

STAYING POWER: THE RELATIONSHIP OF PUBLIC SCHOOL
SUPERINTENDENT TENURE TO LEADERSHIP FRAMES

A Dissertation

By

Doyne Scott Elliff

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

Texas A&M University—Corpus Christi

Corpus Christi, Texas

December, 2012

© Copyright by Doyne Scott Elliff
All Rights Reserved
December 2012

ABSTRACT

STAYING POWER: THE RELATIONSHIP OF PUBLIC SCHOOL SUPERINTENDENT TENURE TO LEADERSHIP FRAMES

(December, 2012)

Doyne Scott Elliff

B.S., Corpus Christi State University

M.S., Corpus Christi State University

Dissertation Chair: Raul Prezas, Ed.D.

The study examined the types of leadership frames (*human resource*, *structural*, *political*, and *symbolic*) (Bolman & Deal, 1997) most often used by public school superintendents in Texas, the relationship of leadership frames to the length of superintendent tenure in a single school district, and the influence of school district size on the relationship of leadership frames to tenure. The non-probability sample included 212 superintendents from public school districts in nine Education Service Centers in Texas, representing small / rural, mid-sized, and large urban districts. The study was descriptive correlational in nature, utilizing a survey to generate quantitative data.

Results revealed that the *human resource* frame was used most often by superintendents. The only frame statistically correlated to tenure in one district, however, was the *political* frame ($r=.17$, $p<.05$), and this relationship remained statistically significant when controlling for school district size, as measured by student population ($r=.17$, $p<.05$). Qualitative data were gathered from two open-response questions asking superintendents to identify factors related to 1) successful leadership of major change in a district and 2) ability to persist in the superintendent position. In response to the question

regarding factors enabling leadership of major change in a district, theme analysis revealed overlapping associations to each of the four frames, with an emphasis on the *human resource* frame. Analysis of responses to the question regarding factors enabling superintendents to persist in their tenure in a school district revealed an emphasis on the *human resource* frame.

DEDICATION

To my father and mother, “Bud” and Jane Elliff, exemplary parents and public educators
who always taught my brothers and me that a good education was something no one
could ever take from you, and

To my son, Adam, whose creativity inspires me to see the world from a different point of
view and whose unconditional love has been my greatest gift.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Completing this doctoral program has been a long journey. Throughout that journey, there have been guides, family members, colleagues, friends, and fellow travelers who have offered their support. I would like to acknowledge the outstanding faculty at Texas A&M University—Corpus Christi for their patience, wisdom, and unyielding support: my friend and committee chair, Dr. Raul Prezas; committee members, Dr. Kamiar Kouzekanani, Dr. Bryant Griffith, Dr. Randall Bowden, and Dr. Blair Sterba-Boatwright; and Dr. James Walter and the late Dr. Caroline Sherritt.

No superintendent can be successful without the leadership and support of the school board. The members of the Corpus Christi Independent School District Board of Trustees have patiently supported my efforts as I have pursued this degree while serving as the Superintendent of Schools. My appreciation and respect go to trustees Bill Clark, Carol Scott, Dwayne Hargis, Lucy Rubio, John Longoria, Dr. Tony C. Diaz, Guillermo “Willie” Perez, Louis Garza, and Norman Ransleben, each of whom served on the board at some time during my course of study.

In addition, my colleagues and Corpus Christi ISD Executive Team members Bernadine Cervantes, Janis Jordan, Roland Hernandez, Xavier Gonzalez, Debbie Lenz, John Janssen, and Lorette Williams have each encouraged me in this endeavor, along with many others in the District family.

Finally, I extend my appreciation to Michael Briones for his moral support on the many occasions when it has been sorely needed and his constant encouragement for me to see this work through to the end.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| CONTENTS | PAGES |
|--|-------|
| ABSTRACT..... | iv |
| DEDICATION..... | vi |
| ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS..... | vii |
| TABLE OF CONTENTS..... | viii |
| LIST OF TABLES..... | xi |
| I INTRODUCTION..... | 1 |
| Background and Setting..... | 1 |
| Statement of the Problem..... | 2 |
| Theoretical Framework..... | 3 |
| Purpose of the Study and Research Questions..... | 5 |
| Operational Definitions..... | 5 |
| Definition of Terms..... | 6 |
| Delimitations, Limitations, and Assumptions..... | 7 |
| Significance of the Study..... | 7 |
| II REVIEW OF LITERATURE..... | 9 |
| Introduction..... | 9 |
| Superintendent Competencies and Characteristics..... | 10 |
| The Urban Superintendency..... | 13 |

| | | |
|-----|---|----|
| | Superintendent Turnover Factors and Implications..... | 15 |
| | Leadership Frameworks..... | 17 |
| | Summary..... | 27 |
| III | METHODOLOGY..... | 28 |
| | Introduction..... | 28 |
| | Research Design..... | 28 |
| | Subject Selection..... | 29 |
| | Instrumentation..... | 31 |
| | Data Collection..... | 32 |
| | Data Analysis..... | 33 |
| IV | RESULTS..... | 35 |
| | Profile of Subjects..... | 35 |
| | Leadership Skills..... | 37 |
| | Correlational Analysis..... | 45 |
| | Qualitative Data..... | 46 |
| | Summary of Results..... | 49 |
| V | SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND DISCUSSION..... | 51 |
| | Introduction..... | 51 |
| | Summary of Results..... | 51 |
| | Conclusions..... | 52 |
| | Discussion..... | 52 |
| | Implications..... | 54 |
| | Recommendations for Further Research..... | 55 |

| | | |
|------------|--|----|
| | Final Remarks..... | 57 |
| REFERENCES | | 58 |
| APPENDICES | | |
| | APPENDIX A..... | 64 |
| | IRB Application..... | 65 |
| | IRB Approval..... | 74 |
| | Consent Form..... | 75 |
| | APPENDIX B..... | 76 |
| | Superintendent Leadership Inventory (SLI)..... | 77 |
| | APPENDIX C..... | 83 |
| | Qualitative Data..... | 84 |

LIST OF TABLES

| TABLE | | PAGE |
|-------|---|------|
| 1 | Characteristics of the Four Frames..... | 4 |
| 2 | Profile of Subjects, Categorical Variables, n=212..... | 35 |
| 3 | Profile of Subjects, Continuous Variables, n=212..... | 36 |
| 4 | Frequency and Percentage Distributions of Responses to the Leadership Orientations Inventory (LOI), n=212..... | 37 |
| 5 | Ranking of Leadership Skills..... | 42 |
| 6 | Ranking of Leadership Frames..... | 43 |
| 7 | Repeated Measures ANOVA Results for Leadership Frames..... | 44 |
| 8 | Post Hoc Results for Leadership Frames..... | 44 |
| 9 | Simple Associations Between Leadership Frames and Longest Tenure as Superintendent..... | 45 |
| 10 | First Order Partial Correlations Between Leadership Frames and Longest Tenure as Superintendent, Controlling for District Size..... | 46 |

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

This chapter provides an introduction to and overview of the dissertation study. The chapter begins with the background and setting, followed by the statement of the problem, theoretical framework, purpose of the study and research questions, operational definitions, definition of terms, significance of the study, and delimitations, limitations and assumptions.

Background and Setting

School systems, particularly in urban areas, are complex organizations governed by myriad local, state, and federal regulations (Cooper, Fusarelli, & Carella, 2000). Interpersonal relationships among members of the organization must be managed, and external influences from special interest groups can interfere with efforts to improve instruction and student achievement (Renchler, 1992). Further, the dynamics of responding to the political agendas of an elected board of trustees, teacher unions, and legislators are always challenges for school district superintendents (Council of the Great City Schools [CGCS], 2008).

The superintendent of schools must deal with these types of issues adeptly in order to survive and succeed (CGCS, 2008). As the chief executive officer of a school district, the superintendent is responsible for developing and implementing plans to achieve broad goals established by the Board of Trustees (Texas Education Code, 2012), but often is also viewed as the moral and intellectual leader of the community in which the school district is located, tasked with bringing about change in tiered, bureaucratic organizations influenced by politics, tradition, and special interests (Schlechty, 2009).

Charged with leading in such a complex, demanding, and dynamic environment, superintendent turnover presents challenges for the implementation and long-term maintenance of systemic change efforts, particularly in urban areas (Shields, 2002). Sorgi (2006) reports a correlation between superintendent tenure, as measured by the number of superintendents over time, and academic performance in large urban districts. Further, a meta-analysis of research reveals that superintendent tenure is correlated to student achievement and the positive effects of sustained superintendent tenure manifest themselves within the first two years of a superintendent's tenure (Waters & Marzano, 2006). A study examining the relationship of superintendent tenure to student performance on New York State mathematics and English language arts examinations also revealed a positive correlation (Caplan, 2010).

Superintendent turnover is likely to increase in the near future, with nearly half of current superintendents reporting that they do not expect to be in the superintendency in 2015 (Kowalski, et al, 2011). Average superintendent tenure has been documented to be between 2.5 years and 7 years (NSBA, 2001; CGCS, 2008). The mean tenure of superintendents in urban districts is 3.5 years. While rising since 1999, this figure is relatively low when compared to suburban and rural systems (CGCS, 2008).

Statement of the Problem

Leading major change in an organization such as a school district requires the need for stability in the superintendent position. Successful large-scale school reform requires five or more years of tenure for a superintendent (Natkin, et al, 2002). Superintendent turnover, particularly in urban districts, disrupts efforts to effectuate substantive change, perpetuates bureaucracy, and impedes the attainment of goals

(Shields, 2002). Frequent superintendent turnover creates chaos in systems, increases frequency of turnover in subordinate administrative positions, and creates a climate of risk aversion, where survival is a greater concern than real school improvement (Natkin, et al, 2002). The relationship of superintendent tenure to academic achievement has also been documented (Caplan, 2010; Sorgi, 2006; Waters & Marzano, 2006). Byrd, Drews, and Johnson (2006) cited the factors that influence superintendents to leave their districts, including challenges in raising student achievement, conflicted board relationships, and other external pressures. Less research has been conducted, however, on the personal characteristics and attributes of superintendents persisting successfully in districts long enough to have the opportunity to create and maintain transformational change. Without research that identifies the leadership characteristics and attributes of superintendents that related to persistence, the problem of continuous superintendent turnover in districts will most likely continue (Shields, 2002).

Theoretical Framework

Bolman and Deal's (1997) four-frame model is the theoretical framework that guided the study. The framework assumes that successful managers and leaders must be able to frame and reframe experiences to lead effectively and deal successfully with organizational challenges. Frames can be thought of as a set of tools, each with its strengths and limitations. The frames and their distinctive characteristics are presented below:

- *structural* frame, which has the “factory” as its metaphor and is characterized by rules, roles, goals, policies, technology, and environment;

- *human resource* frame, which has the “family” as its metaphor and is characterized by needs, skills, and relationships;
- *political* frame, which has the “jungle” as its metaphor and is characterized by power, conflict, competition, and organizational politics; and
- *symbolic* frame, which has the “temple” or “theater” as its metaphor and is characterized by culture, meaning, ritual, ceremony, stories, and heroes.

Successful leaders are those who learn to apply all four frames adeptly, as needed, to respond to organizational challenges (Bolman & Deal, 1997). A summary of the origins, organizational metaphors, and characteristics of each frame is presented in Table 1.

Table 1

Characteristics of the Four Frames

| Frame | Origin | Organizational Metaphor | Characteristics |
|----------------|-------------------|-------------------------|---|
| Structural | Sociology | Factory or Machine | Rules, roles, goals, policies, technology |
| Human resource | Psychology | Family | Needs, relationships skills |
| Political | Political Science | Jungle | Power, conflict competition |
| Symbolic | Anthropology | Temple | Culture, ritual, ceremony |

(Bolman & Deal, 1997)

Purpose of the Study and Research Questions

The purpose of the study was to determine which of the frames superintendents are more likely to use, and to examine the relationship of the use of the four frames to the length of tenure of the superintendent in a single district. The study also focused on the influence of school district size, as measured by student population, on the relationship between the use of the four frames and tenure. The following research questions guided the study:

1. What leadership frames are superintendents most likely to use in their work?
2. What is the relationship between length of superintendent tenure in one district and one or more of the four leadership frames?
3. How is the relationship between the length of superintendent tenure and the four frames influenced by district size, as determined by student population?

Operational Definitions

For the purpose of the study, the following operational definitions were adopted:

The *four frames* of leadership, namely *structural* frame, *human resource* frame, *political* frame, and *symbolic* frame were measured by the respondents' responses to Part I of the Superintendent Leadership Inventory (SLI).

Tenure was measured by the longest length of time in the superintendent position in one district.

Size of the district was measured by student population in the district where the superintendent had the longest tenure.

Definition of Terms

Frames or four frames refers to the four perspectives (*structural, human resource, political, and symbolic*) identified by Bolman and Deal (1997) through the consolidation of major schools of organizational thought and which they identify as important for managers and leaders to use in leading organizations.

Mid-sized school district refers to a district in Texas with between 1,600 and 5,000 students (TAMS, 2012).

Region is a geographical area in Texas served by one of twenty Education Service Centers that exist to provide an opportunity for school districts to meet accountability standards established by the Commissioner of Education (Texas Education Code [TEC] 8.001) (Texas Education Code, 2012).

School board refers to the elected body responsible for the oversight of the management of a school district (TEC 11.091) (Texas Education Code, 2012).

School district refers to the political subdivision responsible for implementing the state's system of public education and ensuring student performance (TEC 11.002) (Texas Education Code, 2012).

Small / rural district refers to a public school district with fewer than 1,600 students (TARS, 2012)

Superintendent refers to the educational leader who is the chief executive officer of a school district (TEC 11.201) (Texas Education Code, 2012).

Texas Education Agency (TEA) is the state regulatory agency charged with oversight of the public schools in Texas (TEC 7.021 & 7.055, 2012) (Texas Education Code, 2012).

Urban school district refers to one of 17 public school districts in Texas with 50,000 students or more as of 2011 (TASB, 2012).

Delimitations, Limitations, and Assumptions

1. The study was delimited to superintendents in Education Service Center Regions 1, 2, 4, 10, 11, 13, 17, 19, and 20 in Texas.
2. The study was delimited to independent variables of *structural* frame, *human resource* frame, *political* frame, and *symbolic* frame.
3. The study was delimited to the outcome measure of tenure in the superintendency.
4. Due to the non-probability nature of the sampling, external validity was limited to study participants.
5. It was assumed all variables of interest were measureable.
6. It was assumed that the participants were truthful in their responses to the survey.
7. It was assumed that the researcher was not biased by his own personal experiences.

Significance of the Study

The study was potentially significant to a variety of constituencies, including school board members, superintendents, professional associations, and those leading superintendent preparation programs. In Texas alone, with over 1000 public school districts, there are typically 10 to 30 superintendent positions open at any given time. School board members and search consultants may make use of the results of the study in developing more insightful interview protocols, candidate profiles, and selection tools. School boards may also use the results of the study in developing tools and processes for evaluating superintendents.

Additionally, colleges and universities may use results in planning the curriculum for superintendent preparation programs. Professional associations, such as the American Association of School Administrators, Texas Association of School Administrators, National School Boards Association, and Texas Association of School Boards, may use results in professional development, guidance, and programming. Finally, superintendents may use the results of the study to inform and improve their own practice.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Introduction

Today's public school superintendents, particularly those in urban settings, face increasing demands in their roles as chief executive officers of their systems.

Urban school superintendents hold one of the most important and challenging jobs in America's education system. In this era of accountability and standards, superintendents are charged with making visible and rapid improvements in the academic achievement of the nation's most vulnerable children. They must break down barriers to reform and build capacity for quality teaching and learning in their schools. They must unite parents, educators, school boards, and community leaders behind a clear and coherent vision of instructional purpose. Amidst the highly politicized environments of big city school districts, superintendents must serve as mediators, statesmen, and agents of change (Council of the Great City Schools [CGCS], 2008, p. 1).

As these demands and challenges increase, the pool of qualified applicants for the superintendent positions is decreasing. Consultants working with predominantly suburban and urban school district boards to recruit and place new superintendents indicated that applicant pools were decreasing in both size and quality, with an average of only 30 to 40 applicants for any vacancy (ECS, 2001).

Turnover is particularly challenging in urban districts, where the mean tenure of superintendents is 3.5 years. While rising since 1999, this figure is relatively low when compared to suburban and rural systems (CGCS, 2008).

The challenging nature of the position combined with a supply shortage of new superintendent candidates and more frequent superintendent turnover in urban districts calls for an examination of those characteristics leading to persistence, or increased tenure, among superintendents, particularly in urban districts (Renchler, 1992). A comprehensive analysis of the literature was derived from books, papers, dissertations, and professional journals. The review of the literature is organized into four sections: (a) superintendent competencies and characteristics; (b) the urban superintendency; (c) superintendent turnover and its implications; and (d) leadership frameworks, with an emphasis on the four-frame model of Bolman and Deal (1997).

Superintendent Competencies and Characteristics

Successful superintendents, in general, possess a common set of competencies sought by school boards in their search processes. These general competencies include good interpersonal, communications, and political skills; leadership and management expertise, integrity and personal commitment (CGCS, 2006).

The American Association of School Administrators (AASA) Commission on Standards for the Superintendency developed eight standards that effective superintendents should meet and for which they should be able to demonstrate the identified competencies and skills: (a) leadership and district culture, (b) policy and governance, (c) communications / community relations, (d) organizational management,

(e) curriculum planning and development, (f) instructional management, (g) human resource management, and (h) values and ethics of leadership (Hoyle, 1993).

Further, the various states have developed formal competencies required for certification as a superintendent. In Texas, the competencies required for certification as a superintendent are organized within three domains, which, in turn, are further delineated into ten competencies (Texas Education Agency, 2006). The three domains are: (a) leadership of the educational community, (b) instructional leadership, and (c) administrative leadership.

In the first domain, leadership of the educational community, the superintendent knows how to:

- act with integrity, fairness, and in an ethical manner in order to promote the success of all students;
- shape district culture by facilitating the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a vision of learning that is shared and supported by the educational community;
- communicate and collaborate with families and community members, respond to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilize community resources to ensure educational success for all students; and
- respond to and influence the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context, including working with the board of trustees, to achieve the district's educational vision.

In the second domain, instructional leadership, the superintendent knows how to:

- facilitate the planning and implementation of strategic plans that enhance teaching and learning, ensure alignment among curriculum, curriculum resources, and assessment, and promote the use of varied assessments to measure student performance;
- advocate, nurture, and sustain an instructional program and a district culture that are conducive to student learning and staff professional growth; and
- implement a staff evaluation and development system to improve the performance of all staff members and select appropriate models for supervision and staff development.

In the third domain, administrative leadership, the superintendent knows how to:

- apply principles of effective leadership and management in relation to district budgeting, personnel, resource utilization, financial management, and technology use;
- apply principles of leadership and management to the district's physical plant and support systems to ensure a safe and effective learning environment; and
- apply organizational, decision-making, and problem-solving skills to facilitate positive change in varied contexts (Texas Education Agency, 2006).

Candidates for certification are tested on these competencies prior to certification.

An inability to demonstrate these and similar competencies is a primary factor leading to the dismissal or early departure of a superintendent. School board presidents and superintendents agree that unsatisfactory performance in the area of curriculum development and implementation and poor superintendent-board relations are factors in premature dismissal or departure of superintendents (Peterson & Klotz, 1999).

In addition to these formal competencies, common personal values and motivating factors among superintendents have been identified, including a strong desire to improve the educational experiences of the students in their districts. With regard to motivating factors for becoming a superintendent, statements such as “I thought I could make a difference,” “The job would allow me to help move the district forward,” and “The job would enable me to provide leadership” are most highly rated (Sharp, Malone, & Walter, 2002). In a 2002 study sponsored by the American Association of School Administrators (as cited in Education Commission of the States [ECS], 2001), approximately 29% of superintendents surveyed felt that they were hired because of their abilities as instructional leaders. Further, over 60% believed that they were hired based on personal characteristics and the ability to be change agents (ECS, 2001).

Search consultants are frequently employed to assist school boards in their search for superintendents. Communication and interpersonal relationship skills, along with school board relationship-building skills, were cited as the most important skills for superintendents, with lower marks given to instructional leadership and financial management (ECS, 2001).

The Urban Superintendency

CGCS represents the nation’s largest urban school districts. CGCS’s 66 districts serve approximately 7.2 million of America’s 48.7 million public school students (15%), and approximately 30% of the nation’s lowest income students, students of color, and English language learners (CGCS, 2008). As of 2008, 48% of CGCS member district superintendents identified themselves as white, 42% as black, and 10% as Hispanic. Further, 66% of the superintendents were men, and, of these, 36% were White, 22% were

Black, and 8% were Hispanic. Additionally, 34% were females, of whom 20% were Black, 12% were White, and 2% were Hispanic.

While tenure for urban superintendents is shorter than their suburban and rural counterparts, the length of tenure in urban districts is increasing. The average tenure of CGCS superintendents increased from 3.1 years in 2006 to 3.5 years in 2008. This is a marked increase from 1999 when average tenure was about 2.33 years; however, 18% of CGCS superintendents have been in office for five or more years, down from 25% in 2006 (CGCS, 2008).

A National School Boards Association (NSBA) (2001) survey showed that superintendent tenure in urban districts was longer than that reported by the CGCS. The NSBA Council of Urban Boards of Education (CUBE) conducted a survey of their 102 member school districts and the nation's 50 largest cities in 2001 and found that the average tenure of superintendents was 5 years; however, for the 50 largest cities, the average tenure was less, at 4.6 years (NSBA, 2001). Among the 77 CUBE districts who responded to the survey, the immediate past superintendents served 6.4 years. The results also showed that eight CUBE districts reported having more than five superintendents from 1985 to 2000, while 28 of the districts reported that every superintendent whose tenure ended during that 15-year period served at least 5 years. The longest serving immediate past superintendent among CUBE districts at the time of the survey had served 13.4 years in Omaha, Nebraska, and the shortest tenure was 1.1 years in Detroit, Michigan. Among the 50 largest cities, the longest tenure was in Mesa, Arizona, with 14.8 years. Cleveland, Ohio, had the shortest immediate past superintendent tenure, at 0.7 years.

Superintendent Turnover Factors and Implications

Several studies indicate that poor relationships with school board members are often the root cause of superintendent turnover. A survey of Illinois superintendents found that 61.2% indicated that their boards sometimes tried to micromanage their districts, and 39.2% felt that at least one board member had tried to “stab them in the back” (Sharp & Walter, 1995). Another study found that superintendent turnover was frequently predicated on poor board-superintendent relationships due to incorrect interpretations of board members’ roles, election of board members with personal agendas, lack of board support, the board’s inability to police itself, and actions of individual board members (Grady & Bryant, 1991).

Several variables predictive of superintendent turnover have been identified as part of the “dissatisfaction theory of school governance” (Natkin, et al, 2002). This theory holds, in part, that a district’s recent history of elected school board member turnover should be predictive of superintendent survival in office. Communities experience long periods of quiet and satisfaction among the electorate; however, during those periods, dissatisfactions begin to build in various sectors of the community, leading to the defeat of school board trustees. This, in turn, brings a shift of the political composition of the school board and the replacement of the superintendent.

Other studies indicate that board member interference in management, conflicts with staff, cultural clashes between board members and superintendents hired from outside the district, and sports-related conflicts can be predictors of impending turnover (Shields, 2002). Board members often avoid accepting responsibility for superintendent turnover, refute the idea that public schools are political in nature, are less concerned

about role clarification than the superintendents they employ, and are somewhat naïve about the impact of community dynamics on superintendent turnover (Poole, 1992).

Group politics, racial and ethnic factors, and the governance structure of the school board and local government can impact the superintendent's job performance and length of tenure (Beaumont, 1993). These factors, along with the school board's administrative and political history, the superintendent's personal and management style, arbitrary triggering events, and the superintendent's relationship with key actors in the community could prompt the school board to not renew or terminate the superintendent's contract.

Communication between superintendents and board members is also cited as a cause for turnover. Martinez (1988) attributed concerns about power and communication breakdowns between the superintendent and school board members in part to the type of language and vocabulary each used to define the theory and practice of education.

Perceptions of school boards and superintendents regarding superintendent longevity in Michigan have been studied, and protective and risk factors for longevity as perceived by both trustees and superintendents have been identified (Hipp, 2002). Superintendent factors that were protective for longevity included the length of time the superintendent lived within 25 miles of his or her position, the outcome of the last evaluation, the existence of additional retirement benefits in the salary package, and the age of the superintendent. The greatest superintendent factor that was a risk for longevity was, again, micromanagement of the board that inhibits the superintendent's effectiveness.

With regard to urban superintendents, specifically, reasons for turnover do not vary greatly between districts (Gaeston, 2009). Politics, board turnover, board involvement in personnel issues, and lack of clarity in roles have been cited as reasons for turnover.

In contrast to studies identifying factors influencing superintendent turnover, there is sparse research that identifies the specific, individual leadership behaviors of superintendents who maintain tenure in the same school district for long periods (Atherton, 2008). Superintendents who are successful in maintaining tenure are those who can meet the political and instructional needs of the school board members and the community they represent.

Leadership Frameworks

Various frameworks have been developed and popularized in the last two decades to describe the behavior of successful leaders of high-performing organizations, the behavior of members of the organization, or both. Now frequently applied to the superintendency, these include frameworks describing processes for leading change (Kotter, 1996), social systems within an organization (Schlechty, 2009), characteristics of organizations in which significant performance improvements have been achieved and maintained (Collins, 2001), and the frames through which leaders must view organizational issues and challenges in order to be effective (Bolman & Deal, 1997).

Superintendents are called upon to be “transformational” leaders of change in their districts (CGCS, 2008). An eight-step process model for leading change in organizations has been developed (Kotter, 1996). The first step, establishing a sense of urgency, requires the leader to examine the current reality, and identify crises, potential

crises, or major opportunities faced by the organization. The second step, creating a guiding coalition, involves putting together a group with enough power to lead the change, and then getting them to work as team. The third step, developing a vision and strategy, requires the leader to create an image of the preferred future, identify specific steps necessary to accomplish that vision, and then direct the implementation of those strategies. The fourth step, communicating the change vision, uses every means possible to constantly reinforce the new vision and strategies, and allows the guiding coalition to model the expected behavior of employees.

The fifth step, empowering broad based action, requires the leader to remove obstacles, change systems or structures that impede accomplishment of the vision, and encourage risk-taking and nontraditional actions. The sixth step, generating short-term wins, requires planning for specific improvements, creating those “wins,” and rewarding people who made the wins possible. The seventh step, consolidating gains and producing more change, involves hiring, promoting, and developing people who can implement the change vision, and continually re-energizing the work with new projects and themes. The eighth step, anchoring those new approaches in the culture, connects new behaviors to organizational success and ensures leadership development and succession (Kotter, 1996).

Superintendents who are successful in leading transformational change in their school districts understand the complexity of the social systems in the organizations they lead (Schlechty, 2009). Within any human group, the rules, roles, relationships, values, beliefs, and traditions that gain expression are referred to as norms. These norms become

expressions of group culture that are organized into at least six “critical systems” within any organization, including school districts:

- Directional systems are the systems through which goals and priorities are set and determined, and through which corrective actions are initiated.
- Knowledge development and transmission systems are the formal and informal systems that define how knowledge related to cultural norms is developed, imported, evaluated, and transmitted.
- Recruitment and induction systems are the systems that define how new members are identified, recruited, and brought into an organization, or reoriented when a system is transitioning.
- Boundary systems are the systems that define who and what are inside and outside an organization, as well as the formal role relationships within an organization.
- Evaluation systems are the systems that define how merit, status, and honor are bestowed to organizational members, as well as the means by which sanctions are levied.
- Power and authority systems are the systems by which sanctions are legitimized, the exercise of power is defined, and status is determined (Schlechty, 2009).

As leaders of change, superintendents must understand the disruptive nature of transformational change as perceived by those within school organizations (Schlechty, 2009). These changes are disruptive because the systems most likely to impact learning (directional, knowledge development and transmission, and recruitment and induction systems) are not the same as the systems most associated with flexibility and adaptability

of the school organization (power and authority, evaluation, and boundary systems). The odds of a particular innovation working are limited by the superintendent's awareness of the way power and authority are arranged, the way value is assigned, the way boundaries are established, and the flexible arrangement of these systems.

Superintendents must not only lead change, but sustain it over time (CGCS, 2008). A third framework known as "good to great" is based on characteristics of both the leader and the members of the organization that relate to implementation and sustenance of change (Collins, 2001). The framework describes seven characteristics of high performing organizations identified through an analysis of performance results of selected businesses over period of time, and comparisons of successful and unsuccessful businesses within similar sectors. The first characteristic, Level 5 leadership, is represented by a combination of professional will and personal humility on the part of the organizational leader. Level 5 leaders are described as "ambitious first and foremost for the company, not themselves" (Collins, 2001, p. 39). Level 5 leaders set up their successors for even greater success in the next generation. The second characteristic, "First Who, then What," describes the leader as one who is skilled at "getting the right people on the bus, getting the wrong people off the bus, and getting the right people in the right seats" (Collins, 2001, p. 63). This characteristic refers to the selection and placement of team members and shares attributes with Kotter's (1996) second step of creating a guiding coalition.

The third characteristic, "Confront the Brutal Facts (Yet Never Lose Faith)," refers to the willingness and ability of the leader and members of the organization to reflect honestly and frequently on performance data and use those data to spur

improvements. “All good-to-great companies began the process of finding a path to greatness by confronting the brutal facts of their current reality” (Collins, 2001, p. 88). The fourth characteristic, “The Hedgehog Concept,” emphasizes the core business of the organization. “If you cannot be the best in the world at your core business, then your core business cannot form the basis of your Hedgehog Concept” (Collins, 2001, p. 118). The fifth characteristic, “Culture of Discipline,” emphasizes behaviors of both the leader and members of the organization that demonstrate extreme diligence, commitment, and intensity related to the organization’s core business. The sixth characteristic, “Technology Accelerators,” refers to the ability of leaders and members of the organization to adapt the use of technology to accomplish the organization’s core business, or hedgehog. Finally, “The Flywheel and the Doom Loop” contrasts the characteristics of the companies in the comparison analysis whose sustainable transformations follow a predictable pattern of buildup and breakthrough with those companies who skip the buildup phase and try to jump immediately to breakthrough. Successful companies persistently push in a consistent direction over a long period of time, building momentum.

The fourth framework and theoretical model upon which the study was grounded is the four-frame model (Bolman & Deal, 1997). This model emphasizes the behavior of the leader, specifically the ability to use different frames when facing organizational challenges and to help others in the organization to use different frames as well. Each frame has its own distinctive characteristics, and an effective leader will be able to use all four. The four frames are *structural*, *human resource*, *political*, and *symbolic*.

Structural frame. The *structural* frame focuses on designing a pattern of roles and relationships that will accomplish goals and accommodate individual differences. The structural frame is based on six assumptions about the nature of organizations: (a) organizations exist to achieve established goals and objectives; (b) organizations work best when rationality prevails over personal preferences and external pressures; (c) structures must be designed to fit the circumstances of an organization; (d) organizations increase efficiency and enhance performance through specialization and division of labor; (e) control and coordination are essential to ensure individuals and units work together; and (f) problems can be remedied through restructuring (Bolman & Deal, 1997).

Drawing from sociology and management science, the *structural* frame emphasizes goals, specialized roles, and formal relationships. Structures are designed to fit the environment and technology of an organization. In this context, rules, policies, procedures, and hierarchies are created and revered. With this frame, the organization is viewed as a factory, and problems are solved by reorganizing people or activities (Bolman & Deal, 1997).

Structure is a blueprint for the pattern of expectations and exchanges among internal players, such as executives, managers, employees, and external constituencies, such as customers and clients. As a feature of organizations, structure has a positive impact on morale when it helps employees to get their work done, but the same structure can have a negative impact on morale when it impedes communication or increases bureaucratic control (Bolman & Deal, 1997).

Human resource frame. The *human resource* frame draws on ideas from psychology and views an organization much like an extended family, inhabited by

individuals who have needs, feelings, prejudices, skills, and limitations. From this perspective, the key challenge is to tailor organizations to people and to find a way for individuals to get the job done while feeling good about what they are doing (Bolman & Deal, 1997).

The *human resource* frame rests on four assumptions about organizations: (a) organizations exist to serve human needs, rather than the reverse; (b) people and organizations need each other; (c) when the fit between the individual and the organization is poor, either the individual or the organization will suffer; and (d) when the fit between the individual and the organization is good, the individual is satisfied and the organization is energized, resulting in a benefit for both (Bolman & Deal, 1997).

Both the needs of the organization and the individual are considered in the *human resource* frame (Bolman & Deal, 1997). Different theorists have attempted to define human needs in both hierarchical and contrasting terms. One hierarchical view posits that individuals must have certain basic needs met before they are able to attend to higher-order needs (Maslow, 1943). In this model, physiological needs, such as those for food, oxygen, water, health, and comfort, must be met before the individual can be concerned with safety. The need for safety precedes the need for belongingness and love from others, followed by the need for self-esteem and, finally, self-actualization.

McGregor (1960) built on Maslow's theory by adding the idea that managers make assumptions about people that become self-fulfilling prophecies. These assumptions can generally be grouped into two "theories" about subordinates and how to manage them: (a) Theory "X", which emphasizes coercion, control, threats, and punishments because subordinates are presumed to be passive, lazy, unambitious, and

naturally resistant to change; or (b) Theory “Y”, which proposes that “the essential task of management is to arrange organizational conditions so that people can achieve their own goals best by directing their efforts toward organizational rewards” (McGregor, 1960, p. 61). Theory “Y” is exemplified in the *human resource* frame (Bolman & Deal, 1997).

In addition to understanding individual and organizational needs, the interpersonal dynamics among individuals within organizations, as well as within and among groups inside the organization, are also considerations of the *human resource* frame (Bolman & Deal, 1997). Group dynamics are influenced by both the content of the task to be accomplished and the process used to accomplish the task. Accordingly, within the *human resource* frame, the leader must manage a number of group issues, including the informal roles of the individuals within the groups, the norms under which the group operates, and interpersonal conflicts which may arise among group members.

Political frame. With the *political* frame, different interests compete for power and scarce resources, and the organization is viewed as a jungle. The characteristics of this frame acknowledge that (a) conflict is commonplace and expected because of the enduring differences in needs, perspectives, and lifestyles among various individuals and groups; (b) bargaining, negotiation, coercion, and compromise are acceptable parts of everyday life; and (c) solutions to challenges in the organization arise from the leader’s political skill and acumen (Bolman & Deal, 1997).

Five assumptions about organizational dynamics underlie the *political* frame: (a) organizations are seen as comprised of continually shifting coalitions formed in order to accomplish specific ends; (b) there are always enduring differences among the various

coalitions within an organization; (c) the most important decisions to be made are assumed to pertain to the allocation of scarce resources; (d) conflict is a central and unavoidable dynamic in organizations, and the most important scarce resource is power; and (e) the process of making goals and reaching decisions always includes bargaining, positioning, and negotiating (Bolman & Deal, 1997).

In considering the dynamics of the political frame, power is defined simply as the capacity to make things happen (Bolman & Deal, 1997). Power has also been defined as the potential ability to influence behavior, change course of events, overcome resistance, and get people to do things they would not otherwise do (Pfeffer, 1992). The *political* frame recognizes numerous sources of power within organizations, including positional authority, reward control, information, expertise, access to key individuals, and control of agendas (Bolman & Deal, 1997).

The leader viewing organizational issues through the *political* frame understands that when partisans are convinced that the existing authority is too evil or too incompetent to continue, they will take the risk to try to wrest power away, unless they regard the authorities as too formidable to confront. Conversely, when partisans trust authority, they will leave it alone and support it if it is attacked (Bolman & Deal, 1997).

With the *political* frame, conflict is not necessarily a problem or sign that something is wrong, and the focus is not on resolving conflict; rather, the focus is on identifying and using strategies and tactics to make the best of the conflict that exists (Bolman & Deal, 1997). The leader or manager effectively using the *political* frame must possess a number of skills, including agenda setting, accurately mapping the political terrain, and the ability to effectively bargain and negotiate.

Symbolic frame. The *symbolic* frame draws on cultural and social anthropology. Using the metaphor of theater, actors play their roles in the organizational drama while audiences form impressions from what they see on stage. “Problems arise when actors play their parts badly, when symbols lose their meaning, when ceremonies and rituals lose their potency” (Bolman & Deal, 1997, p. 14).

Six assumptions underlie the *symbolic* frame: (a) what happens within an organization is less important than the meaning behind what happens; (b) events have multiple meanings because of the differing interpretations of those events by individuals within the organization; (c) life is ambiguous, uncertain, puzzling, and rarely black-or-white; (d) rational analysis, problem solving, and decision making are affected or undercut by ambiguity; (e) people create symbols to resolve confusion, provide hope, and make meaning from that which is unclear; and (f) events within an organization are important more for what is expressed than what is produced (Bolman & Deal, 1997).

With the *symbolic* frame, rituals, ceremonies and myths play an important role in the organization. Such elements provide the “story behind the story” for individuals affiliated with the organization, anchor the present in the past through narrative, and establish and perpetuate traditions. These elements also convey both the values and identity of the organization to both insiders and outsiders. The leader must be sensitive to the positive and negative aspects of these symbolic elements, recognizing that these myths, stories, and rituals can blind individuals to new information and learning at the same time they are distinguishing the institution, and can obscure the failure of a bad program as easily as communicating the success of a good one (Bolman & Deal, 1997).

Summary

Competencies for, and characteristics of, successful superintendents have been identified by professional organizations, consortia of school districts, and regulatory agencies. These include strong communications and political skills, ethics, community relations, and the instructional and business aspects of school leadership. Failure to demonstrate these competencies and characteristics has been identified as a factor leading to early departure of superintendents from their districts. Additional factors have been identified related to superintendent turnover, including poor relationships with school board members, poor communication with school boards, and school board politics, in general.

Length of tenure has been correlated to improved academic performance school districts. Moreover, turnover in the superintendency is disruptive to the implementation and sustenance of change in districts. While studies have documented the factors leading to a superintendent's early departure from a school district, research on the factors enabling superintendents to persist is sparse.

Several frameworks for successful organizational leadership have been applied in recent years to the leadership role of the superintendent. These frameworks provide guidance for leading major systemic change, understanding the social systems within organizations, applying best practices used in other successful organizations and corporations over time, and using "frames" to understand and deal with organizational challenges.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

The primary purpose of the study was to document the four leadership frames used by a sample of superintendents in Texas and the extent of the relationship between leadership frames and the longest tenure in one school district, as well as the influence of school size on the relationship between the use of frames and tenure. The following research questions guided the study:

1. What leadership frames are superintendents most likely to use in their work?
2. Is there a relationship between length of superintendent tenure in one district and the four leadership frames?
3. Is the relationship between the length of superintendent tenure and the four frames influenced by district size, as determined by student population?

The chapter describes methods used to conduct the study. Sections in the chapter include: research design, subject selection, instrumentation, data collection, and data analysis.

Research Design

The study employed a correlational design. Correlational studies are conducted by collecting data on two or more variables for each individual in a sample and computing a correlation coefficient (Gall, Gall, & Borg, 2007). In contrast to experimental studies, which provide definitive conclusions about a cause-and-effect relationship, correlational studies are best used to measure the degree and direction of the relationship between two or more variables and to explore factors that might be causal. If

a significant relationship exists among variables, subsequent experimental studies may be designed and implemented to determine a possible cause-and-effect relationship.

The study was also retrospective in nature and relied heavily on recollection of past experiences in the superintendent position. In retrospective studies, the researchers neither manipulate the independent variables nor have any control over the antecedent events, situations, or circumstances influencing the subjects' responses; thus, no causal statements or inferences are drawn (Meltzoff, 1998). The study included four independent variables of leadership frames (*structural* frame, *human resource* frame, *political* frame, and *symbolic* frame), one dependent variable of longest tenure as a superintendent, and one potential confounding variable of district size. The study was explanatory in nature.

Subject Selection

The participants for study were superintendents drawn from nine Education Service Center regions in Texas, specifically Regions 1, 2, 4, 10, 11, 13, 17, 19, and 20 (N = 456). Each of these Education Service Center regions contains small / rural, mid-sized, and large urban districts, as defined by various school associations in the state, including:

- The Texas Association of Rural Schools (TARS), which identifies districts eligible for membership in the TARS as those with 1600 or fewer students (TARS, 2012);
- The Texas Association of Mid-Sized Schools (TAMS), which identifies districts with between 1600 and 5000 as eligible for membership in the TAMS (TAMS, 2012); and

- The Texas Association of School Boards (TASB), which identifies the largest urban school districts as those with more than 50,000 students (TASB, 2012).

All superintendents employed in the districts as of July 2012 were invited to participate in the study. Contact information was obtained from a database of superintendent email addresses provided by the Texas Association of School Administrators.

Region 1 is located in the Rio Grande Valley of Texas and includes 37 districts and nearly 413,000 students. The region includes the Brownsville, Harlingen, McAllen, and Laredo metropolitan areas. Region 2, surrounding the Corpus Christi metropolitan area in South Texas, includes 42 districts and over 104,000 students. Region 4 is located in Southeast Texas and includes 51 districts with over 1.1 million students. Region 4 includes the Houston metropolitan area.

Region 10 is located in North Central Texas and includes 80 districts with nearly 750,000 students. The region serves the Dallas metropolitan area. Region 11, also located in North Central Texas, serves the Fort Worth metropolitan area and includes 77 districts and over 521,000 students. Region 13 is located in Central Texas and serves 60 districts, including the Austin metropolitan area, with nearly 376,000 students.

Region 17 is located in Northwest Texas and includes 57 districts with approximately 81,000 students. Region 17 includes the Lubbock metropolitan area. Region 19 is located in West Texas. The region includes the El Paso metropolitan area, with 12 districts serving approximately 181,000 students. Finally, Region 20 is located in South Central Texas and includes 50 districts with nearly 402,000 students. Region 20 includes the San Antonio metropolitan area.

Permission to conduct the study was obtained from the Institutional Review Board at Texas A&M University – Corpus Christi (Appendix A).

Instrumentation

For the purpose of the study, the researcher developed a two-part online questionnaire, the Superintendent Leadership Inventory, SLI (Appendix B). Part I was designed to collect the data to answer the first research question. Part II gathered demographic data to answer the second and third research questions and to describe the study's participants and the student populations of the districts they serve or have served as superintendents.

Part I of the SLI was derived from the Leadership Orientations Inventory (LOI), (Bolman & Deal, 1997) and measured the four frames of leadership. The complete LOI is designed to measure three aspects of leadership orientations, namely, 1) *behaviors*, 2) *leadership style*, and 3) *overall rating*. The study was delimited to the *behaviors* section of the LOI, which includes 32 attitudinal items. The respondents were provided with a 5-point Likert-type scaling (5 = always, 4 = often, 3 = sometimes, 2 = occasionally, 1 = never) and asked to indicate how often each of the items is true of them. The 32 items measure the four frames of leadership. The first frame, *structural*, is defined by items 1, 5, 9, 13, 17, 21, 25, and 29. The second frame, *human resource*, is defined by items 2, 6, 10, 14, 18, 22, 26, and 30. The third frame, *political*, consists of items 3, 7, 11, 15, 19, 23, 27, and 31. *Symbolic* is the fourth frame and is defined by items 4, 8, 12, 16, 20, 24, 28, and 32.

The reliability statistics for the LOI have been published (Bolman, 2010). Based on approximately 1,300 colleague ratings for a multi-sector sample of managers in

business and education, reliability coefficients for the four leadership frames, as estimated by Cronbach's coefficient alpha, were reported to be .92 (*structural* frame), .93 (*human resource* frame), .91 (*political* frame), and .93 (*symbolic* frame).

Part II of the SLI was designed to collect demographic data to describe the participants. Specifically, data on age, gender, number of years of experience in the education profession, total years employed as superintendent, the longest tenure in one district as superintendent, and the size of district (as measured by student population) where the superintendents had the longest tenure were gathered. Two additional open-response questions were included to gather superintendents' perceptions related to factors enabling superintendents to lead change, as well as factors related to superintendents' ability to persist in one district.

The SLI was reviewed by a panel of experts for its content validity in May 2012. The panel included five current and former superintendents. Feedback from the expert panel was used to revise the survey. The SLI was pilot tested with a group of seven superintendents in June 2012 to evaluate its internal consistency and usability. The reliability coefficient, as estimated by Cronbach's coefficient alpha, was .93. Superintendents in the expert panel and pilot group were not included in the research study.

Data Collection

Collection of quantitative data took place in three stages. First, an email was sent to all superintendents in the nine Education Service Center regions on July 17, 2012, informing them of the purpose of the study and advising that the survey would be sent to them via email within a few days. Then, an e-mail invitation including a hyperlink to the

web-based survey questionnaire was sent to all prospective respondents on July 23, 2012. Finally, a third e-mail was sent on July 25, 2012, thanking those who responded to the survey and encouraging those who had not yet responded to do so. The data collection was commenced on July 27, 2012. Of the 456 superintendents who received the survey, 212 responded, resulting in a response rate of 46.49%.

Data Analysis

Survey data were coded and entered into a computer. The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) was utilized for the purpose of data entry and analysis. Descriptive statistics were used to answer the first research question as well as to describe the sample.

Cronbach's Coefficient Alpha, an internal-consistency approach, was used to estimate the reliability of the leadership frames (Crocker & Algina, 1986). Specifically, $\alpha = [k/k-1][1-(\sum \sigma_i^2 / \sigma_x^2)]$, where k is the number of items on the test, σ_i^2 is the variance of item i , and σ_x^2 is the total test variance (sum of the variances plus twice the sum of the covariances of all possible pairs of its components, that is, $\sigma_x^2 = \sum \sigma_i^2 + 2\sum \sigma_{ij}$).

A univariate repeated measures analysis of variance (Stevens, 2009) was performed to examine the differences among the four leadership frames. The statistical technique uses the blocking procedure to isolate the effects of a nuisance variable, thus, reducing the error term. The linear model equation is: $X_{ij} = \mu + \alpha_j + \pi_i + \epsilon_{ij}$ (Score = Grand Mean + Treatment Effect + Block Effect + Error Effect). The sphericity assumption, which requires that the variances of the differences for all pairs of repeated measures be equal, was tested, using Epsilon (ϵ). If ϵ is .70 or greater, the assumption is met. Modified Tukey procedure, $HSD = q_{\alpha; k, (n-1)(k-1)} \sqrt{MSRES/n}$, where $(n-1)(k-1)$ is the

error degrees of freedom and MSRES is the error term, was used for the purpose of post hoc analysis.

A series of Pearson's Product-Moment Correlation Coefficients (Kirk, 1999) was computed to examine the magnitude and direction of the bivariate/simple associations between the four leadership frames and the longest tenure as the superintendent in one district. A series of first-order partial correlation coefficients (Howell, 1992) was computed to compute the associations between each of the independent variables and the outcome measure, independent of the size of the school district. Coefficient of determination, r^2 , (Kirk, 1999) was used to examine the practical significance of the simple and partial correlation coefficients.

Theme analysis was performed to analyze the responses to the two open-ended questions. To do so, the data were coded, the codes were divided into groups, the groups were named, and themes were derived (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2011).

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

The primary purpose of the study was to examine the leadership frames used by a non-probability sample of superintendents in Texas and the relationship between the use of the four leadership frames and the length of the longest tenure as superintendent in a single school district. The study also examined the influence of school district size, as measured by student population, on the relationship of the use of the four frames and tenure.

Profile of Subjects

The non-probability sample consisted of 212 superintendents from small / rural, mid-sized, and large urban districts in nine Education Service Center regions in Texas. The respondents were predominantly white, non-Hispanic males with graduate degrees. Results are summarized in Table 2.

Table 2

Profile of Subjects, Categorical Variables, n=212

| Variable | | f | % |
|-----------|---------------------|-----|-------|
| Gender | Male | 163 | 76.90 |
| | Female | 34 | 16.00 |
| | Missing | 15 | 7.10 |
| | | | |
| Ethnicity | White, non-Hispanic | 160 | 75.50 |
| | Hispanic | 25 | 11.80 |
| | African-American | 8 | 3.80 |
| | Asian | 2 | .90 |
| | Other | 2 | .90 |
| | Missing | 15 | 7.10 |

Table 2, continued

| Variable | f | % |
|-------------------|-----|-------|
| Education | | |
| Bachelor's Degree | 1 | .50 |
| Master's Degree | 103 | 48.60 |
| Doctoral Degree | 93 | 43.90 |
| Missing | 15 | 7.10 |

A typical superintendent was 53 years old ($SD = 7.86$) with a 28.40 years of experience in education ($SD = 8.17$). The respondents reported total years as a superintendent, the longest tenure in one district as a superintendent, and the size of student population in the district in which they had the longest tenure as a superintendent. These distributions were positively skewed; thus, the median was reported as the most appropriate measure of central tendency. The median total years as superintendent was 8.00, median longest tenure in one district as superintendent was 6.00, and median size of district by student population was 1600. Results are summarized in Table 3.

Table 3

Profile of Subjects, Continuous Variables, $n=212$

| Characteristic | Mean | Median | Mode | SD | Skew Coef. |
|--|---------|--------|---------|----------|------------|
| Total Years of Experience in Education | 28.40 | 29.00 | 35.00 | 8.17 | .07 |
| Total Years as Superintendent | 9.76 | 8.00 | 1.00 | 7.47 | .96 |
| Longest Tenure in One District as Superintendent | 6.88 | 6.00 | 5.00 | 4.86 | 1.78 |
| Size of District by Student Population | 6753.26 | 1600 | 250.00* | 13850.30 | 7.86 |
| Age | 52.81 | 53.00 | 48.00* | 7.86 | -.02 |

*Multiple modes, the smallest value is shown.

Leadership Skills

The superintendents were asked to complete the 32-item Leadership Orientations Inventory (LOI) using a 5-point Likert-type scaling: 5 = always, 4 = often, 3 = sometimes, 2 = occasionally, and 1 = never. Results are summarized in Table 4.

Table 4
Frequency and Percentage Distributions of Responses to the Leadership Orientations Inventory (LOI), n = 212

| Leadership Skill | Response | F | % |
|--|--------------|-----|-------|
| Think clearly and logically | Always | 29 | 42.00 |
| | Often | 119 | 56.10 |
| | Sometimes | 2 | 9.00 |
| | Occasionally | 1 | 0.50 |
| | Never | 0 | 0.00 |
| | Missing | 1 | 0.50 |
| Show high levels of support | Always | 93 | 43.90 |
| | Often | 110 | 51.90 |
| | Sometimes | 6 | 2.80 |
| | Occasionally | 0 | 0.00 |
| | Never | 0 | 0.00 |
| | Missing | 3 | 1.40 |
| Ability to mobilize people and resources | Always | 62 | 29.20 |
| | Often | 126 | 59.40 |
| | Sometimes | 23 | 10.80 |
| | Occasionally | 0 | 0.00 |
| | Never | 0 | 0.00 |
| | Missing | 1 | 0.50 |
| Inspire others | Always | 55 | 25.90 |
| | Often | 138 | 65.10 |
| | Sometimes | 17 | 8.00 |
| | Occasionally | 1 | 0.50 |
| | Never | 0 | 0.00 |
| | Missing | 1 | 0.50 |
| Emphasize planning and timelines | Always | 59 | 27.80 |
| | Often | 116 | 54.70 |
| | Sometimes | 35 | 16.50 |
| | Occasionally | 1 | 0.50 |
| | Never | 0 | 0.00 |
| | Missing | 1 | 0.50 |

Table 4, continued

| Leadership Skill | Response | F | % |
|---|--------------|-----|-------|
| Build trust through open, collaborative relationships | Always | 92 | 43.40 |
| | Often | 110 | 51.90 |
| | Sometimes | 6 | 2.80 |
| | Occasionally | 0 | 0.00 |
| | Never | 0 | 0.00 |
| | Missing | 4 | 1.90 |
| Skillful, shrewd negotiator | Always | 37 | 17.50 |
| | Often | 95 | 44.80 |
| | Sometimes | 62 | 29.20 |
| | Occasionally | 14 | 6.60 |
| | Never | 2 | 0.90 |
| | Missing | 2 | 0.90 |
| Highly charismatic | Always | 26 | 12.30 |
| | Often | 96 | 45.30 |
| | Sometimes | 67 | 31.60 |
| | Occasionally | 18 | 8.50 |
| | Never | 2 | 0.90 |
| | Missing | 3 | 1.40 |
| Logical analysis and careful thinking | Always | 76 | 35.80 |
| | Often | 125 | 59.00 |
| | Sometimes | 8 | 3.80 |
| | Occasionally | 1 | 0.50 |
| | Never | 0 | 0.00 |
| | Missing | 2 | 0.90 |
| Sensitivity to others' needs and feelings | Always | 74 | 34.90 |
| | Often | 110 | 51.90 |
| | Sometimes | 24 | 11.30 |
| | Occasionally | 2 | 0.90 |
| | Never | 0 | 0.00 |
| | Missing | 2 | 0.90 |
| Unusually persuasive and influential | Always | 29 | 13.70 |
| | Often | 131 | 61.80 |
| | Sometimes | 45 | 21.20 |
| | Occasionally | 6 | 2.80 |
| | Never | 0 | 0.00 |
| | Missing | 1 | 0.50 |
| Inspiration to others | Always | 26 | 12.30 |
| | Often | 130 | 61.30 |
| | Sometimes | 51 | 24.10 |
| | Occasionally | 4 | 1.90 |
| | Never | 0 | 0.00 |
| | Missing | 1 | 0.50 |

Table 4, continued

| Leadership Skill | Response | F | % |
|---|--------------|-----|-------|
| Develop and implement logical policies and procedures | Always | 39 | 18.40 |
| | Often | 144 | 67.90 |
| | Sometimes | 27 | 12.70 |
| | Occasionally | 1 | 0.50 |
| | Never | 0 | 0.00 |
| | Missing | 1 | 0.50 |
| Foster participation and involvement | Always | 55 | 25.90 |
| | Often | 121 | 57.10 |
| | Sometimes | 33 | 15.60 |
| | Occasionally | 0 | 0.00 |
| | Never | 0 | 0.00 |
| | Missing | 3 | 1.40 |
| Deal with organizational conflict | Always | 34 | 16.00 |
| | Often | 119 | 56.10 |
| | Sometimes | 52 | 24.50 |
| | Occasionally | 1 | 0.50 |
| | Never | 0 | 0.00 |
| | Missing | 6 | 2.80 |
| Highly imaginative and creative | Always | 32 | 15.10 |
| | Often | 81 | 38.20 |
| | Sometimes | 76 | 35.80 |
| | Occasionally | 21 | 9.90 |
| | Never | 0 | 0.00 |
| | Missing | 2 | 0.90 |
| Approach problems with facts and logic | Always | 77 | 36.30 |
| | Often | 123 | 58.00 |
| | Sometimes | 7 | 3.30 |
| | Occasionally | 1 | 0.50 |
| | Never | 0 | 0.00 |
| | Missing | 4 | 1.90 |
| Helpful and responsive to others | Always | 68 | 32.10 |
| | Often | 121 | 57.10 |
| | Sometimes | 21 | 9.90 |
| | Occasionally | 0 | 0.00 |
| | Never | 0 | 0.00 |
| | Missing | 2 | 0.90 |
| Effective in getting support from influential people | Always | 29 | 13.70 |
| | Often | 131 | 61.80 |
| | Sometimes | 44 | 20.80 |
| | Occasionally | 6 | 2.80 |
| | Never | 0 | 0.00 |
| | Missing | 2 | 0.90 |

Table 4, continued

| Leadership Skill | Response | F | % |
|--|--------------|-----|-------|
| Communicate strong sense of mission and vision | Always | 71 | 33.50 |
| | Often | 103 | 48.60 |
| | Sometimes | 34 | 16.00 |
| | Occasionally | 1 | 0.50 |
| | Never | 0 | 0.00 |
| | Missing | 3 | 1.40 |
| Set specific goals and hold people accountable | Always | 58 | 27.40 |
| | Often | 122 | 57.50 |
| | Sometimes | 24 | 11.30 |
| | Occasionally | 5 | 2.40 |
| | Never | 0 | 0.00 |
| | Missing | 3 | 1.40 |
| Listen well to others' ideas and input | Always | 59 | 27.80 |
| | Often | 123 | 58.00 |
| | Sometimes | 27 | 12.70 |
| | Occasionally | 0 | 0.00 |
| | Never | 0 | 0.00 |
| | Missing | 3 | 1.40 |
| Politically sensitive and skillful | Always | 49 | 23.10 |
| | Often | 93 | 43.90 |
| | Sometimes | 55 | 25.90 |
| | Occasionally | 12 | 5.70 |
| | Never | 1 | 0.50 |
| | Missing | 2 | 0.90 |
| See beyond current realities | Always | 45 | 21.10 |
| | Often | 113 | 53.30 |
| | Sometimes | 49 | 23.10 |
| | Occasionally | 4 | 1.90 |
| | Never | 0 | 0.00 |
| | Missing | 1 | 0.90 |
| Extraordinary attention to detail | Always | 40 | 18.90 |
| | Often | 88 | 41.50 |
| | Sometimes | 71 | 33.50 |
| | Occasionally | 10 | 4.70 |
| | Never | 1 | 0.50 |
| | Missing | 2 | 0.90 |
| Give personal recognition for job well done | Always | 50 | 23.60 |
| | Often | 125 | 59.00 |
| | Sometimes | 34 | 16.00 |
| | Occasionally | 1 | 0.50 |
| | Never | 1 | 0.50 |
| | Missing | 1 | 0.50 |

Table 4, continued

| Leadership Skill | Response | F | % |
|---|--------------|-----|-------|
| Develop alliances to build support | Always | 48 | 22.60 |
| | Often | 136 | 64.20 |
| | Sometimes | 22 | 10.40 |
| | Occasionally | 4 | 1.90 |
| | Never | 0 | 0.00 |
| | Missing | 2 | 0.90 |
| Generate loyalty and enthusiasm | Always | 58 | 27.40 |
| | Often | 137 | 64.60 |
| | Sometimes | 15 | 7.10 |
| | Occasionally | 0 | 0.00 |
| | Never | 0 | 0.00 |
| | Missing | 2 | 0.90 |
| Strong belief in structure and chain of command | Always | 109 | 51.40 |
| | Often | 71 | 33.50 |
| | Sometimes | 22 | 10.40 |
| | Occasionally | 9 | 4.20 |
| | Never | 0 | 0.00 |
| | Missing | 1 | 0.50 |
| Highly participative manager | Always | 67 | 31.60 |
| | Often | 111 | 52.40 |
| | Sometimes | 25 | 11.80 |
| | Occasionally | 7 | 3.30 |
| | Never | 0 | 0.00 |
| | Missing | 2 | 0.90 |
| Succeed in face of conflict and opposition | Always | 36 | 17.00 |
| | Often | 149 | 70.30 |
| | Sometimes | 24 | 11.30 |
| | Occasionally | 0 | 0.00 |
| | Never | 0 | 0.00 |
| | Missing | 3 | 1.40 |
| Serve as model of organizational aspirations and values | Always | 50 | 23.60 |
| | Often | 131 | 61.80 |
| | Sometimes | 26 | 12.30 |
| | Occasionally | 1 | 0.50 |
| | Never | 0 | 0.00 |
| | Missing | 4 | 1.90 |

On the basis of the mean of the respondents' responses, the 32 LOI skills were ranked from the highest to the lowest. The two highest ranked skills, "Show high levels of support" and "Build trust through open, collaborative relationships," are both

associated with the *human resource* frame. The two lowest ranked skills, “Highly charismatic” and “Highly imaginative and creative,” are both associated with the *symbolic* frame. Results are summarized in Table 5.

Table 5
Ranking of Leadership Skills

| Leadership Skill | n | Mean* |
|---|-----|-------|
| Show high levels of support | 209 | 4.42 |
| Build trust through open, collaborative relationships | 208 | 4.41 |
| Think clearly and logically | 211 | 4.40 |
| Strong belief in structure and chain of command | 211 | 4.33 |
| Approach problems with facts and logic | 208 | 4.33 |
| Logical analysis and careful thinking | 210 | 4.31 |
| Helpful and responsive to others | 210 | 4.22 |
| Sensitivity to others’ needs and feelings | 210 | 4.22 |
| Generate loyalty and enthusiasm | 210 | 4.20 |
| Ability to mobilize people and resources | 211 | 4.18 |
| Inspire others | 211 | 4.17 |
| Communicate strong sense of mission and vision | 209 | 4.17 |
| Listen well to others’ ideas and input | 209 | 4.15 |
| Highly participative manager | 210 | 4.13 |
| Set specific goals and hold people accountable | 209 | 4.11 |
| Serve as model of organizational aspirations and values | 208 | 4.11 |
| Foster participation and involvement | 209 | 4.11 |
| Emphasize planning and timelines | 211 | 4.10 |
| Develop alliances to build support | 210 | 4.09 |
| Succeed in face of conflict and opposition | 209 | 4.06 |
| Give personal recognition for job well done | 211 | 4.05 |
| Develop and implement logical policies and procedures | 211 | 4.05 |

Table 5, continued

| Leadership Skill | n | Mean* |
|--|-----|-------|
| See beyond current realities | 211 | 3.94 |
| Deal with organizational conflict | 206 | 3.90 |
| Effective in getting support from influential people | 210 | 3.87 |
| Unusually persuasive and influential | 211 | 3.87 |
| Inspiration to others | 211 | 3.84 |
| Politically skillful and sensitive | 210 | 3.84 |
| Extraordinary attention to detail | 210 | 3.74 |
| Skillful, shrewd negotiator | 210 | 3.72 |
| Highly charismatic | 209 | 3.60 |
| Highly imaginative and creative | 210 | 3.59 |

* 5 = always, 4 = often, 3 = sometimes, 2 = occasionally, 1 = never

The 32-item LOI measured four leadership frames. There were eight (8) items in each frame. The reliability coefficients ranged from .79 to .82, attesting to the internal consistency of the scale scores. The *human resource* frame was endorsed the most, followed by *structural* frame, *symbolic* frame, and *political* frame. Results are summarized in Table 6.

Table 6

Ranking of Leadership Frames

| Frame | n | # of items | Reliability Coefficient | M* | SD |
|-----------------|-----|------------|-------------------------|------|------|
| Human Resources | 211 | 8 | 0.81 | 4.21 | 0.40 |
| Structural | 211 | 8 | 0.79 | 4.17 | 0.44 |
| Symbolic | 211 | 8 | 0.81 | 3.95 | 0.47 |
| Political | 211 | 8 | 0.82 | 3.94 | 0.46 |

* 5 = always, 4 = often, 3 = sometimes, 2 = occasionally, 1 = never

A univariate repeated measures analysis of variance was performed to examine the differences among the four leadership frames. The sphericity assumption was met, as both the Greenhouse-Geisser (.93) and Huynh-Feldt (.94) Epsilon values were greater than .70 (Stevens, 2009). The mean differences were statistically significant, $F(3, 630) = 50.42, p < .01$. Results are summarized in Table 7.

Table 7

Repeated Measures ANOVA Results for Leadership Frames

| Source | SS | df | MS | F |
|------------------|--------|-----|------|--------|
| Leadership Frame | 12.84 | 3 | 4.28 | 50.42* |
| Block | 112.22 | 210 | 0.53 | |
| Residual | 53.46 | 630 | .08 | |

* $p < .01$

Since the mean differences were statistically significant and the sphericity assumption was met, modified Tukey procedure (Stevens, 2009) was employed for the purpose of post hoc analysis. Results showed that the differences among the frames were statistically significant, with the exception of the *human resource* frame vs. *structural* frame pairing and *symbolic* frame vs. *political* frame pairing, which were not statistically significant. Results are summarized in Table 8.

Table 8

Post Hoc Results for Leadership Frames

| Pair-wise Comparison | Significance* |
|---|---------------|
| Human Resource Frame vs. Structural Frame | NS |
| Human Resource Frame vs. Symbolic Frame | S |
| Human Resource Frame vs. Political Frame | S |
| Structural Frame vs. Symbolic Frame | S |
| Structural Frame vs. Political Frame | S |
| Symbolic Frame vs. Political Frame | NS |

* NS = not statistically significant, S = statistically significant

Correlational Analysis

A series of Pearson's Product-Moment Correlation Coefficients was computed to examine the strength and direction of the simple associations between the four leadership frames and the longest tenure as a superintendent. As can be seen in Table 9, the correlation between *political* frame and the longest tenure was statistically significant ($r = .17, p < .05$); however, it accounted for only 2.90% of the variation, as determined by the coefficient of determination (r^2). None of the other associations was statistically significant.

Table 9

| Simple Associations Between Leadership Frames and Longest Tenure as Superintendent | | |
|--|------|------|
| Leadership Frame | r | p |
| Political | .17 | <.05 |
| Structural | -.01 | .99 |
| Human Resource | .09 | .20 |
| Symbolic | .10 | .16 |

A series of first order partial correlation coefficients was computed to examine the strength and direction of the associations between the four leadership frames and the longest tenure as a superintendent, controlling for the size of the district in which the superintendent served the longest. The partial correlation between *political* frame and tenure, controlling for district size, was statistically significant ($r = .17, p < .05$) and accounted for 2.90% of the variation. None of the other partial correlations was statistically significant. Results are shown in Table 10.

Table 10

First Order Partial Correlations Between Leadership Frames and Longest Tenure as Superintendent, Controlling for District Size

| Leadership Frame | r | p |
|------------------|-----|-----|
| Political | .17 | .01 |
| Symbolic | .11 | .14 |
| Human Resource | .09 | .20 |
| Structural | .01 | .96 |

Qualitative Data

Superintendents were also asked to respond to two open-response questions: 1) “Based on your experiences as a superintendent, what is the most important factor a superintendent must consider when leading major change in a school district?”, and 2) “In your opinion, what is the most significant factor that enables a public school superintendent to persist in one district long enough to implement and sustain change?”

A total of 194 responses were received for the first question. A theme analysis was conducted by coding responses with common words or phrases. The analysis resulted in four major themes as the most important factors a superintendent must consider when leading a major change in a school district. The themes had overlapping associations to each of the four leadership frames:

Collaboration, buy-in, and support. The theme related to both the *human resource* frame, with its emphasis on positive relationships, and the *political* frame with its emphasis on building coalitions to accomplish a goal (Bolman & Deal, 1997). The theme was characterized by responses such as:

- Buy-in; bring others along
- Buy-in from staff and leaders

- Support from all parties
- Building trust and consensus
- Stakeholder buy-in
- Remembering and practicing the theory of participative leadership
- Politics and working with the Board
- Open to all ideas from opposition
- Know history of district and identify the players or heavy hitters who can assist

Relationships with school board, staff, and community. The theme related to the *human resource* frame, with its focus on positive relationships (Bolman & Deal, 1997), and was characterized by responses such as:

- Strong school-community relationships
- Board relations
- Build relationship both up (board) and down (staff / parents)
- Establishing an environment of trust
- Having integrity and being open with the stakeholders
- Respected by community
- Develop a firm, fair relationship with board members

Communicating vision, goals, and focus on students. The theme related to the *structural* frame, with its emphasis on goals, and the *symbolic* frame, with its emphasis on organizational values (Bolman & Deal, 1997). The theme was characterized by responses such as:

- Clear sense of vision and mission
- Is this the right thing for students?
- Goals of the district
- Student achievement and instructional practice

- Consistent and persistent message of vision and expectations
- Board and district unity on vision and mission

Organizational culture, capacity, and readiness for change. The theme related to the *symbolic* frame, with its emphasis on understanding history and culture of the organization, and the *human resource* frame, with its emphasis on understanding the needs of individuals and the needs of the whole organization (Bolman & Deal, 1997).

The theme was characterized by responses such as:

- Readiness and capacity for change of community and staff
- Readiness, timing, and communication
- Understanding the culture and people
- Patience with various publics in moving through the change process

A total of 193 responses were received for the second question. The analysis resulted in three major themes being identified in the superintendents' responses regarding the most important factor enabling a superintendent to persist in one district long enough to implement and sustain change, each related to the *human resource* frame (Bolman & Deal, 1997):

Relationships. The predominant theme in the responses referred to relationships generally or to specific relationships the superintendent had with the board, staff, or community. Examples of these responses included:

- Support of the board of trustees
- Board relations
- Building trust with the board and community
- Flexibility with changing boards and changing goals
- Community support
- Being able to connect with others in a meaningful way

- Staff involvement
- Developing the support of the whole community, not just the Board

Trust, honesty, and integrity. The next most common responses used these terms specifically, either in describing personal characteristics of the superintendent or elements of the superintendent's relationship with others. Examples of these responses included:

- Gaining credibility and earning trust
- Trust that decisions are being made in the best interest of all students
- Perceived as trustworthy, committed to community
- Trust from various public in superintendent to lead fairly and effectively through time

Communication. The third most common responses used the word “communication” specifically as an element of the superintendent's relationships with others. Examples of these responses included:

- Communication
- Strong communication (transparency)
- Open and honest communication with all stakeholders at all times
- Communication and fostering support

The complete listing of all responses to the two open-response questions is included in Appendix C.

Summary of Results

The study's participants were most likely to use the *human resource* frame in their work, and least likely to use was the *political* frame; however, the results showed that the *political* frame was the only frame which was statistically correlated with the longest tenure as superintendent, and the association remained statistically significant

after controlling for the school district size. Analysis of the responses to first open-response question resulted in four themes related to leadership of change, namely 1) collaboration, buy-in, and support; 2) relationships with school boards, community, and staff; 3) communicating vision, goals, and focus on students; and 4) organizational culture, capacity, and readiness for change. Analysis of the responses to the second open-response question resulted in three themes related to persistence, namely 1) relationships; 2) trust, honesty, and integrity; and 3) communication. Responses to these two questions overlapped each of the four frames, but were most often associated with the *human resource* frame.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND DISCUSSION

Introduction

The study examined the use of leadership frames by public school superintendents, and relationship of the use of those frames to superintendent tenure in one school district. The study also examined the influence of school district size on the relationship of use of frames to tenure. Research questions that guided the study were:

1. What leadership frames are superintendents most likely to use in their work?
2. What is the relationship between length of superintendent tenure in one district and one or more of the four leadership frames?
3. How is the relationship between the length of superintendent tenure and the four frames influenced by district size, as determined by student population?

The study was significant because superintendent tenure has been correlated to student academic performance. Further, continuous turnover in the superintendency negatively impacts the implementation and sustenance of major change efforts in a district.

Summary of Results

Analysis of the quantitative results revealed that the participants were most likely to use the *human resource* frame, and least likely to use the *political* frame. While the analysis of the qualitative results revealed an emphasis on multiple frames in the answers to the first open-response question related to change leadership, responses to the second question related to persistence revealed an emphasis on the *human resource* frame. The quantitative data analysis revealed, however, that the *political* frame was the only frame

with a statistically correlated relationship to superintendent tenure in one school district, and this relationship remained statistically significant when controlling for the size of school district as measured by student population.

Conclusions

Based on the summary of data, it was concluded that the use of the *political* frame was most likely to positively influence the length of superintendent tenure in one school district, regardless of the size of the district. The correlation of the *political* frame to superintendent tenure in one school district is aligned with the reasons cited for superintendent turnover in the review of literature, such as group politics, the “dissatisfaction theory of school governance,” the governance structure of the school board, and conflicts, communication breakdowns, and cultural clashes between superintendents and school boards (Beaumont, 1993; Natkin, et al, 2002; Shields, 2002; Grady & Bryant, 1991; Martinez, 1992). Further, it was concluded that the superintendents who participated in the study were more likely to frame their work and leadership using other frames that were not correlated to tenure, most notably the *human resource* frame.

Discussion

The self-assessment responses of the 212 Texas superintendents who participated in the study revealed that the *human resource* frame is the most likely used of the four frames; however, the results of the study also revealed that the *political* frame was the only frame with a statistical correlation to superintendent tenure, and this relationship was maintained when controlling for school district size. Bolman and Deal suggested that the skillful leader is one who can ably use all four frames as needed (Bolman & Deal,

1997). A skillful superintendent is one who will organize people to maximize their talents (*human resource* frame), implement policies and procedures for efficiency and effectiveness (*structural* frame), keep a touch on the political pulse of the school board and staff and be aware of shifting alliances and power bases (*political* frame), and use words and events to inspire those who work in the district and the greater community to embody the values, mission, and vision of the organization (*symbolic* frame).

It is not surprising that superintendents might cite the *human resource* frame as the most relied-upon of the four frames. Typically, over 80% of a school district's budget is allocated to personnel costs, exemplifying the nature of school districts as "people" organizations. Managing personnel issues, ensuring people's needs are met, and making sure the fit between the individual and the organization is good can become a full-time endeavor for a superintendent. Further, while the perspective of school board members may be oriented toward the *political* frame since they are elected, trustees also are often publicly concerned with ensuring that school employees are happy and fulfilled in their jobs—a concern emphasized through the *human resource* frame.

The *political* frame, on the other hand, may be seen as being in conflicting with, rather than complementing, the *human resource* frame. With the *human resource* frame, a leader may work to avoid conflict in order to keep people happy and maintain harmony within the organization; however, the *political* frame assumes conflict will be present as the competition for scarce resources increases. Using the *human resource* frame, a leader is likely to see an important part of his or her role as bringing together all stakeholders for a particular purpose, while the leader using the *political* frame may see no problem with

excluding some stakeholders, so long as the right “guiding coalition” is assembled for the right reason.

Use of the *political* frame may be confused with “being political” or “playing politics.” These terms are often viewed negatively. As the review of literature indicated, breakdowns in communication between the superintendent and the school board, or board politics in general, can be a superintendent’s downfall. Use of the *political* frame, however, is not necessarily about choosing sides in a political battle. Effective use of the political frame is about skillfully setting agendas, knowing where alliances and coalitions already exist through mapping the political terrain, making the best of conflict without always trying to resolve it, using negotiation and compromise effectively, and recognizing the numerous sources of power within an organization such as a school district (Bolman & Deal, 1997).

If the use of the political frame is an essential element in keeping one’s position in the superintendency long enough to implement and maintain change, can the skills necessary to use the frame effectively be learned, either through formal means such as superintendent preparation programs, or informally through experience? Certainly, training programs in conflict management, negotiation techniques, and facilitation exist and are used effectively in both the public and private sector. These concepts can, and should, be included in superintendent preparation programs and professional development for superintendents.

Implications

The study was conducted because, while there were numerous studies examining the factors that lead to superintendents leaving their positions before the end of their

contracts, there was sparse research on the factors that would likely increase a superintendent's tenure in one school district. The results of this study showing a relationship of the use of the *political* frame to tenure, as well as the political factors revealed in the review of literature to superintendent turnover indicate a need for superintendents to develop skills related to the use of the *political* frame. Such skill development should be considered in both superintendent preparation programs and continuing professional development once in the superintendent position. Further, superintendent search consultants should consider exploring evidence of potential candidates' successful use of the skills related to the *political* frame in vetting them for consideration by school boards.

To maximize the potential for superintendents to maximize their tenure in one district, explicit efforts to map the political environment within the school district staff, on the school board, and in the community should be among the first steps for an incoming superintendent. Being knowledgeable of the power structure in the district and community, regardless of the size, and developing an awareness of existing and potential conflicts among key players can be beneficial.

Recommendations for Further Research

The limitations and delimitations of the study offer opportunities for further research. Due to non-probability sampling, external validity was limited to the participants. Further, the results of the survey were dependent solely on the self-assessment of the subjects. Finally, the setting for the study—Texas—excluded superintendents whose work is influenced by the presence of strong employee unions, since collective bargaining for school employees is prohibited in Texas.

To enhance the ability to generalize the results of the study, the researcher recommends further study, specifically:

1. Replication of the study pairing the self-assessments of superintendents with the self-assessments of one or more of their elected school board members.
2. Replication of the study with superintendents outside the state of Texas, particularly in states where collective bargaining for employees is allowed, to see the results when controlled for the influence of unions and collective bargaining in the political environment.
3. A study that would involve the comparison of urban to rural district superintendents and school board members.
4. A study that would compare elected superintendents with non-elected superintendents.
5. A study that would compare the tenure of superintendents of charter schools with those of traditional public schools.
6. A study involving key administrators and the assessment of the superintendent's leadership.
7. A study involving tenured teachers and their assessment of superintendent leadership.
8. Additional qualitative data collection, including interviews with superintendents who have maintained tenure in one district longer than the national average, to deepen the understanding of those factors that enable superintendents to persist in one district.
9. A qualitative study of school board members who have retained superintendents longer than the national average.

Final Remarks

The superintendent role in any school district, regardless of size, is multi-faceted. He or she must be skilled at playing many roles: instructional expert, businessperson, public relations guru, communicator extraordinaire, and compliance officer. Most importantly, the superintendent must be able to motivate and inspire students, employees, parents, and community to coalesce around the vision and mission established by the elected board of trustees. To do so requires the buy-in and participation of each of those broad and diverse audiences.

The superintendent who can persist long enough to see the vision and mission achieved is the one who recognizes that getting everyone “on board” is not wholly sufficient. Indeed, the superintendent with “staying power” will also bring together the right guiding coalition to help move the district forward, possess the skill to assess the political subtleties in each situation, and demonstrate the wisdom and will to adjust the course of action accordingly.

REFERENCES

- Atherton, D. (2008). *Perceptions of school board members and a superintendent on superintendent long-tenure* (Doctoral dissertation, Lewis and Clark College, Portland, OR). Retrieved from ProQuest. (ProQuest document ID 1529745961).
- Beaumont, J. J-M. (1993). *Factors contributing to involuntary superintendency turnover in urban public school systems*. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Maryland Baltimore County, Baltimore, MD). Retrieved from ProQuest. (ProQuest document ID 746007401).
- Bolman, L. (2010). *Research using leadership orientations survey instrument*. Retrieved from <http://leebolman.com/orientations.htm>
- Bolman, L., & Deal, T. E. (1997). *Reframing organizations: artistry, choice, and leadership*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Byrd, J., Drews, C., & Johnson, J. (2006). Factors impacting superintendent turnover: lessons from the field. *NCPEA Education Leadership Review, Vol. 7 (No. 2)*. Retrieved from <http://cnx.org/content/m14507/latest/>
- Collins, J. (2001) *Good to great*. New York, NY.: HarperCollins Publishers.
- Cooper, B. S., Fusarelli, L. D., Carella, V.A. (2000). *Career crisis in the school superintendency: The results of a national survey*. American Association of School Administrators, Arlington, VA.
- Council of the Great City Schools. (2006). *Superintendent search and selection process for great city school boards: a primer*. Washington, DC.: Council of the Great City Schools.

- Council of the Great City Schools (2008, Winter). *Urban school superintendents: characteristics, tenure, and salary sixth survey and report*. Washington, DC.: Council of the Great City Schools.
- Creswell, J. W. and Plano Clark, V. L. (2011). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Crocker, C. & Algina, J (1986). *Introduction to classical and modern test theory*. New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston
- Education Commission of the States. (2001, August). *The superintendent crisis: a review by search consultants*. (ESC Issue Paper: Leadership). Denver, CO.: Thomas E. Glass
- Education Commission of the States. (2001, July). *Superintendent leaders look at the superintendency*. (ESC Issue Paper: Leadership). Denver, CO.: Thomas E. Glass
- Field, A. (2005). *Discovering statistics using SPSS, 2nd edition*. London: Sage Publications, Ltd.
- Gaeston, C.E. (2009). *The primary factors affecting superintendent turnover in the urban southwestern United States* (Doctoral dissertation, Northern Arizona University, Flagstaff, AZ). Retrieved from ProQuest. (ProQuest document ID 18881999201).
- Gall, M. D., Gall, J. P., and Borg, W.R. (2007). *Educational research: an introduction*. Boston, MA.: Pearson.
- Grady, M.L., Bryant, M. (1991, February). School board turmoil and superintendent turnover: What pushes them to the brink? *School Administrator*. 28, 2: 19-25.

- Hipp, S. (2002). *Factors affecting superintendent longevity in Michigan* (Doctoral dissertation, Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo, MI). Retrieved from ProQuest. (ProQuest document ID 765186911).
- Hoyle, J.R. & AASA Commission on Standards for the Superintendency. (1993). *Professional Standards for the Superintendency*. Washington, DC.: American Association for School Administrators.
- Howell, D. (1992). *Statistical methods for psychology, 3rd edition*. Boston, MA: PWS-Kent Publishing Co.
- Kirk, R. (1999). *Statistics: an introduction, 4th edition*. Orlando, FL: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Kotter, J. (1996). *Leading change*. Boston, MA.: Harvard Business Press.
- Kowalski, T., McCord, R., Petersen, G., Young, I., and Ellerson, N. *The American school superintendent: 2010 decennial study*. Latham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Education.
- Martinez, O.G. (1988). *A critical analysis of language and communication among boards of education and superintendents*. (Doctoral dissertation, University of San Francisco, San Francisco, CA). Retrieved from ProQuest. (ProQuest document ID 746980571).
- Maslow, A. (1943). *A theory of human motivation*. Psychological Review, 50, 370-396.
- McGregor, D. (1960). *The human side of enterprise*. New York, NY: McGrawHill
- Meltzoff, J. (1998). *Critical thinking about research: psychology and related fields*. Washington, DC.: American Psychological Association.

- National School Boards Association. (2001). *Superintendent tenure: CUBE survey report*. Alexandria, VA.: National School Boards Association.
- Natkin, G. L., Cooper, B. S., Alborano, J. A., Padilla, A., & Ghosh, S. (2002). *Predicting and modeling superintendent turnover*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA. Paper retrieved from <http://0-www.eric.ed.gov.prta1.tamucc.edu/>
- Peterson, M. and Klotz, J. (1999, November). *Superintendent competencies for continued employment as perceived by Louisiana public school superintendents and school board presidents*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Mid-South Educational Research Association. Point Clear, Alabama.
- Pfeffer, J. (1992). *Managing with power: politics and influence in organizations*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press
- Poole, G.D. (1992). *Perceptions of superintendents and school board members relative to selected political variables*. (Doctoral dissertation, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Chapel Hill, NC). Retrieved from ProQuest. (ProQuest document ID 744420941).
- Renchler, R. (1992). Urban superintendent turnover: the need for stability. *Sounding Board*. 1(1) 1-11. ERIC Clearinghouse for Educational Management. Eugene, OR.
- Schlechty, P. C. (2009). *Leading for learning: How to transform schools into learning organizations*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

- Sharp, W. L., Malone, B. G., and Walter, J. K. (2002, October). *What motivates someone to become a superintendent?* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Mid-Western Educational Research Association, Columbus, OH.
- Sharp, W. L. and Walter, J. K. (1995, October). *The health of the school superintendency.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Mid-Western Educational Research Association. Chicago, IL.
- Shields, B. A. (2002). *A review of the literature on administrator turnover: why they move on or are displaced.* Retrieved online from <http://ftp.daemen.edu/academics/education/faculty/bshields/LitReview.pdf>
- Sorgi, D. H. (2006). *Correlation between superintendent tenure and improved academic achievement scores in large urban school districts.* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Phoenix, Phoenix, AZ). Retrieved from ProQuest. (ProQuest document ID 746980571).
- Stevens, J. P. (2009) *Applied multivariate statistics for the social sciences.* New York, NY: Routledge Taylor and Francis Group.
- Texas Association of Midsize Schools (2012). Austin, TX. *TAMS profile.* Retrieved online from www.midsizeschools.org/profile.html
- Texas Association of Rural Schools (2012). *About us.* Austin, TX. Retrieved online from www.tarsed.org
- Texas Association of School Boards (2012). *Annual superintendent salary survey.* Austin, TX. Retrieved online from www.tasb.org
- Texas Education Agency (2006). *TEExES Texas examinations of educator standards superintendent test framework.* Austin, TX. Retrieved online

from http://www.texas.ets.org/assets/pdf/test_descriptions/te_facmanappendixc_fl_d064_r.pdf.

Texas Education Agency (2012). *Texas education code*. Austin, TX. Retrieved online from <http://www.tea.state.tx.us>.

Waters, J. and Marzano, R. (2006). *School district leadership that works: the effect of superintendent leadership on student achievement*. Denver, CO: McRel.

APPENDIX A

IRB Application

IRB Approval

Consent Form

FOR COMPLIANCE OFFICE
USE ONLY:

IRB#

Date Received:

☐ Revision

Application for Review of Research Involving Human Subjects Institutional Review Board (IRB)

Texas A&M University-Corpus Christi



INSTRUCTIONS

If you have any questions or need assistance completing this application, please contact Erin Sherman at (361)825-2497 or email erin.sherman@tamucc.edu

1. Complete CITI Training

Note: The Certificate of Completion will be automatically emailed to the Research Compliance Officer upon completion.

2. Complete Form

Form must be complete and free of typographical/grammatical errors.

3. Submit Application & Completed Supplemental Documents

Review of application will not begin until all required documentation is received.

Submit this application with **ORIGINAL signatures** (PI, Co-PI, Faculty Adviser as applicable) and any additional documentation to: Erin Sherman, Research Compliance Officer Erin Sherman, FC 168 (Unit 5844)

Check which of the following documents are submitted with the protocol application

- ☒ Any other documents referenced in this application as applicable (survey instrument, interview questions, debriefing form, payment schedule, etc.)
- ☐ Grant/contract proposal as applicable
- ☐ Permission from site of study as applicable
- ☐ Recruitment Materials as applicable: Flyers, Letters, Phone Scripts or Email
- ☐ Consent Documentation as applicable: Informed Consent Form, Assent Form, Translated Informed Consent Form, and Translated Assent Form

REVIEW REQUESTED

Exempt Review

*Are you requesting exempt status for the project?

☒ Yes ☐ No

If yes, based on which category outlined at the end of the application?

Category

Expedited Review

(Expedited review does NOT mean rushed approval. Please allow at least two weeks for the expedited review process.)

*Are you requesting an expedited review of the project?

☐ Yes ☒ No

If yes, based on which category outlined at the end of the application?

Category

*** You may only select one of the above choices. A protocol cannot qualify for both exempt and expedited review.**

INVESTIGATOR INFORMATION

A. Principal Investigator Information:

Name: Doyne Scott Elliff

Address: 929 Driftwood Place
Corpus Christi, TX 78411

Please include unit number if address is on campus.

Phone Number: 361-537-1684

Email Address: dselliff@gmail.com

Department: Educational Leadership Doctoral Student

College: College of Education

☐ Faculty ☐ Staff Member ☐ Undergraduate Student ☒ Graduate Student ☐ Faculty Advisor ☐ Other

Specify Other:

B. Co-Principal Investigator or Faculty Advisor Information:

Name: Dr. Raul Prezas

Address: 6300 Ocean Drive
Unit 5818, FC 215
Corpus Christi, TX, 78412

Please include unit number if address is on campus.

Phone Number: 361-825-2165

Email Address: raulprezas@tamucc.edu

Department: College of Education

College: Department of Educational Administration & Research

☐ Faculty ☐ Staff Member ☐ Undergraduate Student ☐ Graduate Student ☒ Faculty Advisor ☐ Other

Specify Other:

C. Co-Principal Investigator or Faculty Advisor Information:

Name: Dr. Kamiar Kouzekanani

Address: 6300 Ocean Drive
Unit 5818, FC 223
Corpus Christi, TX, 78412

Please include unit number if address is on campus.

Phone Number: 361-825-2318

Email Address: kamiar.kouzekanani@tamucc.edu

Department: Department of Educational Administration & Research

College:

☐ Faculty ☐ Staff Member ☐ Undergraduate Student ☐ Graduate Student ☐ Faculty Advisor ☐ Other

Specify Other:

D. Co-Principal Investigator or Faculty Advisor Information:

Name:

Address:

Please include unit number if address is on campus.

Phone Number:

Email Address:

Department:

College:

☐ Faculty ☐ Staff Member ☐ Undergraduate Student ☐ Graduate Student ☐ Faculty Advisor ☐ Other

Specify Other:

PROJECT CLASSIFICATION

☐ Research Project ☐ Masters Thesis ☐ Class Project ☒ Doctoral Dissertation ☐ Other

Specify Other:

EXTERNAL FUNDING

Is the project externally funded? ☒ No ☐ Yes *If yes, complete the remainder of the External Funding Section. If no, go to next section.*

External Funding Submission Deadline/Award Date:

Funding Agency:

PROJECT TITLE

Title of Project:

PROJECT DATES

Starting Date:

The starting date CANNOT be a date before IRB approval is received. If you will start as soon as approval is received, enter "Upon IRB Approval" for the starting date.

Estimated Completion Date:

The above is an estimated date of completion. A Completion Report is due at the conclusion of the project noting the actual completion date.

PROJECT OBJECTIVES

Describe Project Objectives:

Be specific and thorough.

The purpose of the study will be to examine the relationship of the use of four leadership "frames" (Bolman and Deal, 1997) to the length of tenure in the superintendent position in a single district. The study will also examine the influence of school district size, as measured by student population, on the relationship between tenure and the use of the four frames. The following research

questions will guide the study:

1. What leadership frames are superintendents most likely to use in their work?

2. Is there a relationship between length of superintendent tenure in one district and one or more of the four leadership frames?

3. Is the relationship between the length of superintendent tenure and the four frames influenced by district size, as determined by student population?

RESEARCH SUBJECTS

Description and Source of Research Subjects:

MINIMUM information to include:

1. Target number of participants

2. Location of participants (on campus or specifically provide names for other locations - permission needed from other locations)

3. Manner in which participants will be identified from a larger pool of individuals

4. Criteria for participation (ex. age, physical characteristics, learning characteristics, professional criteria, etc.)

5. Minimum age for participants

6. How participants will be contacted (ex. online, through a faculty member, through a social networking site, through a professional in a specific field, etc.)

The participants for the study will be superintendents drawn from nine Education Service Center regions in Texas, specifically Regions 1, 2, 4, 10, 11, 13, 17, 19, and 20 (N=465). Each of these Education Service Center regions contains small, suburban, and large urban districts. All superintendents currently employed in those districts will be invited to participate in the study.

The participants have been identified from the current listing of school superintendents provided by the Texas Association of School Administrators (TASA).

Participants will be contacted via email (see "Methods and Procedures") and will be invited to complete an online survey.

All participants are over 18 years old of age.

METHODS & PROCEDURES

Describe Methods and Procedures for Human Subject Interactions:

Be specific and thorough.

Describe the methods and procedures step-by-step for the human subject interaction in the study in common terminology. Describe each procedure, including frequency duration and location of each procedure. You do not need to describe the statistical methods for analyzing data once it is collected or other elements of the study not involving human subject interactions.

For the purpose of the study, the researcher has developed a two-part online questionnaire, the Superintendent Leadership Inventory (SLI). Part One is designed to collect the data to answer the first research question. Part Two gathers demographic data to describe the study's participants and the student populations of the districts they serve or have served as superintendents.

Part One of the SLI includes the Leadership Orientations Inventory (Bolman & Deal, 1997), includes 32 attitudinal items related to four frames of leadership. The respondents are provided with a 5-point Likert-type scaling (5=always, 4=often, 3=sometimes, 2=occasionally, 1=never) and asked to indicate how often each of the items is true of them.

Part Two of the SLI is designed to collect demographic data to describe the participants, specifically gender, number of years of experience in public education, longest tenure in the superintendent role in one school district, total years employed as superintendent, and size of district, as defined by student enrollment, in which the participant has the longest tenure as superintendent.

The SLI will be reviewed by a panel of experts for its content validity. The panel includes five current and former superintendents. Feedback from the expert panel will be used to revise the survey. The SLI will be pilot tested with a group of superintendents to evaluate its internal consistency and usability. Superintendents in the expert panel and pilot group will not be included in the research study. The SLI is attached.

DATA COLLECTION

Collection of quantitative data will take place in three stages. First, an email will be sent to all superintendents in the Education Service Center regions identified informing them of the purpose of the study. Second, a few days later, an e-mail invitation will be sent to all prospective respondents including a

hyperlink to the web-based survey questionnaire. Finally, a third e-mail will be sent approximately one week later, thanking those who responded to the survey and encouraging those who have not yet responded to do so.

Consent for participants will be obtained online.

DATA ANALYSIS

Survey data will be coded and entered into a computer. The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) will be utilized for data entry and analysis. Descriptive statistics will be used to organize and summarize the data.

RISKS & PROTECTION MEANS

Describe the Specific Risks and Protection Means for Human Subject Participants:

Be specific and thorough. If no risk, state "No risk." If risks associated with the study are minimal and not greater than risks ordinarily encountered in daily life, state: Minimal Risk and describe risks. Be sure the risk levels provided in the protocol and the consent forms are consistent.

Describe each potential risk and the steps taken to protect human subject participants from the risk (ex. break of confidentiality, possibly injury, psychological distress, pressure to conform, pressure to participate, etc.) Describe the protection means specifically and how participants will gain access to outside assistance (ex. medical care, counseling, etc.) if available.

This study involves no risk to participants. All responses will be confidential, with data reviewed only by the research and faculty co-investigators. No personally identifiable information is included on the survey.

BENEFITS VS. RISKS

Describe Benefits & Risks to Human Subject Participants:

Address benefits reasonably expected to the research participant and potential benefits to society. Any possible monetary compensation is not to be categorized as a benefit. Be specific and thorough.

There are no direct benefits to the participants from participating in the study and responding to the survey; however, superintendents may use the results of the study to inform and improve their own practice.

INFORMED CONSENT METHODS

Describe Methods for Obtaining Informed Consent from Human Subject Participants:

For the quantitative component of the study, subjects will consent to voluntarily participate in the study by checking a box on the online survey (see attached).

Be specific and thorough. Describe how participants will be provided the consent documentation, what form the consent will be provided in, any discussion that will take place with participants, and methods of communication utilized to keep participants aware of their rights throughout the study, if applicable. Points to remember:
 (1) Participants must be given time to review the consent/informational documents and ask questions
 (2) minors must have a separate assent for participation written at a level appropriate to the age group of participants, and parents must be given a separate parental consent form.

☐ Check if waiver of signed informed consent is requested. Justification must be provided for waiver. See waiver criteria at end of form.

Justification:

INVESTIGATOR(S) QUALIFICATIONS

Qualifications of the Investigator(s) to Conduct Research:

Describe the qualifications of each investigator to conduct human subject research.

Principal investigator, Doayne Scott Elliff, holds BS and MS degrees from Corpus Christi State University and is currently a doctoral student in Educational Leadership in the College of Education. He is the current sitting superintendent of the Corpus Christi Independent School District. He has completed the NIH online course on Work with Human Subjects (documentation attached).

FACILITIES & EQUIPMENT

Facilities & Equipment to be Used in the Research:

Describe any equipment that will be used, including audio/video equipment.

Name any off-campus locations that will be used. List any on-campus locations where the study will occur.)

The data collection will be conducted via online survey. The PI's personal computer will be used for various activities (e.g., data coding and analysis).

INVESTIGATOR(S) RESPONSIBILITIES & SIGNATURES

By complying with the policies established by the Institutional Review Board of Texas A & M University-Corpus Christi, the principal investigator(s) subscribe(s) to the principles stated in "The Belmont Report" and standards of professional ethics in all research, development, and related activities involving human subjects under the auspices of Texas A & M University-Corpus Christi. The principal investigator(s) further agree(s) that:

- A. Approval will be obtained from the Institutional Review Board before making any change in this research project.
- B. Development of any unexpected risks will be immediately reported to the Institutional Review Board.
- C. An annual review and progress report will be completed and submitted when requested by the Institutional Review Board.
- D. Signed informed consent documents will be kept for the duration of the project and for at least three years thereafter at a location approved by the Institutional Review Board.

ALL INVESTIGATOR(S) AND ADVISOR(S) MUST SIGN THE PROTOCOL. The Principal Investigator should save a copy of the IRB Protocol Form after emailing the form to the Research Compliance Officer for review. Type the name of each individual in the appropriate signature line. Add

additional signature pages if needed for all Co-Principal Investigators, collaborating and student investigators, and faculty advisor(s).

A. Principal Investigator Certification:

Principal Investigator (Typed): Doyne Scott Elliff

Principal Investigator (Signature):

Doyne Scott Elliff

Digitally signed by Doyne Scott Elliff
DN: cn=Doyne Scott Elliff, o=Corpus Christi ISD,
ou=Superintendent, email=scott.elliff@ccisd.us, c=US
Date: 2012.03.28 10:07:33 -05'00'

Date: March 31, 2012

B. Co-Principal Investigator or Faculty Advisor Certification:

Co-Principal Investigator/
Advisor (Typed):

Co-Principal Investigator/
Advisor (Signature):

Date:

Check one: ☐ Co-PI ☐ Faculty
Advisor

C. Co-Principal Investigator or Faculty Advisor Certification:

Co-Principal Investigator/
Advisor (Typed):

Co-Principal Investigator/
Advisor (Signature):

Date:

Check one: ☐ Co-PI ☐ Faculty
Advisor

D. Co-Principal Investigator or Faculty Advisor Certification:

Co-Principal Investigator/
Advisor (Typed):

Co-Principal Investigator/
Advisor (Signature):

Date:

Check one: ☐ Co-PI ☐ Faculty
Advisor

(see 45 CFR as amended) to the subjects and the only involvement of human subjects will be in one or more of the categories listed below:

- 1) Collection of: hair and nail clippings, in a nondisfiguring manner; deciduous teeth; and permanent teeth if patient care indicates a need for extraction.
- 2) Collection of excreta and external excretion including sweat, uncannulated saliva, placenta removed at delivery, and amniotic fluid at the time of rupture of the membrane prior to or during labor.
- 3) Recording of data from subjects 18 years of age or older using noninvasive procedures routinely employed in clinical practice. This includes the use of physical sensors that are applied either to the surface of the body or at a distance and do not involve the input of matter or significant amounts of energy into the subject or an invasion of the subject's privacy. It also includes such procedures as weighing, testing sensory acuity, electrocardiography, electroencephalography, thermography, detection of naturally occurring radioactivity, diagnostic echography, and electroretinography. It does not include exposure to electromagnetic radiation outside the visible range (for example, X-rays, microwaves).
- 4) Collection of blood samples by venipuncture, in amounts not exceeding 450 milliliters in an eight-week period and no more often than two times per week, from subjects 18 years of age or older who are in good health and not pregnant.*
- 5) Collection of both supra- and subgingival dental plaque and calculus, provided the procedure is not more invasive than routine prophylactic scaling of the teeth and the process is accomplished in accordance with accepted prophylactic techniques.
- 6) Voice recording made for research purposes such as investigation of speech defects.
- 7) Moderate exercise of healthy volunteers.**
- 8) The study of existing data, documents, records, pathological specimens, or diagnostic specimens.
- 9) Research on individual or group behavior or characteristics of individuals, such as studies of perception, cognition, game theory, or test development, where the research investigator does not manipulate subjects' behavior and the research will not involve stress to the subjects.
- 10) Research on drugs and devices for which an investigational new drug exemption or an investigational device exemption is not required.
- 11) Any other category specifically added to this list by HHS and published in the Federal Register.

* Subjects must be informed orally of the risk of bruising and infection.

** Moderate exercise does not include stress testing.

Criteria for Waiver of Consent

§46.116 General requirements for informed consent.

(c) An IRB may approve a consent procedure which does not include, or which alters, some or all of the elements of informed consent set forth above, or waive the requirement to obtain informed consent provided the IRB finds and documents that:

- (1) The research or demonstration project is to be conducted by or subject to the approval of state or local government officials and is designed to study, evaluate, or otherwise examine: (i) public benefit or service programs; (ii) procedures for obtaining benefits or services under those programs; (iii) possible changes in or alternatives to those programs or procedures; or (iv) possible changes in methods or levels of payment for benefits or services under those programs; and
- (2) The research could not practicably be carried out without the waiver or alteration.

(d) An IRB may approve a consent procedure which does not include, or which alters, some or all of the elements of informed consent set forth in this section, or waive the requirements to obtain informed consent provided the IRB finds and documents that:

- (1) The research involves no more than minimal risk to the subjects;
- (2) The waiver or alteration will not adversely affect the rights and welfare of the subjects;
- (3) The research could not practicably be carried out without the waiver or alteration; and
- (4) Whenever appropriate, the subjects will be provided with additional pertinent information after participation.

Human Subject Research Categories

Please Note

Research involving special or protected populations, such as children, prisoners, pregnant women, mentally disabled persons, or economically or educationally disadvantaged persons, does not qualify for exempt review and is subject to full review.

The following types of studies do not qualify for exempt reviews and are subject to expedited or full reviews:

- 1) Studies involving a faculty member's current students
- 2) Studies supported by external funding
- 3) Studies involving the following and similar sensitive subject matters which can potentially cause discomfort and stress to the participant: Abortion, AIDS/HIV, Alcohol, Body Composition, Criminal Activity, Psychological Well-being, Financial Matters, Sexual Activity, Suicide, Learning Disability, Drugs, Depression

7.1 Exempt Research Categories

- 7.1.1 Certain categories of research are exempt from the Protection of Human Subjects policy in the Code of Federal Regulations 45 CFR 46. The IRB Chair will determine, based on the federal guidelines, whether a research activity qualifies for exemption. Although exempt research is not regularly reviewed by the IRB, the exempt research form (and the informed consent form, if applicable) must be on file with the IRB, and the research may be reviewed at the committee's discretion. If the committee deems necessary, it may require a full review.
- 7.1.2 Unless otherwise required by federal departments or agencies, research activities in which the only involvement of human subjects will be in one or more of the following categories are generally exempt from full review by the IRB:
 - 1) Research conducted in established or commonly accepted educational settings, involving normal education practices, such as
 - i. research on regular and special education instructional strategies, or
 - ii. research on the effectiveness of or the comparison among instructional techniques, curricula, or classroom management methods.
 - 2) Research involving the use of educational tests (cognitive, diagnostic, aptitude, achievement), survey procedures, interview procedures or observation of public behavior, unless:
 - i. information obtained is recorded in such a manner that human subjects can be identified, directly or through identifiers linked to the subjects; and
 - ii. any disclosure of human subjects' responses outside the research could reasonably place the subjects at risk of criminal or civil liability or be damaging to the subjects' financial standing, employability, or reputation.
 - 3) Research involving the use of educational tests (cognitive, diagnostic, aptitude, achievement), survey procedures, interview procedures, or observation of public behavior that is not exempt under the previous paragraph, if:
 - i. the human subjects are elected or appointed public officials or candidates for public office; or
 - ii. federal statute(s) require(s) without exception that the confidentiality of the personally identifiable information will be maintained throughout the research and thereafter.
 - 4) Research involving the collection or study of existing data, documents, records, pathological specimens, or diagnostic specimens, if these sources are publicly available or if the information is recorded by the investigator in such a manner that subjects cannot be identified, directly or through identifiers linked to the subjects.
 - 5) Research and demonstration projects that are conducted by or subject to the approval of federal department or agency heads, and that are designed to study, evaluate, or otherwise examine:
 - i. public benefit or service programs;
 - ii. procedures for obtaining benefits or services under these programs;
 - iii. possible changes in or alternatives to those programs or procedures; or
 - iv. possible changes in methods or levels of payment for benefits or services under those programs

7.2 Expedited Review Categories

- 7.2.1 Expedited review procedures are available for certain kinds of research involving no more than minimal risk, and for minor changes in approved research. Specifically, research is eligible for expedited review if it involves no more than minimal risk



ERIN L. SHERMAN, MAcc, CRA, CIP
Research Compliance Officer
Division of Research, Commercialization and Outreach

6300 OCEAN DRIVE, UNIT 5844
CORPUS CHRISTI, TEXAS 78412
O 361.825.2497 • F 361.825.2755

May 8, 2012

Mr. Doyne Scott Elliff
929 Driftwood Place
Corpus Christi, TX 78411

Dear Mr. Elliff,

The research project entitled "Staying Power: The Relationship of Public School Superintendent Tenure and Leadership Frames" (IRB# 46-12) has been granted approval through an exempt review under category 7.1.2(1). You are authorized to begin the project as outlined in the IRB protocol application.

Please submit an IRB Amendment Application for any modifications to the approved study protocol. Changes to the study may not be initiated before the amendment is approved. Please submit an IRB Completion Report to the Compliance Office upon the conclusion of the project. Both report formats can be downloaded from IRB website.

All study records must be maintained by the researcher for three years after the completion of the study. Please contact me if you will no longer be affiliated with Texas A&M University – Corpus Christi before the conclusion of the records retention timeframe to discuss retention requirements.

Please contact me if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Erin L. Sherman". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Erin L. Sherman

THE ISLAND UNIVERSITY

SLI 1.0

1. SUPERINTENDENT LEADERSHIP INVENTORY (SLI)

ONLINE CONSENT FORM

You are being asked to participate in an online survey. Please read the following. If there are any questions, you may contact the principal investigator, D. Scott Elliff, via email (dselliff@gmail.com) or telephone (361-537-1684).

Description: I understand that the purpose of the study is to examine the relationship of the ways public school superintendents view their leadership roles and the length of tenure in the superintendent position in a single district. The study will also examine the influence of school district size, as measured by student population, on the relationship between tenure and the ways superintendents view their leadership roles.

Confidentiality: I understand that the identity of the respondents and individual responses will remain confidential. If the results are published or presented at a scientific meeting, the identity of the participants will not be disclosed.

Compensation: I understand that participation in the study will not cost me anything and that I will not receive any money for my participation.

Risks and Benefits: I understand that there is no physical risk to participate in the study and that there is not any direct benefit to me individually; however, my participation will benefit the field of public school administration.

Right to Withdraw: I understand that I am free to withdraw my consent and stop participating in the study at any time without penalty or loss of benefits for which I may be entitled.

Voluntary Consent: I certify that I have been informed about the study's purpose, procedures, possible risks and benefits. Additionally, I know that if I have any questions about my rights as a research participant, I can contact Erin Sherman, Compliance Officer, at Texas A&M University – Corpus Christi, at (361) 825-2497.

***1. Do you consent to participate in the study?**

☐

I consent.

APPENDIX B

Superintendent's Leadership Inventory (SLI)

SLI 1.0

2. Leadership Orientations Inventory (LOI)

1990, Lee G. Bolman and Terrence E. Deal (All rights reserved)

This questionnaire asks you to describe your leadership and management style as a public school superintendent. Considering your experience as a public school superintendent, you are asked to indicate how often each of the items below is or was true of you.

Please use the following scale in answering each item.

- 1 Never
- 2 Occasionally
- 3 Sometimes
- 4 Often
- 5 Always

You would answer '1' for an item that is or was never true of you, '2' for one that is or was occasionally true, '3' for one that is or was sometimes true of you, and so on.

Be discriminating! Your results will be more helpful if you think about each item and distinguish the things that you really do or did all the time as superintendent from the things that you seldom or never do or did.

1. Think very clearly and logically.

| | | | | |
|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| Never | Occasionally | Sometimes | Often | Always |
| <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

2. Show high levels of support and concern for others.

| | | | | |
|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| Never | Occasionally | Sometimes | Often | Always |
| <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

3. Have exceptional ability to mobilize people and resources to get things done.

| | | | | |
|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| Never | Occasionally | Sometimes | Often | Always |
| <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

4. Inspire others to do their best.

| | | | | |
|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| Never | Occasionally | Sometimes | Often | Always |
| <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

5. Strongly emphasize careful planning and clear timelines.

| | | | | |
|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| Never | Occasionally | Sometimes | Often | Always |
| <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

6. Build trust through open and collaborative relationships.

| | | | | |
|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| Never | Occasionally | Sometimes | Often | Always |
| <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

SLI 1.0

7. Am a very skillful and shrewd negotiator.

| | | | | |
|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| Never | Occasionally | Sometimes | Often | Always |
| <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

8. Am highly charismatic.

| | | | | |
|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| Never | Occasionally | Sometimes | Often | Always |
| <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

9. Approach problems through logical analysis and careful thinking.

| | | | | |
|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| Never | Occasionally | Sometimes | Often | Always |
| <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

10. Show high sensitivity and concern for others' needs and feelings.

| | | | | |
|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| Never | Occasionally | Sometimes | Often | Always |
| <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

11. Am unusually persuasive and influential.

| | | | | |
|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| Never | Occasionally | Sometimes | Often | Always |
| <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

12. Am able to be an inspiration to others.

| | | | | |
|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| Never | Occasionally | Sometimes | Often | Always |
| <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

13. Develop and implement clear, logical policies and procedures.

| | | | | |
|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| Never | Occasionally | Sometimes | Often | Always |
| <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

14. Foster high levels of participation and involvement in decisions.

| | | | | |
|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| Never | Occasionally | Sometimes | Often | Always |
| <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

15. Anticipate and deal adroitly with organizational conflict.

| | | | | |
|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| Never | Occasionally | Sometimes | Often | Always |
| <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

16. Am highly imaginative and creative.

| | | | | |
|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| Never | Occasionally | Sometimes | Often | Always |
| <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

17. Approach problems with facts and logic.

| | | | | |
|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| Never | Occasionally | Sometimes | Often | Always |
| <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

SLI 1.0

18. Am consistently helpful and responsive to others.

| | | | | |
|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| Never | Occasionally | Sometimes | Often | Always |
| <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

19. Am very effective in getting support from people with influence and power.

| | | | | |
|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| Never | Occasionally | Sometimes | Often | Always |
| <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

20. Communicate a strong and challenging sense of vision and mission.

| | | | | |
|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| Never | Occasionally | Sometimes | Often | Always |
| <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

21. Set specific, measurable goals and hold people accountable for results.

| | | | | |
|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| Never | Occasionally | Sometimes | Often | Always |
| <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

22. Listen well and am unusually receptive to other people's ideas and input.

| | | | | |
|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| Never | Occasionally | Sometimes | Often | Always |
| <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

23. Am politically very sensitive and skillful.

| | | | | |
|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| Never | Occasionally | Sometimes | Often | Always |
| <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

24. See beyond current realities to generate exciting new opportunities.

| | | | | |
|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| Never | Occasionally | Sometimes | Often | Always |
| <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

25. Have extraordinary attention to detail.

| | | | | |
|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| Never | Occasionally | Sometimes | Often | Always |
| <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

26. Give personal recognition for work well done.

| | | | | |
|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| Never | Occasionally | Sometimes | Often | Always |
| <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

27. Develop alliances to build a strong base of support.

| | | | | |
|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| Never | Occasionally | Sometimes | Often | Always |
| <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

28. Generate loyalty and enthusiasm.

| | | | | |
|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| Never | Occasionally | Sometimes | Often | Always |
| <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

SLI 1.0

29. Strongly believe in clear structure and a chain of command.

| | | | | |
|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| Never | Occasionally | Sometimes | Often | Always |
| <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

30. Am a highly participative manager.

| | | | | |
|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| Never | Occasionally | Sometimes | Often | Always |
| <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

31. Succeed in the face of conflict and opposition.

| | | | | |
|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| Never | Occasionally | Sometimes | Often | Always |
| <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

32. Serve as an influential model of organizational aspirations and values.

| | | | | |
|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| Never | Occasionally | Sometimes | Often | Always |
| <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

3. Demographic Information

***1. How many total years of experience do you have working in the field of public education?**

Number of Years

***2. How many total years of experience do you have as a superintendent?**

Number of Years

***3. In years, what is the longest tenure you have served as superintendent in any one school district, including your current position?**

Number of Years

***4. What was/is the size of the student population of the school district in which you have the longest tenure as a superintendent?**

Total number of students

***5. What is your gender?**

☐

Female

☐

Male

***6. What is your age?**

Age in years

***7. What category would best describe your race / ethnicity?**

☐

Asian

☐

Black or African American

☐

White (Not Hispanic or Latino)

☐

Hispanic or Latino

☐

Other

***8. What is the highest level of education you have completed?**

☐

Bachelor's Degree

☐

Master's Degree

☐

Doctoral Degree

SLI 1.0

9. Based on your experience as a superintendent, what is the most important factor a superintendent must consider when leading major change in a school district?

10. In your opinion, what is the most important factor that enables a public school superintendent to persist in one district long enough to implement and sustain change?

APPENDIX C

Qualitative Data

“Based on your experience as a superintendent, what is the most important factor a superintendent must consider when leading major change in a school district?”

- Where the stakeholders currently are; the success and failures of all involved.
- Willingness to face termination
- Collaboration and buy-in
- Must have the players buy in to the change
- Capacity of the school board and administrators
- How it will impact the school community
- Collaboration
- What's best for students!
- Listening and observing, taking appropriate action.
- Board of Education support
- Buy in and support thru collaboration
- Readiness/capacity for change of community and staff
- Planning and consensus building
- Servant Leader and ability to communicate with people at all levels
- Measurable progress/success
- Facts, following, fearless
- Consistent and persistent message of vision and expectations
- Buy -in. Bring others along
- Honesty
- Goals of the District
- Readiness and timing and communication. The superintendent must know the right

time to introduce a major change and communicate that change effectively.

- Know/realize who are both the formal and informal leaders of the group
- Where your organization is related to the change
- Effect on students
- Board Buy In
- Visionary
- Empowerment of others
- Willingness of school community to accept change
- Communication
- The effect policy or decisions will have on students
- Buy-in from staff and leaders
- What is best for the students
- Trust
- Organizational readiness
- Gradual but steady change
- Attention to detail
- Compassion
- Student Achievement and Instructional practice
- Right people on the bus-J.Collins
- Community support
- Board relations
- School board support and the ability to build/forgo relationships within and outside of the educational system.

- Money to pay for it
- Buy in
- Strong school community relationship
- Board and District directional unity on vision and mission
- Support from all parties
- Culture of the district
- Staff
- Generating support
- Making sure everyone is aware of the needed changes
- Community buy-in into all solutions and change
- A clear, thoughtful process with input
- Getting all stakeholders apprised of the reasons for the recommended change so they will support it.
- Understanding the culture and people
- Careful planning of all consequences, intended and unintended
- Is it best for the students, and is it what the community wants!
- Is this right thing for students?
- Community values
- Community support
- Go slow to go fast
- Build relationships both up (board) and down (staff/parents)
- Board Support of Change Initiatives
- Input from all stakeholders is key

- Building relationships
- Student need
- Establishing an environment of trust
- Knowledge in teaching and learning areas
- Building trust and consensus
- Stakeholder buy in.
- Community served
- People
- Building employee and community support
- Staff involvement
- Leadership skills
- How change will benefit the students of the district.
- Long term consequences.
- Believe in it yourself and get buy in from community.
- Ability to lead and inspire
- Collaboration
- Convincing Staff of the necessity of the change
- Trust
- Is your Board on board with you?
- Commitment of staff
- Student Impact
- Buy in
- Do not rush it. Change too quickly can have major blowback, especially with veteran

personnel. Show evidence that change is needed and let the personnel direct WANT the change.

- Focus & Flexibility
- Support of Board
- What's best for the kids
- People's readiness and packaging the change
- What are the possible results of this major change
- collaboration
- The students
- Shared vision
- The Board of Trustees
- Clear vision
- Patience with various publics in moving through the change process.
- Building consensus
- Impact on students
- Buy in
- Getting stakeholders to take ownership
- Does the superintendent have the fortitude to withstand the kickback?
- Establish relationships first
- Gaining consensus from the majority of stakeholders
- Climate
- Politics and working with the Board
- Remembering and practicing the theory of participative leadership----effective school leadership can no longer be the sole responsibility of the school principal or the school

superintendent. When leadership roles are assumed by multiple individuals in any school organization, the behavioral attributes of the organization begin to define a more cohesive interactive union, an organization that has come alive and is moving the mission of the school forward in a coordinated fashion (Erlandson, 1997).

- Communication
- Needs of the students
- What is best for the students
- Clear expectations, support and follow-up
- Public Reaction
- Competency of employees
- Communication
- Buy in from stakeholders
- The culture of the district
- The organization's readiness
- The impact the change will have on the culture of the school district.
- Establish a clear, shared vision
- Clarity of mission and vision
- Equity for all students
- Student outcomes
- Open to all ideas from opposition. Use some of their ideas and make sure your available and accountable for your decisions.
- Communicating the value and purpose of the change, so as to engage the support of a critical mass.
- Have all the facts and data needed to support you plan of action
- Vision

- Make haste slowly!
- Board Support
- Trust
- Good Communication with community, staff, and board
- Get buy-in from staff
- What level and amount of change the organization can handle to ensure success of said change.
- Communicating the change and building support.
- Dedication
- Communication
- Trust and credibility
- Do the stakeholders desire change?
- Support of the staff.
- Political timing
- Does the Board/community trust school/administration?
- Establish relationships
- Trust
- Total commitment to the change
- Flexibility
- Including all stakeholders
- Buy in, or understanding of need for change.
- Impact on Students
- Developing buy-in from all constituents

- Persistence
- Clear plan of action with specific measurable goals, expectations and resources.
- Money
- Move incrementally
- Faculty and student morale
- Being flexible
- Trust and involvement all parties in the organization.
- Having Integrity and being open with the stake holders
- With my lack of experience, I am still learning and currently in the process of leading a major change.
- Develop a sense of urgency
- Why do we need to change?
- Buy in.
- The folks
- Respected by community
- A charismatic leader who provides staff with the resources they need to successfully implement change
- Organized, communicator, collaborative
- Develop a firm, fair relationship with board members
- What is best for children
- Be confident and sincere
- The board of trustees
- Have great staff that is enthusiastic.

- Know history of district and identify the players or heavy hitters who can assist
- Student Instructional needs should always be the most important factor.
- Communication
- Funding
- Value to the children
- Good communication skills
- Strong Communicator
- What is best for student learning?
- Credibility
- Research and make certain the change is right for your district
- Having the end product defined.
- Community trust
- Buy-in
- Collaboration
- How prepared is the staff for change.
- Must know and understand the wants and needs of the district clientele
- Patience
- Collaborative vision
- Collaboration
- Stakeholder's needs and views
- Do you have buy-in from key stakeholders?
- Having others 'on board' and understanding the need for the change.

- You will never make everyone happy; do what is good for kids not adults.
- How to deal with reluctance

“In your opinion, what is the most important factor that enables a public school superintendent to persist in one district long enough to implement and sustain change?”

- Trust and open communication
- Will power in the face of criticism and political attack
- Trust and credibility
- Trust
- School Board support and longevity and commitment to a constancy or purpose.
- Strong communication (transparency)
- Integrity
- Communication!
- Trust and integrity
- Board support and vision
- Public relations sustained during tenure
- A long-term vision which is shared by most all facets of the community
- Communication and relationship with the Board
- Stable school boards, and student success
- Intelligence/Compassion/Communications
- Know the public and elected folks ability to digest change and in what quantities.
- Being consistent, make sound decisions, staying on point, avoiding the pratfall of

'stupid'

- Superintendent/ Board relations
- Honesty
- Be open minded
- Keeping students and learning as the most important issue
- Adaptability
- Serendipity
- Communication
- Academic Growth and Community Support
- Trust based on what I have learned I'm year one.
- Prayer.....
- Systemic change
- Communication
- Communication
- Trust and ethics
- Building Relationships
- Results
- Support of the Board of Trustees
- Transparency
- School board support
- Compassion
- Communication

- Build relationships of trust
- Support from the community and school personnel
- Board relations
- Sustaining the positive working relationships within your district and community.
- Tough skin
- Board support
- Truthfulness and relationship with the community
- Relationships with Board of Trustees
- Be open, honest and maintain integrity at all times
- Being flexible
- Progress relationship with community
- Integrity of mission and ideals that inspires belief in followers
- Cooperation and empowerment
- Willingness to sacrifice personal aspirations for school/community growth
- Being able to connect with others in a meaningful way.
- Open and honest communications with all stakeholders at all times.
- Confidence and trust
- Always working towards building trust and always understanding who you are as an educator (knowing your own "true north" and living there).
- Human relation skills, and the political skills to work with all constituencies.
- Build and sustain relationships
- Community support

- Board support
- Pace your change appropriately
- Be honest and keep it clean - have a plan and work it
- Board Support and Positive Relations with Board
- Building trust with the board and community
- Building relationships and empowering staff
- Understanding the dynamics of the Board/political culture
- Establishing an environment of trust
- Ability to adapt and quickly
- Staff and community support.
- Board relationships
- Relationships
- Flexibility with changing boards and changing goals
- Staff involvement
- Strong political skill set
- Communication with stakeholders.
- School Board Support and good Administrative Support.
- Put the needs of students first and let them and the community know you care about district.
- Ability to work well with board
- Transformational leadership
- Trust relationship with School Board, Staff, and Parents.
- Trust

- Getting the main characters (employees) to buy into it.
- Being able to show staff your commitment and your responsibility for change
- Hire/Retain Quality People in ALL Positions
- Positive relationships
- Board support
- Focus & Flexibility
- Support of Board and District willingness for change
- Trust
- Building trust, alliances and credibility
- Surround yourself with good talented staff
- Accommodate
- Ability to rally support behind key mission of district
- Shared vision
- Flexibility and determination
- Well thought-out implementation of vision
- Trust from various publics in superintendent to lead fairly and effectively through time.
- Building relationships
- Ability to build relationships
- Trust
- Flexibility and knowing clientele
- The community must believe that the change is in the best interest of the children.
- Compromise on things that do not matter and hold firm to those things that do.

- Building community trust
- Patience
- Working positively with their Board
- A stable school board who fully understand their roles and responsibilities and have a mutually supportive relationship with their superintendent.
- Superintendent/Board Relationship
- Ability to lead, while still being able to compromise, when needed to obtain goals.
- Building relationships
- Consistency with the board, staff, and community
- Trustful Relationships
- Relationships
- Adaptability
- You gotta know when to hold 'em and know when to fold 'em
- Supportive Board of Trustees
- Building a case for change, creating a sense of urgency, involve stakeholders in plan and have timeline w metrics
- The ability to be flexible and not rush change. Change, no matter what type it is, will have its challenges. You must stay the course and get buy in from your Board and Staff...They will sell your students and community.
-
- Establish a high level of trust
- Political Savvy
- Positive community relations
- Good communication and full transparency with the Board
- I feel that you have to ride the waves of change. Rome wasn't built in a day and you have to have patience and persistence with opportunities of buy in from the the people it is going to affect

- Building trust relationships with the Board, faculty, and parents
- The school and kids come first always - Be honest in everything you do - Communication
- Galvanizing people around a clear direction
- Understanding the community
- Community Support
- Resiliency
- Good Board of Education
- Servant leadership
- Ability to unify a common vision in the district and get buy in from the staff to move forward towards that common vision.
- Building support and treating people right.
- Work ethic
- Perceived as trustworthy, committed to community
- Trust and credibility
- Having integrity.
- Ability to articulate a compelling need for the change.
- Customer service
- Same: Board/community TRUST in school/administration
- Trust
- Board relations and trust
- Flexibility
- Flexibility

- Perseverance
- The ability to generate trust.
- Ownership from stakeholders
- Open lines of communication
- Flexibility
- Academic success.
- Influence on board of trustees
- Ability to communicate
- Honesty
- Stay strong and ignore the detractors.
- Working with the school board and community
- Maintaining Integrity and being open with stake holders
- Buy in from community and school board.
- Develop trust with staff, board, and community
- Trust that decisions are being made in the best interest of all students.
- Clear vision
- Make sure that you bring everyone along in the process
- Liked by the community
- Support of their school board - Team of 8 philosophy- Common Goals and vision between Board and Supt
- Build a solid foundation as a leader
- Relationships
- Always doing what is best for children in every decision

- Be open and honest in your dealings
- The board of trustees!
- Getting along with the board. Their kids, money and school
- Show the need for change and generate support of community members
- A School Board that works as a team with the Supt. through constant communication will allow you to guide the district in a direction that is educationally sound at all levels. School Boards that value all aspects of a child's education and that are in sync with the Supt. in demanding quality in every level of the school. When everyone is on the same page schools can accomplish the ultimate goal of all schools which is to provide opportunities to feel successful for all our children. I have been blessed to work with this kind of School Board.
- Communication
- Strong board of trustees
- Support of the school-community because of your dedication to children.
- Passion for education
- Sincere and Authentic Leadership
- Clear communication with all stakeholders.
- Honesty
- Must have a school board that is supportive
- Developing the support of the whole community, not just the Board.
- Community trust
- Common sense
- Communication
- Understands the change process.
- The key to longevity in any district is becoming immersed in the district and

community.

- Trust
- Board relationships
- Communication
- Communication and fostering support
- If he/she is running the district, not the board!
- His or her relationship with the school board.
- Knowing the political climate of the district but still doing what is good for kids. Showing success from the beginning then building on that success.
- Gaining credibility and earning trust