process.

Inferential Results

Vision Significant Results

Significant differences existed in Research Question 2 for vision and location. An examination of ANOVA results on the whole sample population determined that significant

differences with the model existed with the location type. Rural locations scored the importance of vision significantly lower than urban respondents. As evident of the inferential test findings, the null hypothesis was rejected showing a significant difference regarding effective characteristics for superintendents in the area of vision, values, and goals based on location type.

Instructional Leadership Skills Significant Results

Significant differences existed in Research Question 11 for instruction and location. ANOVA results of the whole sample population determined that significant differences existed with location types regarding effective characteristics for superintendents in the area of instructional leadership skills. Those in rural locations scored the importance of instructional leadership significantly lower than suburban respondents. A possible explanation for differences among instructional leadership skills between these two locations could be effective leadership practices for rural superintendents involve direct personal conversations with their staff members. In rural areas, a possibility might be that superintendents leverage a closer working relationship with the building principals to increase student achievement through teachers. Another possibility could be the different instructional strategies used in the different locations as a result of funding for professional development for teachers in the area of instructional strategies.

Lack of Significance

There were no differences in position type on principals and superintendent's perceptions regarding the effective characteristics for vision, collaboration, and instructional leadership skills. No significant difference was found in the independent sample *t* test regarding effective characteristics for superintendents in these three areas based on position type. The examination of the results of the one-way ANOVA determined that no significant differences regarding

effective characteristics for superintendents in the area of collaboration skills based on location type as well as in the area of vision, values, and goals, collaboration, and instructional leadership skills based on respondent's years of employment in current position. As evident of the inferential test findings, potential differences were not statistically proven to show any differences within the responses. Size of a school district did not have an effect on principals' and superintendents' perceptions of effective characteristics of superintendents in the area of collaboration. These results suggest that principals did not perceive any differences from superintendents among the effective characteristics in the areas of vision, collaboration, and instruction leadership skills.

Implications

Superintendents' roles and responsibilities have changed over the years. With today's accountability measures and changes in education, school districts are looking for effective leaders. This study identified principals' perceptions regarding the effective characteristics of superintendents. The four areas of effective characteristics of superintendents through the principals' perceptions studied included vision, management, collaboration, and instructional leadership skills. This section offers support for the findings.

Vision

Principals reported the need for setting high goals and expectations higher than superintendents, whereas superintendents rated a safe learning environment higher than principals. This perception could be due to principals' desire to set goals to increase student achievement, whereas superintendents still see the overall vision of the district rather than the classroom. The three highest rated descriptive analysis responses for vision were trust, implementation and development of the vision, and setting high goals. ISLLC Standard 1 by the

National Policy Board for Educational Administration (2011) addressed how educational leaders should facilitate a vision "A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by facilitating the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a vision of learning that is shared and supported by the school community" (National Policy Board for Educational Administration, 2011, para. 3). Many superintendents believe they can affect change by having a set vision, but Kerrins and Cushing (n.d.) discussed that superintendents should start with building trusting relationships, acting in trustworthy ways, and communicating openly, honestly, and sincerely before addressing the hard issues they could face. Even after identifying effective characteristics of superintendents, interpretations of the characteristics will depend on the reader.

> Understanding perceptions on the most important aspects of vision can provides guidance to an organization by articulating what it wishes to attain. It serves as a signpost pointing the way for all who need to understand what the organization is and where it intends to go. (Nanus, 1992, p. 36)

Another component of vision perceived with a high rating was setting high goals and this study's results reinforces that need. Goal setting can also be a part of the district's evaluation system for the superintendent. This study suggests that superintendents should develop measurable and attainable goals. According to Portis and Garcia (2007),

> a systemic change in an entire district's culture and structure is a tall order. It's no wonder board members and personnel become frustrated about the amount of effort and time it takes to bring about true reform. Recognizing that stakeholders' sense of resolve may diminish, superintendents say it is essential to set realistic expectations and emphasize a deep commitment to seeing the change through to the end. (Portis & Garcia,

2007, para. 10)

This study's findings suggest there are different perceptions with regards to location between rural and urban respondents, perhaps due to the superintendent's workload in rural compared to urban school districts. The enrollment and household income levels of students might vary in these two locations and the number of enrolled students plays a role in funding for these schools. Limited funding could cause superintendents to vary based on location. DeYoung (1994) stated that "rural superintendents face specific obstacles that render service in such districts and roles less attractive than elsewhere. These obstacles included isolation, limited resources, and community resistance to change, and have persisted over time" (p. 4).

Collaboration

This study revealed that principals' perceptions on the effective characteristics were the same as superintendents for the three effective characteristics related to collaboration. The three rated effective characteristics of the superintendent were focus on collaboration with principals, communicating with stakeholders, and creating a collaboration culture. A possible reason for these ratings could be that leadership teaming is a vital component to increasing student achievement. A superintendent can be a role model on how principals should be leaders of the collaboration process to improve school successs.

> High-performing school system requires an effective superintendent and a quality principal in every building. What often is overlooked is the fact that creating a team, even with highly skilled individuals, takes what every good relationship needs—conscious effort and endless communication. (West & Derrington, 2009, p. 130)

Many leaders understand clear communication is vital to the success of any organization. Collins (2001) asserted, "A primary task in taking a school system from good to great is to create

a culture wherein people have a tremendous opportunity to be heard and, ultimately, for the truth to be heard" (p. 88). Communication with stakeholders is seen as a high rating of an effective characteristic in this study. According to Carr (2005), a communicative leader in schools and industry,

> one of the great ironies of school leadership today is that you can do a great job of educating students and communicating with parents, and still miss 78 to 80 percent of the people upon whose support public education—and your livelihood—depends. That's because the vast majority of people who pay taxes today in most communities small and large, do not have school-aged children. This means that we have to start paying more attention to school public relations and marketing, or pay the consequences. (p. 33)

The National School Public Relations Association conducted surveys and interviews of leading superintendent search firms to discover what qualities and skills were most important in the hiring of a new superintendent and which were lacking in those superintendents who were not successful in their positions. The "lack of communication and the failure to keep people informed" (Moore, Bagin, & Gallagher, 2007, p. 68) was the chief factor affecting the failure of superintendent.

Perceptions in the variables of location, levels of experience (1-5 years), and levels of experience (6-10 years) rated visibility as higher than that of creating a collaboration culture. A possible reason for this perception is visibility could often be an overlooked effective characteristic by principals and superintendents. It could be seen as one of the major characteristics to have in the success of a school district. Sanaghan (2011) pointed out after working and consulting with unsuccessful superintendents that building relations of visibility can make the difference in success.

> Without positive, mature and authentic relationships with people throughout the district, *especially*, parents and teachers, a superintendent cannot lead successfully. Relationships are the "currency" in school districts and need to be built and maintained if a superintendent is going to take their district to a better place. Superintendents should be visible and accessible throughout the school district. People need to feel the presence of their superintendent. Attending events, both large and small, in the schools is imperative. (Sanaghan, 2011, para. 4)

Instructional Leadership Skills

Principals' perceptions on the effective characteristics were the same as superintendents in the area of instructional leadership skills. The three highest perceptions in the area of instructional leadership skills were on professional development, develop skills to be globally competitive, and challenge staff members. Education reform discussion topics include whether or not students are ready for post-secondary experiences. The Indiana Career Council (2014) identified the need to have a plan in place to improve the workforce for the state of Indiana. The education system is just one component of this plan in ensuring students are globally competitively ready to compete. Currently 40% of Indiana residents are workforce ready and the goal is set to 60%.

> The future globally competitive work environment will likely be one dominated by a need to redefine what makes engineering and technology workers successful. Traditionally, success has been defined as having "intelligent" graduates who have completed a rigorous college course that stresses problem solving and mastery of huge amounts of technical information. In the last 50 years, schools have been content to let the work-a-day skills their graduates will likely encounter on the job be administered by

> the hiring companies—or they leave it up to graduates to acquire them on their own. Education must focus no longer simply on content, but on both content and process. In this article, the author recommends a number of changes to the curriculum to prepare today's students for their future. (Roman, 2009, p. 19)

Professionally developing staff received a high rating as an effective characteristic for superintendents. A study investigating the instructional leadership roles of superintendents in school districts in a large mid-western state examined the relationships among superintendents' descriptions of their involvement in curriculum-development and instructional leadership activities in their districts. Of the 397 participating, the study concluded that superintendents most spent little time in curriculum development. Time constraints, role overload, lack of personal interest in curriculum and instruction and other priorities tended to confine the majority of superintendents. Effective school leadership must combine traditional school leadership duties such as teacher evaluation, budgeting, scheduling, and facilities maintenance with a deep involvement with specific aspects of teaching and learning. Effective instructional leaders are intensely involved in curricular and instructional issues that directly affect student achievement. Although traditional responsibilities still must be met, priorities should be shifted toward instructional issues that will impact classroom instruction and student achievement. Some of those elements include (a) promoting a vision; (b) creating alignment of curriculum, instruction, assessment, and standards; (c) focusing on data; and (d) maintaining a culture of continuous learning. (Bredeson, 1995, p. 29)

Significant differences existed with demographic location between rural and urban for the area of instructional leadership skills. A possible explanation could be that many view urban students as living in poverty and having social service needs that rural students may not

experience, even though many urban areas offer pre-learning opportunities before students start school. Another explanation could be the perceived value of education in rural areas and the challenges principals and superintendents face with students' failure to set good postsecondary goals. Other differences that could exist between the two locations are parent and social involvement within the two locations as rural parents are more likely to attend conferences and communicate with schools.

Discussion

The purpose of this study was to identify effective characteristics of superintendents from the perceptions of principals. Descriptive data results suggested that principals rate superintendents who set high goals and expectations as being more effective while superintendents regard safer learning environments as being more important. Both principals and superintendents perceived both implementation and development as well as increase in trust as effective characteristics of superintendents. There were no statistically significant differences with regard to position type in any of the four areas. However, the data in this study identified significant differences in the area of vision and instructional leadership skills with the variable of location. Rural respondents scored the importance of vision significantly lower than urban respondents. Rural respondents scored the importance of instructional leadership skills significantly lower than suburban respondents. The findings suggest the perceptions in effective characteristics of superintendents were different with regard to rural location in the areas of vision and instructional leadership skills. One possible reason for this difference of location could be the duties or responsibilities of the superintendents and principals in the rural area. Principals of rural schools spend a large percentage of their time teaching cross-age, multi-grade students (Starr & White, 2008). As recent legislation and litigation continue to place more

responsibility on the principal, site level responsibilities challenge the constant, increasing role of the administrator (Cruzeiro & Morgan, 2006). Most principals in rural schools get little in the way of administrative support, ancillary personnel, and ground staff (Starr & White, 2008). Although principals in larger schools are able to delegate and share in management tasks, this is not a luxury afforded to their small rural counterparts (Starr & White, 2008). Regardless of the size of the school, principals still have a moral obligation to comply with federal and state standards.

A possible barrier that rural schools face is having limited resources. Though rural schools have possible positive aspects such as community pride and easier decision-making, meeting the needs of students can be a challenge (Kennedy & Barker, 1989). The superintendent's role is critical as an agent of change (Hill, Wise, & Shapiro, 1989). The role of superintendents in rural and small districts in effecting change is limited. However, one study found that superintendents of rural and small districts play a direct role as change agents because they are in the "unique position of being able to mobilize not only . . . staff, but the community as well" (Jacobson, 1989, p. 108).

In the United States there are a higher number of employed superintendents in urban areas compared to rural. There are about 29,000 rural schools out of 88,000, which is about 30% (Chen, 2010). Understanding effective characteristics between the two groups could be beneficial. Relationships with people are perceived as more important for rural superintendents, than those in urban areas. Rural superintendents have personal relationships and decisions are made with that in mind. The same doesn't appear to be true in urban districts where superintendent decisions tend to be more data-based as a result of their not being able to meet all the stakeholders.

The most common overall responses of the effective characteristics for superintendents perceived by superintendents and principals for vision were trust, implementation and development of the vision, and setting high goals. The three most common overall characteristics perceived by superintendents and principals for the area of management were making genuine decisions, analyzing data, and inspiring others to follow goals. Overall perceived characteristics by superintendents and principals in the area of collaboration were good working relationship with the principal, communicating with stakeholders, and creating a collaboration culture. The three most selected effective characteristics of superintendents perceived by superintendents and principals in the area of instructional leadership skills were professional development, develop skills to be globally competitive, and challenge staff members.

Conclusions

Within the descriptive results, principal's perceptions were different with the in the area of vision. Principals perceived setting high goals and expectations as higher, whereas superintendents rated a safe learning environment as higher. Both perceived implementation and development and trust as effective characteristics of superintendents. The data analysis showed that trust, implementation and development, and setting goals were the three predominant effective characteristics. Trust was the number one rated effective characteristic perceived by superintendents and principals for superintendents with vision, $M = 5.75$, $SD = .615$. This reason could be due to building a capacity and having a systematic approach (Fullan, 2011). Superintendents and principals placed a higher value on the effective characteristics of superintendents on making genuine decisions, analyzing data, and inspiring others to follow goals in the area of management. The number one rated effective characteristic perceived by

superintendents and principals for superintendents with management was making genuine decisions, *M* = 5.52, *SD* = .724. The most common chosen three responses when superintendents and principals completed the survey on the descriptive data analysis for the whole sample, position type, and location type of suburban (2,501-250,000) were good working relationship with the principal, communicating with stakeholders, and creating a collaboration culture. The number one rated effective characteristic for superintendents with collaboration was good working relationship with principal, *M* = 5.52, *SD* = .724. Descriptive analysis of the superintendent and principal results placed a higher value on professional development, developing skills to be globally competitive, and challenge staff. The number one rated effective characteristic for superintendents with instructional leadership skills was professional development, *M* = 5.30, *SD* = .660.

Superintendents should recognize that vision, management, collaboration, and instructional leadership skills are regarded as important by principals. In this study, principals perceived setting high goals and expectations as more important than superintendents. Certain characteristics discussed in each of the four areas of vision, management, collaboration, and instructional leadership skills mentioned in this paper have been identified as effective characteristics of superintendents perceived by principals and superintendents. Schools are too complex for effectiveness to be attributed to any single one characteristic (Bailey & Maduakolam, 1999). "The success of recent efforts, such as those of reform movements aimed at refocusing the mission of public education in America, depends greatly on the quality of leadership manifested in schools by school superintendents" (Bailey & Maduakolam, 1999, p. 30).

Superintendents that assist principals in being effective help to create effective schools by having effective teachers that can lead to increase in student achievement (Robbins & Alvy, 2004).

> A student attends a school that is one of the least effective and has a teacher that is classified as one of the least effective. After two years the student has dropped from the 50th percentile to the 3rd percentile. . . . the student is in a school that is considered one of the least effective, but she is with a teacher classified as one of the most effective. The student now leaves the class at the 63rd percentile—13 percentile points higher than she entered. The student is not only in a school classified as one of the most effective but is with a teacher classified as one of the most effective. She enters the class at the 50th percentile but leaves at the 96th percentile. (Marzano, 2003, pp. 74–75)

School principals can affect student success by helping teachers be the best they can be (Robbins & Alvy, 2004). Research shows there is a 13% percent variance in student achievement in a given subject area due to what a teachers does compared to about 7% due to what a school does. Table 40 shows the effects on student achievment in comparison to school and teacher effctiveness (Robbins & Alvy, 2004). Table 40 illustrates the gains in student achievement after two years in relation to teacher effectiveness.

Table 40

Effects on Student Achievement of School and Teacher Effectiveness with Students Entering School at the 50th Percentile After Two Years

School and Teacher Scenario	Achievement Percentile After
Average school and average teacher	50th
Least effective school and least effective teacher	3rd
Most effective school and least effective teacher	37th
Least effective school and most effective teacher	63rd
Most effective school and most effective teacher	96th
Most effective school and average teacher	78th

Note. (Adapted from Marzano, 2003)

Superintendents who recognize the importance of building a relationship with principals will result in higher teacher effectiveness and student achievement. The role of leadership in fostering student learning is commonly discussed in educational policies. Effective leadership is viewed as important for turning around schools. An effective rated principal will produce student gains that are 0.05 standard deviations higher than an average rated principal for all students in their school. "The best leaders know to work for improvement in teacher effectiveness to raise the quality of education" (Branch, Hanushek, & Rivkin, 2013, para. 1). "Superintendents who consider a focus on instructional leadership will have the greatest positive impact. Superintendents who promote, develop, and support principals as instructional leaders result in increase of student achievement" (Cudeiro, 2005, para. 11).

A positive correlation exists between the effective characteristics of superintendents and

> student achievement. A .24 correlation is an average superintendent who is at the 50th percentile in terms of leadership abilities and leading a school district where the average student achievement is also at the 50th percentile. If a superintendent improves his or her leadership abilities by one standard deviation to 84th percentile, student achievement in the district would rise to the 60th percentile. (Waters & Marzano, 2007, para. 31)

Superintendents' leadership over principals can influence student achievement and with the alarming gap between the academic achievement of traditionally marginalized students and their peers, superintendents have an ethical duty to lead their districts in closing these achievement gaps. Spillane, Halverson, and Diamond (2001) suggested that, "to have a more complete understanding of educational leadership we need to learn not only 'what' leaders do, but 'why' and 'how' they do it" (p. 24). Superintendents must understand what principals need in order to have the knowledge to increase student achievement (Shutz, & Ellen, 2010). This study began with an introduction, followed by an overview of the evolution of the superintendent position, literature review, and previous research that identified effective characteristics of superintendents as perceived by principals. The research examined research by theorist, leadership paradigms, and past research on identified best practices. The methodology explained the study followed up by results of what principals and superintendents perceived as effective characteristics of superintendents. This study contributes to current professional literature and practice in the fields of education and educational leadership in many different ways. It adds to the body of empirical research regarding effective characteristics of superintendents as perceived by principals. It provides insight and awareness of the superintendent's roles and responsibilities and how they differ based on location. This study sought to improve educational leadership

practice by identifying characteristics that superintendents should possess to improve school districts.

Recommendations for Further Research

Superintendents' leadership of school principals is the key variable in making sure that effective teaching is the focus of improvement in a school (Saphier & Lucy, 2009). The findings of this research can assist in providing information to allow for extended studies on superintendents. Further studies could be qualitative interviews rather than surveys, exploring other states in the country, and including a deeper exploration of other variables such as turnover rate or enrollment.

This study represents an effort to examine the effective characteristics of educational superintendents through the superintendents' and principals' perception based on location and years of experience. The following questions serve to guide further potential research.

- Do the characteristics listed for vision, collaboration, and instructional leadership skills (trust, implementation and development of the vision, setting high goals, making genuine decisions, analyzing data, inspiring others to follow goals, good working relationship with the principal, communicating with stakeholders, creating a collaboration culture, professional development, develop skills to be globally competitive, and challenge staff members) represent a leader in today's educational change?
- What characteristics of superintendents attempt to seek educational innovation change to prepare students for the future?
- What other characteristics not mentioned in this survey can be studied in regards to the ISLLC standards, educational leadership theories, leadership paradigms, and best practices?

- Is the accountability of student achievement higher with identified effective characteristics?

The findings of this study provide insight to similarities and differences between superintendents and principals regarding perceptions of effective superintendent characteristics. Further research could be conducted in understanding what effects the characteristics of superintendents as perceived by both superintendents and principals have on student achievement. The possibility of knowing what is needed in today's educational reform is an endless work of research. Also, further investigation of the survey instrument could be studied to enhance the reliability.

REFERENCES

Achieve. (2010). *Achieving the possible: What Americans think about the college and career ready agenda.* Washington, DC. Retrieved from www.achieve.org

American Association of School Administrators. (1993). *Professional standards for the superintendency.* Arlington, VA: Sans Serif Graphics.

American Association of School Administrators and the National School Boards Association. (2007). *Roles and relationships: What does the superintendent do?* Arlington, VA: Author. Retrieved from http://cl017.k12.sd.us/what_does_the_superintendent_do.htm

Baldwin, J. N., & Farley, Q. A. (1991). Comparing the public and private sectors in the United States: A review of the empirical literature. In A. Farazmand (Ed.), *Handbook of comparative and development public administration* (pp. 27-39). New York, NY: Marcel Dekker.

Bailey, J., & Maduakolam, I. (1999). A study of superintendents' change leadership styles using the situational leadership model *American Secondary Education, 27*(4), 30. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/41064328

Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Bell South Foundation, Schlechty Center for Leadership in School Reform, & Superintendents Leadership Network. (2001). *Inspiring leaders of leaders: Superintendent and principals.* Louisville, KY and Atlanta, GA: Authors. Retrieved from http://s3.amazonaws.com/www.schlechtycenter.org/tools/prod/8226/original/Inspiring_Leaders_of_Leaders.pdf?1297786479

Billet, L. (1978). *The free market approach to educational reform.* [Rand Paper P-6141]. Santa Monica, CA: Rand Corporation. Retrieved from http://www.rand.org

Blake, R. R., & Mouton, J. S. (1972). *The managerial grid: Key orientations for achieving production through people.* Houston, TX: Gulf Publishing.

Bolden, R., Gosling, J., Marturano, A., & Dennison, P. (2003, June). *A review of the leadership theory and contemporary frameworks.* Exeter, UK: Center for Leadership Studies. Retrieved from http://www.academia.edu/1004388/A_review_of_leadership_theory_and_competency_frameworks

Bracey, G. W. (2005). A nation of cheats. *Phi Delta Kappan, 86,* 412-413. Retrieved from http://www.kappanmagazine.org

Branch, G. F., Hanushek, E. A., & Rivkin, S. G. (2013). Measuring the impact of effective principals. *School Leaders Matter, 13*(1). Retrieved from http://educationnext.org/files/ednext_20131branch.pdf

Bredeson, P. V. (1995, April). *Superintendents' roles in curriculum development and instructional leadership: Instructional visionaries, collaborators, supporters, and delegators.* Retrieved from http://eric.edu.gov/?=ED390143,p. 29

Butcher, J. (2011, October 19). Failing schools have nowhere to hide. *Tucson Sentinel.* Retrieved from http://www.tucsonsentinel.com/opinion/report/101911_ schools_goldwater_op/failing-schools-have-nowhere-hide/

Byrne, J. B., & Gerdes, L. (2005, November 27). The man who invented management. *Business Week.* Retrieved from http://www.businessweek.com/stories/2005-11-28/the-man-who-invented-management

Callahan, R. E. (1962). *Education and the cult of efficiency.* Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.

Carlyle, T. (1888). On Heroes, Hero-Worship and the Heroic in History, Fredrick A. Stokes & Brother, New York.

Carr, C. S. (2005). Evolution of a leadership preparation program in the 21st century. *NCPEA Education Leadership Review, 66*(1), 33. Retrieved from http://cdm2635-01.cdmhost.com/cdm/singleitem/collection/p263501coll11/id/26

Carter, G. R., & Cunningham, W. G. (1997). *The American school superintendent: Leading in an age of pressure.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Chapman, C. H. (Ed.). (1997). *Becoming a superintendent: Challenges of school district leadership.* Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill; Prentice Hall International.

Chen, C. (2010). *Numbers and types of public elementary and secondary schools from the common core of data: School Year 2008-2009* (NCES 2010-345). U.S. Department of Education. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics. Retrieved from http://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch

Cohen, S. A. (1995). What standards for national standards? *Phi Delta Kappan, 76,* 740-741. Retrieved from http://www.kappanmagazine.com

Coleman, J. (1966). *Equality of education opportunity.* Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Collins, J. (2001). *Good to great: Why some companies make the leap. . . and others don't.*. New York, NY: Harper Business.

Cookson, P. W., Jr. (2009, September). What would Socrates say? *Educational Leadership, 67*(1), 8-14. Retrieved from http://www.ascd.org/publications/educational-leadership/sept09/vol67/num01/What-Would-Socrates-Say%C2%A2.aspx

Covey, S. R. (2004). *7 habits of highly effective people.* New York, NY: Simon & Schuster.

Creswell, J. W. (1994) *Research design: Qualitative and quantitative approaches.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Creswell, J. W. (2011). Foreward. In T. S. Rocco & T. Hatcher (Eds.), *The handbook of scholarly writing and publishing* (pp. xi-xii). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Crippen, C. (2010). Serve, teach, and lead: It's all about relationships. *Insight: A Journal of Scholarly Teaching, 5,* 27-36. Retrieved from http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ902861.pdf

Cruzeiro, P. A., & Morgan, R. L. (2006). The rural principal' role with consideration for special education. *Education, 126,* 569-579. Retrieved from http://www.projectinnovation.biz/education.html

Cuban, L. (1988). *The managerial imperative and the practice of leadership in schools.* Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Cudeiro, A. (2005). Leading student achievement. *School Administrator, 62*(11). Retrieved from http://www.aasa.org/SchoolAdministratorArticle.aspx?id-7574

Cunningham, L. L. (1985). Leaders and leadership: 1985 and beyond. *Phi Delta Kappan,* 17-20.

Retrieved from http://www.kappanmagazine.com

Darling-Hammond, L., & Bransford J. D. (2005). *Preparing teachers for a changing world: What teachers should learn and be able to do.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Dewey, J. (1938). *The experience of education.* New York, NY: Simon & Schuster.

DeYoung, A. J. (1994, January). *Researching rural American schools: Continuing cultural themes and cultural conflicts in the countryside.* Lexington, KY: Appalachian Center at Kentucky University Retrieved from http://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED366475

Drucker, P. (1988). The coming of the new organization. *Harvard Business Review, 28,* 45-53. Retrieved from http://hbr.org/1988/01/the-coming-of-the-new-organization/ar/1

DuFour, R., DuFour, R., Eaker, R., & Karhanek, G. (2004). *Whatever it takes: How professional learning communities respond when kids don't learn.* Bloomington, IN: Solution Tree.

DuPree, M. (1992). *Leadership jazz.* New York, NY: Dell.

Eaker, R., DuFour, R., & DuFour, R. (2002). *Getting started: Reculturing schools to become professional learning communities.* Bloomington, IN: National Educational Service.

Education Policy and Leadership Center. (2006). *Strengthening school leadership: Preparing and supporting superintendents and principals.* Harrisburg, PA: Author. Retrieved from http://www.eplc.org/strengtheningschoolleadership.pdf

Education Writers Association. (2003). *Effective superintendents, effective boards: Finding the right fit.* Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from http://edsource.org/today/wp-content/uploads/leadership.pdf

Egan, K. (2008). *The future of education: Reimagining our schools from the ground up.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Elmore, R. F. (2000). *Building a new structure for educational leadership.* Washington, DC: The

Albert Shanker Institute.

Fiedler, E. (1964). A contingency model of leadership effectiveness. *Journal for Advances in Experimental Social Psychology, 1*(12), 149-190.

Filion, R., & Wolfskill, P. S. (2004). *California state normal school history.* San Jose, CA: Retrieved July 2013 from http://www.cagenweb.com/archives

Forner, M., Bierlein-Palmer, L., & Reeves, P. (2012). Leadership practices of effective rural superintendents: Connections to Waters and Marzano's leadership correlates. *Journal of Research in Rural Education, 27*(8), 1-13. Retrieved from http://www.jrre.psu.edu/articles/27-8.pdf

Fullan, M. (2001). *The new meaning of educational change* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Fullan, M. (2011). *Choosing the wrong drivers for the whole system.* (Seminar Series 204). East Melbourne, Victoria, Australia: Centre for Strategic Education. Retrieved from http://www.edsource.org/today/wp-content/uploads/Fullan-Wrong-Drivers1.pdf

Fullan, M. A. (2005). *Leadership and Sustainability*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Garvey, J. B. (2012). LRSD history. Retrieved from Little Rock School District website: http://www.lrsd.org/drupal/?q=content/lrsd-history

Glass, T. E. (2003). *The superintendency: A managerial imperative?* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL. Retrieved from http://www.aera.net

Gliem, J. A., & Gliem, R. R. (2003, October 8-10). *Calculating, interpreting, and reporting Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient for Likert-type scales.* Presented at the Midwest Research-to-Practice Conference in Adult, Continuing, and Community Education,

Columbus, OH. Retrieved from https://scholarworks.iupui.edu

Goleman, D. (2005). Emotional intelligence: Why it can matter more than IQ. New York, NY: Bantam Books.

Grieder, C., Pierce, T. M., & Jordan, K. F. (1969). *Public school administration* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: Ronald Press.

Greenleaf, R. K. (1996). *On becoming a servant-leader*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Gunter, H. M. (2001). *Leaders and leadership in education.* London, England: Paul Chapman.

Hall, G. E., & Hord, S. M. (1987). *Change in schools: Facilitating the process.* New York, NY: State University of New York Press.

Harris, S., & Hopson, M. (2011). *School leaders best practices.* Alexandria, VA: American School Board Journal. Retrieved from http://www.asbj.com

Hersey, P., & Blanchard, K. H. (1982). Grid principles and situationalism: Both! A response to Blake and Mouton. *Group and Organization Studies, 7,* 207-210. doi:10.1177/105960118200700207

Hesbol, K. (2012). Learning to lead: An examination of innovative principal leadership preparation practices. [Special Issue]. *Planning and Changing: An Educational Leadership and Policy Journal, 43*(3/4), 223-242. Retrieved from http://www.academia.edu/3894599/Learning_to_Lead_An_Examination_of_Innovative_Principal_Leadership_Preparation_Practices_Special_Issue_Volume_3_4

Hill, P. T., Wise, A. E., & Shapiro, L. (1989). *Educational progress: Cities mobilize to improve their schools.* Santa Monica, CA: RAND Center for the Study of the Teaching Profession.

Hord, S. M. & Czerwinski, P. (1991, Spring). Leadership: An imperative for successful change.

Issues about Change, 1(2). Austin, TX: Southwest Educational Development Laboratory.

Hunt, T., Carper, J., Lasley, T., & Raisch, C. (2010). *Encyclopedia of educational reform and dissent.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Indiana Career Council. (2014). *Align, engage, advance: A strategic plan to transform Indiana's workforce Indiana.* Retrieved from http://www.in.gov/icc/files/Indiana_Career_Council_Strategic_Plan_-_Align_Engage_Advance_-_FINAL.pdf

Indiana Department of Education. (2014). *Data reports*. Retrieved July 12, 2014, from http://www.doe.in.gov/accountability/find-school-and-corporation-data-reports

Institute for Educational Leadership. (2000). *Leadership for student learning: Reinventing the principalship.* Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from http://www.iel.org/programs/21st/reports/principal.pdf

ISLLC standards (interstate school leaders licensure consortium). (2011). In L. Sullivan (Ed.), *The SAGE glossary of the social and behavioral sciences.* (p. 274). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781412972024.n1374

Jacobson, S. L. (1986). Effective superintendents of small, rural districts. *Journal of Rural and Small Schools, 2*(2), 17-21. Retrieved from http://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ382700

Jones, J. D., Goodwin, R., & Cunningham, M. (2003). Leadership for learning: A study of successful school systems. *Journal of School Improvement,* Vol. 67, No. 634.

Kennedy, R., & Barker, B. (1989). *Rural administrative leadership handbook.* Portland, OR: Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory.

Kerrins, J. A., & Cushing, K. S. (n.d.). Strategies to help you avoid committing the common pitfalls of newcomers. In *The Classic Mistakes of New Superintendents.* Retrieved

August 3, 2014, from http://www.superintendentofschools.com/Toolbox/The_Classic_Mistakes_of_New_Superintendents.pdf

King, B. M., Rosopa, P. J., & Minium, E. W. (2011). *Statistical reasoning in the behavioral sciences* (6th ed.). Danvers, MA: John Wiley & Sons.

Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (2007). *The leadership challenge* (4th ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (2008). *Student leadership challenge: Five practices of exemplary leadership.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Kouzes, J., & Posner, B. (2014). *Leadership practices inventory (LPI) assessments.* Retrieved from http://www.leadershipchallenge.com/leaders-section-assessments.apx

Kowalski, T. J. (2003, April 21-25). *The superintendent as communicator.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL. Retrieved from http://www.aera.net

Kowalski, T. (2010). *The American school superintendent: 2010 decennial study.* New York, NY: Rowman and Littlefield Education.

Leithwood, K., Seashore, K., Anderson, S., & Wahlstrom, K. (2004). *How leadership influences student learning.* New York, NY: Wallace Foundation.

Locke, J. (1975). *An essay concerning human understanding* (Clarendon edition, edited by Peter H. Nidditch). Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.

Locke, E. A., & Latham, G. P. (1990). *A theory of goal setting and task performance.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Henry, L., & Reidy, B. (2005). Characteristics of Effective Superintendents. N.p.: National School Public Relations association.

Machiavelli, N. (1999). *The prince* (A. Grafton, Trans.). New York, NY: Penguin Books. (Original work published 1513).

Marzano, R. J. (2012). *The Marzano school leadership evaluation model.* Bloomington, IN: Marzano Research Laboratory.

Marzano, Robert. *What Works in Schools*. Alexandria: Association for Curriculum and Development, 2003.

Mazzeo, C. (2001). Frameworks of state: Assessment policy in historical perspective. *Teachers College Record, 103,* 367-397. Retrieved from http://www.tcrecord.org/library

McGregor, D. (1960). *The human side of enterprise.* New York, NY: McGraw Hill.

McIver, J. P., & Carmines, E. G. (1981). *Unidimensional scaling.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Monroe, P. (1925). *A text-book in the history of education.* New York, NY: MacMillan.

Moore, E. H., Bagin, D. H., & Gallagher, D. R. (2007). *The school and community relations* (9th ed.). New York, NY: Allyn & Bacon.

Murphy, J. (1990). *The educational reform movement of the 1980's: Perspective and cases.* Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.

Murphy, M. M., (2006). Education in ancient Greece. In D. A. Stollenwerk (Ed.), *The history and philosophy of education: Voices of educational pioneers* (pp. 13-47). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education.

Nanus, B. (1992). *Visionary leadership: Creating a compelling sense of direction for your organization.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

National Center on Education and the Economy. (2006). *Tough choices or tough times: The report of the New Commission on the Skills of the American Workforce.* Washington, DC: National Center on Education and the Economy: The New Commission on the Skills of

the American Workforce. Retrieved from http://www.skillscommission.org

National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983). *A nation at risk: The imperative for educational reform.* Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved from htttp://www.ed.gov/pubs/NatAtRisk/index.html

National Governors Association Center for Best Practices & Council of Chief State School Officers. (2010). *Common core state standards.* Washington, DC: Authors. Retrieved from http://www.corestandards.org

National Policy Board for Educational Administration. (2011). *Educational leadership standards* Fairfax, VA: Author. Retrieved from http://www.npbea.org

No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, Pub. L. No. 107-110, 115 Stat. 1425. (2002).

Northouse, P. G. (2010). *Leadership: Theory and practice* (5th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Petersen, M. R. (1999). *Superintendent competencies for continued employment as perceived by Louisiana public school superintendents and board presidents* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 9947700)

Phillips, D. A., & Phillips, R. S. (2007). The four-quadrant leadership team. *School Administrator, 64*(3), 42-47. Retrieved from http://www.aasa.org

Portis, C., & Garcia, M. W. (2007, March). The superintendent as a change leader. *The School Administrator, 64*(3). Retrieved from http://www.aasa.org/SchoolAdministratorArticle.aspx?id=7076

Reback, R., Rockoff, J., & Schwartz, H. L. (2011). *Under pressure: Job security, resource allocation, and productivity in schools under NCLB.* (NBER Working Paper No. 16745) Cambridge, MA: National Bureau of Economic Research. Retrieved from http://www.nber.org/papers/w16745

Robbins, P., & Alvy, R. (2004). *The new principal's fieldbook: Strategies for success.* Alexandria, VA: Association for Curriculum and Development.

Rodgers, R., & Hunter, J. E. (1992). A foundation of good management practice in government: Management by objectives. *Public Administration Review, 52*(1), 27-39. Retrieved from http://www.aspaonline.org

Roman, H. T. (2009, August). Preparing students for success in the new global economy. *Tech Directions, 69*(1), 18-20.

Sanaghan, P. (2011). *Advice for superintendents: A consultant's perspective.* Retrieved from http://www.aasa.org/content.aspx?id=17450

Saphier, J., & Durkin, P. (2012). *Supervising principals: How superintendents can improve teaching and learning in the classroom.* Retrieved from http://www.rbteach.com

Saphier, J., & Lucy, W. (2009). How coaches can maximize student learning. *Phi Delta Kappan, 91*(4), 46-50. Retrieved from http://sim.ttac.vt.edu/Documents/Resources%20for%20Teacher%20Leaders/Coaches%20Maximize%20Learning.pdf

Schlechty, P. C. (2009). *Leading for learning: How to transform schools into learning organizations.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Sergiovanni, T. J. (1990). *Value-added leadership: How to get extraordinary performance in schools.* San Diego, CA: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Shamir, B., & Eilam, G. (2005). What's your story? A life-stories approach to authentic leadership development. *The Leadership Quarterly, 16*, 395-417. doi: 10.1016/j.leaqua.2005.03.005

Shannon, G. S., & Bylsma, P. (2004). *Characteristics of improved school districts: Themes from research.* Olympia, WA: Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction. Retrieved from

http://www.k12.wa.us

Shutz, F., & Ellen, J. M. (2010). *The superintendent beliefs and leadership practices in a school district that has successfully increased the achievement of traditionally marginalized students* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from http://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED521538

Simpson, B. D. (2004, November 9). *The common school movement and compulsory education.* Auburn, AL: Ludwig von Mises Institute. Retrieved from http://mises.org/daily/1679

Spears, L. C. (1995). *Reflections on leadership: How Robert K. Greenleaf's theory of servant leadership influenced today's top management thinkers.* New York: Wiley.

Spillane, J. P., Halverson, R., & Diamond, J. B. (2001). Investigating school leadership practice: A distributed perspective. *Educational Researcher, 30*(3), 23-28. Retrieved from http://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ624230

Spillane, J. P., & Thompson, C. L. (1997). *Looking at local districts' capacity for ambitious reform*. (Policy Bulletin). Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Consortium for Policy Research in Education. Retrieved from http://www.cpre.org/Publications/pb-05.pdf

Spring, J. H. (1994). *The American school, 1642–1993* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Starr, K., & White, S. (2008). The small rural school principalship: Key challenges and cross-school responses. *Journal of Research in Rural Education, 23*(5), 1-12. Retrieved from http://jrre.vmhost.psu.edu/wp-content/uploads/2014/02/23-5.pdf

Stogdill, R. (1974). *Handbook of leadership* (1st ed.). New York, NY: Free Press.

Sturnick, J. (1998). Healing leadership. In L. Spears (Ed.), *Insights on leadership: Service, stewardship, spirit and servant leadership* (pp. 185-196). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.

Sundre, L. (n.d.). Sun Tzu and Niccolo Machiavelli's lessons on leadership. In *BusinessDictionary.com*. Retrieved from http://www.businessdictionary.com/article/442/common-traits-in-a-leader/

Sundre, S. M., & Raisch, C. D. (2002). What would Peter Drucker say? *School Administrator, 59*(4), 32. Retrieved from http://www.aasa.org

Sweeney, P. J. (2000). *The leadership practices of exemplary superintendents that influence principals to lead school-based improvement.* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 9980710)

Tavakol, M., & Dennick, R. (2011). Making sense of Cronbach's alpha. *International Journal of Medical Education, 2,* 53-55. doi:10.5116/ijme.4dfb.8dfd

Taylor, F. W. (1911). *The principals of scientific management*. New York, NY: Harper & Row.

U.S. Department of Education. (2010). *A blueprint for reform: The reauthorization of the elementary and secondary education act.* Alexandria, VA: Education Publications Center.

U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. (2014). In *Common Core of Data.* Retrieved March 6, 2014, from http://nces.ed.gov/ccd/rural_locales.asp

Vitcov, B. J., & Bloom, G. S. (2010, November 11). A new vision for supervision of principals. *The School Administrator, 19*(21), para 4. Retrieved from http://www.aasa.org/SchoolAdministratorArticle.aspx?id=17164

The Wallace Foundation. (2003). *Rolling up their sleeves: Superintendents and principals talk about what's needed to fix public schools.* New York, NY: Author. Retrieved from http://www.wallacefoundation.org

Waters, T. J., & Marzano, R. J. (2006). *School leadership that works: The effect of*

superintendent leadership on student achievement. Denver, CO: Mid-continent Research for Education and Learning Retrieved from http://www.mcrel.org

Waters, T. J., & Marzano, R. J. (2007). The primacy of superintendent leadership. *School Administrator, 64*(3). Retrieved from http://www.aasa.org/SchoolAdministratorArticle.aspx?id=7074

Wells, C. M., Maxfield, C. R., Klocko, B., & Feun, L. (2010). The role of superintendents in supporting teacher leadership: A study of principals' perceptions. *Journal of School leadership, 20,* 669-693. Retrieved from https://rowman.com/page/JSL

West, C. E. (2011). *School leadership teaming.* Alexandria, VA: National Association of Elementary School Principals. Retrieved from http://www.naesp.org

West, C. E., & Derrington, M. L. (2009). *Leadership teaming: The superintendent-principal relationship.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press. Retrieved from http://www.aasa.org/SchoolAdministratorArticle.aspx?id=13588

Wheeler, K. (2014). In *Niccolò Machiavelli and "The Prince."* Retrieved February 25, 2014, from https://web.cn.edu/kwheeler/machiavelli.html

Whitaker, K. S. (2002). Principal role changes and influence on principal recruitment and selection: An international perspective. *Journal of Educational Administration, 41*(1), 37-54. doi:10.1108/09578230310457420

Wren, D. A., & Bedeian, A. G. (2009). *The Evolution of Thought* (6thth ed.). John Wiley: John Wiley & Sons.

Womack, L. (n.d.). *Leading collaboration.* Retrieved from http://larrywomack.com/

Zhao, Y. (2010). *Catching up or leading the way: American education in the age of globalization.* Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum

Development.

Zhao, Y. (2012). *World class learners.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

APPENDIX A: ISLLC STANDARDS

The educational leadership standards with the approval of the Educational Leadership Policy Standards: ISLLC 2011 (Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium), the NPBEA (National Policy Board for Educational Administration) approved an ELCC (Educational Leadership Constituent Council) that revised the standards to address the leadership roles and responsibilities with curriculum, instruction, and running a district as a whole to ensure success. Special skills are necessary to run a district and leaders need guidance on what that entails. The standards below all backed up by extensive research are what leaders will rank on their perceptions of what are most effective. These are very similar to the standards many leaders are aware of in their educational leadership training.

> ELCC Standard 1.0: A district-level education leader applies knowledge that promotes the success of every student by facilitating the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a shared district vision of learning through the collection and use of data to identify district goals, assess organizational effectiveness, and implement district plans to achieve district goals; promotion of continual and sustainable district improvement; and evaluation of district progress and revision of district plans.
>
> ELCC Standard 2.0: A district-level education leader applies knowledge that promotes the success of every student by sustaining a district culture conducive to collaboration, trust, and a personalized learning environment with high expectations for students; creating and evaluating a comprehensive, rigorous, and coherent curricular and

instructional district program; developing and supervising the instructional and leadership capacity across the district; and promoting the most effective and appropriate technologies to support teaching and learning within the district.

ELCC Standard 3.0: A district-level education leader applies knowledge that promotes the success of every student by ensuring the management of the district's organization, operation, and resources through monitoring and evaluating district management and operational systems; efficiently using human, fiscal, and technological resources within the district; promoting district-level policies and procedures that protect the welfare and safety of students and staff across the district; developing district capacity for distributed leadership; and ensuring that district time focuses on high-quality instruction and student learning.

ELCC Standard 4.0: A district-level education leader applies knowledge that promotes the success of every student by collaborating with faculty and community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizing community resources for the district by collecting and analyzing information pertinent to improvement of the district's educational environment; promoting an understanding, appreciation, and use of the community's diverse cultural, social, and intellectual resources throughout the district; building and sustaining positive district relationships with families and caregivers; and cultivating productive district relationships with community partners.

ELCC Standard 5.0: A district-level education leader applies knowledge that promotes the success of every student by acting with integrity, fairness, and in an ethical manner to ensure a district system of accountability for every student's academic and social success

by modeling district principles of self-awareness, reflective practice, transparency, and ethical behavior as related to their roles within the district; safeguarding the values of democracy, equity, and diversity within the district; evaluating the potential moral and legal consequences of decision making in the district; and promoting social justice within the district to ensure individual student needs inform all aspects of schooling.

ELCC Standard 6.0: A district-level education leader applies knowledge that promotes the success of every student by understanding, responding to, and influencing the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context within the district through advocating for district students, families, and caregivers; acting to influence local, district, state, and national decisions affecting student learning; and anticipating and assessing emerging trends and initiatives in order to adapt district-level leadership strategies. (NPBEA, 2011, pp. 3-19)

APPENDIX B: EFFECTIVE CHARACTERISTICS OF SUPERINTENDENTS SURVEY

Section I: Perspectives on Effective Characteristics of Superintendents

Directions: Following are phrases and descriptions of leadership practices. Read each statement, and then click on the bubble that corresponds to how strongly you agree or disagree with your perceptions.

1. In order for a superintendent to be highly effective, he or she must facilitate the development and implementation of a vision of learning. (NPBEA, 2011, pp. 3-19)

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5	6

2. In order for a superintendent to be highly effective, he or she must increase trust in the organization. (Machiavelli, 1999)

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5	6

3. In order for a superintendent to be highly effective, he or she must develop new skills and knowledge for the future competitive global world. (Zhao, 2010)

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5	6

4. In order for a superintendent to be highly effective, he or she must analyze data and provide guidance for actions. (NPBEA, 2011, pp. 3-19)

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5	6

5. In order for a superintendent to be highly effective, he or she must act with a servant leadership style to the corporation. (Crippen, 2010)

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5	6

6. In order for a superintendent to be highly effective, he or she must provide professional development focused around the district goals. (Marzano, 2012)

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5	6

7. In order for a superintendent to be highly effective, he or she must structure the organization for a safe learning environment. (NPBEA, 2011, pp. 3-19)

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5	6

8. In order for a superintendent to be highly effective, he or she must focus on communicating with the community stakeholders. (NPBEA, 2011, pp. 3-19)

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5	6

9. In order for a superintendent to be highly effective, he or she must set high goals and expectations the corporation. (Marzano, 2012)

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5	6

10. In order for a superintendent to be highly effective, he or she must make genuine decisions. (Northouse, 2010)

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5	6

11. In order for a superintendent to be highly effective, he or she must have a good working relationship with the building level principals. (Forner et al., 2012)

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5	6

12. In order for a superintendent to be highly effective, he or she must create a relationship with teachers that involve rewards and recognition. (Kouzes & Posner, 2007)

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5	6

13. In order for a superintendent to be highly effective, he or she must be visible among staff, students, schools, and the community. (Saphier & Durkin, 2012)

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5	6

14. In order for a superintendent to be highly effective, he or she must adjust his/her leadership style depending on the situations that arise. (Bolden, Gosling, Marturano, & Dennison, 2003)

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5	6

15. In order for a superintendent to be highly effective, he or she must challenge all staff members. (Kouzes & Posner, 2007)

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5	6

16. In order for a superintendent to be highly effective, he or she must be the one who sets objectives to organize and manage a school district. (Drucker, 1988)

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5	6

17. In order for a superintendent to be highly effective, he or she must possess strong leadership traits. (Stogdill, 1974)

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5	6

18. In order for a superintendent to be highly effective, he or she must focus on the instructional strategies used in the classroom. (Marzano, 2012)

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5	6

19. In order for a superintendent to be highly effective, he or she must create a culture of collaboration. (DuFour, DuFour, Eaker, & Karhanek, 2004)

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5	6

20. In order for a superintendent to be highly effective, he or she must implement the transformation of the school district by inspiring followers with motivation to achieve the goals. (Bolden, Gosling, Marturano, & Dennison, 2003)

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5	6

Section II: Administrative Experience/School Information

Directions: Please respond to each item as it pertains to you. Indicate your response by marking the appropriate bubble provided.

1. What is your current position? superintendent or principal

2. How many years have you served in this role? 1-5, 6-10, 11-15, 16+

3. Would your school location best be considered? rural, suburban, urban

Rural is defined as a place with less than 2,500 people. Suburban: is defined as a place with populations of 100,000 to 250,000. Urban: is defined as place with populations of 250,000 or more (U.S. Department of Education, 2014).

APPENDIX C: INTRODUCTION ACCOMPANYING SURVEY TO SUPERINTENDENTS AND PRINCIPALS

You are being invited to participate in a research study about effective characteristics of superintendents. Camille Goldman is conducting this study under the guidance of Dr. Terry McDaniel from the Department of Educational Leadership at Indiana State University. This study is being conducted to fulfill a dissertation requirement. The purpose of this study is to determine the effective characteristics of superintendents through the principal's perception. It is being conducted in each public school corporations in the State of Indiana. The survey is given to each superintendent and principal in these school corporations.

There are no known risks if you decide to participate in this research study greater than what would be found in a regular job. There are no costs to you for participating in the study. This study will make educational leaders aware of effective characteristics in superintendents. The questionnaire will take about ten minutes to complete. The information collected may not benefit you directly, but the information learned in this study should provide more general benefits.

The survey is anonymous. Do not write your name on the survey. This is a web-based survey, although there is no absolute guaranteed anonymity, there will be no collection of any participants' IP addresses or any attempt to identify the names of the participants by the researcher. You may delete this e-mail in which this message was delivered at anytime. There will be no future e-mail contacts concerning this survey in the future. In addition, no one will be able to identify you or your answers, and no one will know whether or not you participated in the study. Individuals from the Institutional Review Board may inspect these records. Should the data be published, no individual information will be disclosed.

Your participation in this study is voluntary. By completing parts or all of the survey through the Qualtrics program, you are voluntarily agreeing to participate. You are free to decline to answer any particular question you do not wish to answer for any reason. At any time you may close the browser and exit the program if you do not wish to complete the survey after starting the process.

If you have any questions about the study, please contact me at (502) 468-8246 or at cgoldman@indstate.edu. You may also contact my faculty sponsor, Dr. Terry McDaniel, at (812) 237-3862 or at terry.mcdaniel@indstate.edu.

If you have any questions about your rights as a research subject or if you feel you've been placed at risk, you may contact the Indiana State University Institutional Review Board (IRB) by mail at Indiana State University, Office of Sponsored Programs, Terre Haute, IN, 47809, by phone at (812) 237-8217, or by e-mail at irb@indstate.edu.

APPENDIX D: FOLLOW UP E-MAIL

Greetings Again,

Thank you to for helping with the survey of *Effective Characteristics of Superintendents.* Your quick response was greatly appreciated! With your assistance perceptions on effective characteristics of superintendents will be analyzed among school districts in the state of Indiana. This link will be active for the remainder of this week. Please use the link below to complete the survey if you have not had the opportunity to do so already. All responses are anonymous and it should only take around five minutes to complete. Your input is greatly appreciated!

Thank you in advance for your time and participation.

The survey can be found at this link: http://indstate.qualtrics.com

If you have any questions about the study, please contact me at (502) 468-8246 or at cgoldman@indstate.edu. You may also contact my faculty sponsor, Dr. Terry McDaniel, at (812) 237-3862 or at terry.mcdaniel@indstate.edu.

If you have any questions about your rights as a research subject or if you feel you've been placed at risk, you may contact the Indiana State University Institutional Review Board (IRB) by mail at Indiana State University, Office of Sponsored Programs, Terre Haute, IN, 47809, by phone at (812) 237-8217, or by e-mail at irb@indstate.edu.