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ABSTRACT

LEADERSHIP ORIENTATION STYLE AND USE OF POWER: A STUDY OF NEW JERSEY MALE SUPERINTENDENTS

The purpose of the research study was to examine Leadership Orientation Style and Use of Power by New Jersey male superintendents in order to better understand the contemporary profile, leadership style, and use of power of the New Jersey male superintendent. A secondary purpose of the study was to compare the findings with those of a recent New Jersey study of female superintendents (Edmunds, 2007).

Data was collected using the Leadership Orientation Style (Self-reporting) Survey developed by Bolman and Deal (1990). The survey is aligned with their Four Frame Model of Leadership which views leadership through the lens of four different perspectives, the structural, human resource, political, and symbolic frames. The findings were also examined in the context of the Three Dimensional Model of Power (Fowler, 2004) developed from prevailing theory in the study of power. Interviews were conducted with eleven sitting New Jersey male superintendents to give
"voice" to the survey data. Approximately 35.8% (n = 154) of the 430 surveys were returned (n = 154).

Overall, the findings of the study suggested that New Jersey males exercised a multi-dimensional leadership style and associated closely with the behaviors of all four frames. The predominant frame was the human resource frame, followed closely by the structural, symbolic, and political frames. Overriding themes were identified as accountability, communication, and power. The data suggested males as comfortable with the construct of power, exercising transactional leadership tendencies. When compared to the findings of the female study, the researcher concluded that males and females had differing views on power, and that females, who reported transformational leadership tendencies, were more uncomfortable with exercise of power than were males. Both males and females identified their highest frame association with the human resource frame and lowest association with the political frame.
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CHAPTER I

Introduction

Paul Houston, executive director of the American Association of School Administrators (AASA), once spoke of the superintendent in biblical terms. Houston viewed the superintendent as the savior who is hired to rescue the organization, but is soon tried by a tribunal and run out of town in humiliation, with the hope of resurrection lingering on the horizon (2001). The position of superintendent of schools is a challenging, if not impossible, job with scarce resources and diminishing authority. But overwhelmingly, the contemporary superintendent is happy and satisfied (Glass & Franceschini, 2007).

Educational leaders are under intense scrutiny from national, state, and local policy makers as a result of rapid change and escalating accountability. The job of the chief school administrator is a crucial, high stakes position in regard to the ultimate success of schools and children. Given the recognition of its importance, the superintendent has long been the subject of study by
professional organizations, leadership preparation programs, and educational theorists. Effective leadership style and use of power play an integral part in the success of school leaders (Bolman & Deal, 2003).

Background

AASA has maintained a rich tradition of study of the school superintendent. AASA conducted national studies to include a series of 10-year studies dating back to 1923, interrupted only by World War II. In contemporary history, however, the end-of-decade study of 1998 (Glass, Bjork, & Brunner, 2000) was quickly followed by a mid-decade study in 2006 (Glass & Franceschini, 2007) in recognition of the volatile educational environment that resulted from the passage of No Child Left Behind (NCLB) in 2002. Undoubtedly, the mandates of NCLB and the challenging economic circumstances in the United States will continue to impact the role of today’s public school superintendent (Glass & Franceschini, 2007).

Nationwide, the ranks of public school superintendents are overwhelmingly male (Glass et al., 2007). Estimates of the dominance in the superintendency of the white male have varied between 82% and 99% over the years (Brunner & Grogan, 2007). One recurring question in the literature has
been, "Do women and men lead differently?" (Bolman & Deal, 2003, p. 346). While early studies did not suggest significant differences (Bolman & Deal, 1991b, 1992; Yerkes, Cuellar, & Cuellar, 1992), subsequent studies began to suspect otherwise (Davis, 1996; Frick, 1996; Skrla, 1997).

New Jersey is a prominent player in educational policy, often ranked highly among states for its educational achievements. A recent leadership study of female superintendents in New Jersey concluded that female superintendents in New Jersey exhibited multidimensional leadership styles, but found that women superintendents were clearly uncomfortable in a discussion of power (Edmunds, 2007, p. 175).

This research study examines leadership style and use of power of the New Jersey male superintendent. The research study further compares its findings and conclusions of the study with those of a recent female New Jersey superintendent study (Edmunds, 2007).

Statement of the Problem

A recent study of female superintendents in New Jersey (Edmunds, 2007) provided insight into female superintendency in New Jersey, specifically addressing
demographic profile, leadership style, and the construct and use of power. The study did not include male superintendents, who accounted for nearly 78% of public school leaders in New Jersey. In order to achieve a fuller understanding of the overall state of the superintendency in New Jersey and to further understand the evolving role of the New Jersey superintendent in the context of the 21st century, a study of the New Jersey male superintendent is needed.

Purpose of the Study

The research study examines leadership orientation styles and the use of power of male superintendents in New Jersey school districts. The purpose of the study is twofold: (a) to examine the characteristics of the male superintendent in New Jersey in terms of demographic profile, leadership behaviors, leadership orientation style, and the use of power, and (b) to compare the findings with a recent study of New Jersey female superintendent characteristics, leadership behaviors, leadership orientation style preferences, and the use of power (Edmunds, 2007).

The research study compares the findings of the New Jersey male superintendent study with the findings of
Edmunds's 2007 study in order to draw conclusions regarding differences and similarities between male and female public school superintendents in the state of New Jersey. The study examines the findings for implications regarding policy, practice, and future research to better understand the evolving role of the contemporary superintendent of schools in New Jersey.

Conceptual Framework

The research study is conceptually based on the Four Frame Model of leadership developed by Bolman and Deal (2003). The research study is conceptually based on the Three-Dimensional Model of Power, as described by Fowler (2004; see also Bendix, 1960; Gaventa, 1980; Lukes, 1974; Weber, 1986; Wrong, 1979).

Conceptual Framework: Leadership Orientation Style

Bolman and Deal (2003) are leading researchers in the area of organizational leadership. They constructed a Four Frame Model for use in the study of leadership style, largely drawn from prevailing theories of leadership and management. Inherent in the framework is the belief that critical organizational issues can and should be viewed from various perspectives depending on context. Bolman and Deal suggested that the lens used by the organizational
leader influences both the perception of and reaction to a problem or issue. To best lead in an adaptive environment, a leader is required to "frame and reframe" in context, thus viewing different problems or scenarios from "different lenses" (Pavan & Reid, 1991, p. 2). The ability of a leader to adapt and respond accordingly to an ever-changing environment is described as a necessary attribute. The Four Frame Model is comprised of (a) the structural frame (the factory), (b) the human resource frame (the family), (c) the political frame (the jungle), and (d) the symbolic frame (the theater).

The structural frame is described as reminiscent of assembly line order, with an emphasis on rules, roles, goals, policies, and vertical organization (Bolman & Deal, 2003, p. 16). The human resource frame focuses on the needs, skills, and relationships of those in the organization, with a belief in empowerment vs. the exercise of power. The political frame places a higher value on power, conflict, competition, politics, and competing interests of those in the organization for limited resources. Finally, the symbolic frame places priority on culture, meaning, ritual, ceremony, institutional memory,
and heroes in the search for organizational meaning and inspiration.

The Four Frame Model is a compilation of leading theories of leadership and management. It provides a meaningful framework for the examination of leadership style in male superintendents in New Jersey. The Four Frame Model also provides a meaningful framework for the examination of differences and similarities between male and female public school superintendents in New Jersey.

Drawing from leading theories of power, Bolman and Deal (2003) hypothesized that sources of power would vary according to frame context, given the differences of frame orientation. Fowler (2004) similarly noted that the Three-Dimensional Model of Power was developed using prevailing theories of power. The Three-Dimensional Model of Power also recognizes the need for a multidimensional model that views problem solving as an adaptive skill necessary for organizational survival.

The first dimension of power, the explicit exercise of power, is based on mechanisms of force, economic dominance, authority, and persuasion (Fowler, 2004, p. 30). The second dimension of power, the mobilization of bias, is predicated on mechanisms of customs, norms, organizational structures,
procedures, rules of the game, social usages, and traditions, usages of power described as "implicit." The third dimension of power, the shaping of consciousness, is designed as mechanisms built on communication processes, myths, and symbols, described as "inspirational power." The third dimension of power recognizes the influence of social structures on an organization to include family, media, schools, and religious affiliations.

The Three-Dimensional Model of Power recognizes that context often dictates the necessary power model, and in the complex scenarios encountered daily by the school leader, the three dimensions of power frequently act in concert. The Three-Dimensional Model of Power, by its very definition, is multidimensional in nature. It is reminiscent of the power model of French and Raven (1959): reward power (the ability to reward), coercive power (the ability to manipulate desired outcomes, usually involving punishment if desired outcomes are not attained), legitimate power (power resulting from internalized values that the leader has legitimate right to influence and the follower has obligation to submit), expert power (leader is believed to have knowledge in a given area), and reverent power (follower has identified with the leader as leader, a
desire to please or join the leader; as cited by Podsakoff & Schriescheim, 1985). Traces of other leading power models such as transformational ("power to/with") and transactional power ("power over") can also be tied to the Three-Dimensional Model of Power. The Three-Dimensional Model of Power is consistent with Bolman and Deal's Four Frame Model: Both acknowledge classifications of conduct that may act alone or in concert and often overlap. Both models are constructed from leading theories of organizational theory and power. The complexity of issues encountered today in education and the volatile environment of state and federal mandates create a need to be adaptive. The Four Frame Leadership Model and the Three-Dimensional Model of Power are attractive tools in the examination of leadership style and the use of power.

Research and Guiding Questions

The following research questions are examined:

1. To what extent are leadership behaviors and styles of New Jersey male superintendents understood by applying Bolman and Deal's Four Frame Model? What dominant frames, if any, are identified?
2. To what extent do the findings compare to the findings of a recent study of leadership preferences of New Jersey female superintendents (Edmunds, 2007)?

3. To what extent do the four leadership frames characterize the way New Jersey male superintendents use power in the context of the Three-Dimensional Model of Power?

4. How do the findings compare to the findings of a recent study of New Jersey female superintendents (Edmunds, 2007)?

5. How can the demographic profile of the New Jersey male superintendent be understood based upon the demographic findings of the research study?

6. How do the demographic findings of the New Jersey male superintendent profile compare and contrast with the findings of the recent New Jersey female superintendent study (Edmunds, 2007) and the most recent national data (Glass & Franceschini, 2007)?

7. How is the role of the contemporary New Jersey male superintendent understood in the context of the findings of the research study?
Significance of the Study

Educational leadership is at the forefront of national and state policy today. The research study examines self-perceptions of male leadership orientation style and the use of power in the contemporary New Jersey male superintendency. Also examined are broader questions of gender commonalities and differences of leadership style and use of power between male and female school leaders in New Jersey. Potential implications for the findings on successful school leadership, professional preparation, and future research are also explored.

Assumptions of the Research

1. Bolman and Deal's (2003) Four Frame Model is a useful tool in the study of leadership preferences in the examination of both school and business executives.

2. The Three-Dimensional Model of Power is a useful tool in the study of construct and use of power in the role of superintendent (Fowler, 2004).

3. The role of superintendent was significantly impacted by the passage of NCLB (Glass & Franceschini, 2007).

4. The ranks of the superintendency are overwhelmingly male (Glass et al., 2000; Glass & Franceschini, 2007).
5. Leadership style and construct and use of power are integral ingredients of a superintendent’s success.

6. Communication is an important aspect of leadership. Discourse and power interconnect. Discourse exists as speech, text, discourse practice, and social practice (Fowler, 2004).

Delimitations

The research study is delimited to a survey of 430 full-time New Jersey male superintendents employed in New Jersey public school districts during the 2007-08 and/or 2008-09 academic years.

The research study is delimited to a semistructured interview of 11 New Jersey male, full-time, public school superintendents solicited from a cross-section of urban, suburban, and rural districts pursuant to criteria of geographic location, district size, and district factor grouping (DFG).

The research study does not include acting or interim superintendents of New Jersey public school districts.

The research study does not examine variables of race or ethnicity.

The research study is confined to a two-year period.
Limitations

The research study is limited by the candor of the respondents.

The research study is limited by the number of respondents who agreed to voluntary participation.

The research study is limited by the experience level of the participants.

The research study is limited by the ability of the participants to follow the survey directions.

Definitions of Terms

For the purposes of the study,

The structural frame as defined by Bolman and Deal (2003) is conceptually centered on rules, roles, goals, policies, technology, and environment. Its metaphor is the factory or machine (p. 16).

The human resource frame as defined by Bolman and Deal (2003) is conceptually centered on needs, skills, and relationships. Its metaphor is the family (p. 16).

The political frame as defined by Bolman and Deal (2003) is conceptually centered on power, conflict, competition, and organizational politics. Its metaphor is the jungle (p. 16).
The symbolic frame as defined by Bolman and Deal (2003) is conceptually centered on culture, meaning, metaphor, ritual, ceremony, stories, and heroes. Its metaphor is the carnival, temple, or theater (p. 16).

District factor grouping (DFG) is defined by the State of New Jersey Department of Education (NJDOE) as "an appropriate measure of a community’s relative socioeconomic status (SES)" and is calculated using six variables to include (a) percentage of adults with no high school diploma, (b) percentage of adults with some college education, (c) occupational status, (d) unemployment rate, (e) percentage of individuals in poverty, and (f) median family income. It is recalculated every ten years.

The Three-Dimensional Model of Power is comprised of the first dimension, the explicit exercises of power; the second dimension, the mobilization of bias or implicit power; and the third dimension, the shaping of consciousness or inspirational power (Fowler, 2004).

Gender is defined as "an institutionalized system of social practices for constituting males and females as different in socially significant ways and organizing inequality in terms of those differences" (Ridgeway, 2001, p. 637).
Power is defined as the ability to get things done, whether by social control (authority, "power over") or social production (collaboration, "power to"; Brunner & Schumaker, 1998).

Summary

Organization of the Study

Chapter 1 outlines the introduction and background of the study. It delineates the research questions and states the limitations and delimitations of the study.

Chapter 2 examines a literature review of the historical role of the public school superintendent and the construction of a profile of the male school superintendent. It examines the literature of leadership style and gender, power and gender, and studies of perceived differences or similarities of gender, leadership style, and power.

Chapter 3 examines the methodology of the study. The study utilizes both quantitative and qualitative methodologies. It describes the Leadership Orientation (Self) Survey (Bolman & Deal, 1990) and the semistructured interview questions. Chapter 3 outlines data collection and data analysis.
Chapter 4 reports the demographic data for Bolman and Deal's Leadership Orientation (Self) Survey (1990) and the demographic questions developed by the researcher and Edmunds (2007). It reports the demographic data for the survey participants \( n = 154 \) and the 11 interview participants. Chapter 4 analyzes the demographic data and findings of the research study using descriptive statistical methods and compares the findings with those of the female superintendent study and recent national data.

Chapter 5 describes the data and findings of the 32 leadership behaviors and 24 leadership style items of the Bolman and Deal survey (1990). The data are analyzed using descriptive statistics and factor analysis.

Chapter 6 describes the data and conclusions of the 11 qualitative, semistructured interview participants using grounded theory (Corbin & Strauss, 2008; Strauss & Corbin, 1998). The findings are compared and contrasted with those of the female superintendent study (Edmunds, 2007).

Chapter 7 presents the summary, conclusions, and recommendations of the study. It discusses implications regarding policy, practice, and further research.
CHAPTER II

Literature Review

Introduction

This chapter describes the literature relevant to the research questions. It is organized into five sections: (a) a historical overview of the American superintendency, (b) a historical construct of the profile of the stereotypical male superintendent, (c) an examination of gender and leadership style, (d) an examination of gender and power, and (e) a review of a recent study of the female superintendency in New Jersey.

Historical Overview

The American superintendency has been recognized as a position historically dominated by men (Brunner & Grogan, 2007; Dana & Bourisaw, 2006). Over the years, white males have occupied its ranks 82% to 99% of the time (Brunner & Grogan, 2007).

The AASA has studied the superintendency for decades. Glass and Franceschini (2007) noted that past studies and the recent mid-decade study documented the national role and demographics of school superintendents. The mid-decade
study was undertaken primarily because of a recognition of the rapid change in education in our era and the contemporary calls for reform that have placed education in a prominent position on national and state policy agendas.

Glass and Franceschini (2007) summarized today’s superintendent as (a) a mean age of 54.5 years, (b) most likely male (78.3%), (c) most likely to enter the superintendency from a position of principal (although 43% enter from a central office position), (d) in possession of an earned master’s degree (80%) and/or a doctoral degree (50%), and (e) employed a mean tenure of 5.5 years. Glass and Franceschini noted that the dominant entry point to the superintendency for men was from the position of principal (often the high school principal position), and that women were more likely to enter the superintendency from a central office position of curriculum and instruction.

The role of superintendent evolved with society over the decades. Glass and Franceschini (2007) noted, however, that the role of schools has always been “to ensure social stability” and not to “promote social radicalism and create new orders” (p. xiv). Linehan (1999) outlined a comprehensive perspective of the role of the superintendent dating back to the early 1800s as one impacted by social
change. The early 1900s experienced an industrial model of education based on efficiency and assembly line production (Callahan, 1962, as cited by Linehan, 1999). During this period superintendents became business managers of schools, with a focus on the four bs: bonds, buses, budgets, and buildings (Cunningham, 1997, as cited by Linehan, 1999). Following World War II, the business model of education began to change. School reform was influenced by the emerging social issues of the times and the role of superintendent began to focus on both business and educational programming pursuant to the demands of the public (Griffiths, 1966, as cited by Linehan, 1999). Education had moved swiftly to a political realm (Linehan, 1999).

The post-World War II era saw a movement by universities and educators to professionalize the role of superintendent. The GI Bill helped move men back to universities in the pursuit of degrees in school administration. It was during the period between 1954 and 1974 that the role of superintendent crystallized (Linehan, 1999). The emergent role of superintendent was regarded as the role of educational leader, political leader, and managerial leader. This multifaceted theme of leadership is
consistent with the Four Frame Model of Leadership (Bolman & Deal, 2003). The Four Frame Model was an organizational model developed for all organizational settings, and as such, the intrinsic goal varied according to the nature of the organization. Thus, given the role of the school superintendent, educational leadership was viewed as inherent in each of the frames of the Four Frame Model.

As the job description of superintendent took on characteristics of a chief executive officer (CEO), male superintendents began to require and demand more status and higher pay (Blount, 1999). According to Blount, masculine identification with the role of superintendent flourished after World War II. As schools began to consolidate and centralize, the number of superintendent positions decreased, but males began to move increasingly into the consolidated positions of public school administration. Blount noted that the McCarthy era produced an exaggerated mold of "manliness" that males were pressured to fit, a position often associated with athletic prowess and good looks, as a result of the homophobic hysteria of that era.

Blount (1998) concluded that by 1970, nearly 97% of superintendencies were occupied by males. While that figure decreased to 82% by 2000 (Glass et al., 2000), and 78% by
2006 (Glass & Franceschini, 2007), the position of superintendent remains overwhelmingly male. Brunner and Grogan considered the role of superintendent "masculinized" because men constituted a large proportion of the administrative ranks in a position of authority regarded as one that fit traditional notions of "men's work" (2007, p. 13).

The literature has consistently identified three conflicting roles of superintendent that occupy the top priorities of superintendent responsibilities. The three roles of instructional, managerial, and political leader have remained the cornerstone of the role of superintendent. According to Lashway (2002), recent studies reinforced the prominence of the three roles. Johnson (1996, as cited by Lashway, 2002) completed an in-depth study of superintendents and reached the same conclusion regarding the dominant roles of superintendent. Cuban (1998) also recognized the importance of the three roles and the dilemmas faced by superintendents. Cuban urged superintendents to

Have the following: a practical understanding of these dilemmas; a willingness to teach school boards, staff, and community the complexities of the value conflicts that they and their districts face; a clear cause-effect model of how they will influence others to do what has to be done;
explicit criteria for what will constitute success as a superintendent; and finally, the determination to counter the passion of so many policymakers, foundation officers, and corporate leaders seeking short-term solutions (that evaporate in a few years) for long-term dilemmas. (p. 57)

Cuban, Johnson (1996), and Lashway (2002) recognized the conflicting, multidimensional roles of the superintendent and the complexities of conflict, the "DNA of the superintendency," (Cuban, 1998, p. 56) in the workplace. Their conclusions reinforced the philosophies of the Four Frame Model and the Three-Dimensional Model of Power, namely the need to be an adaptive, multiframe leader in complex and often politically charged times.

However, according to Lashway (2002) and others (Glass & Franceschini, 2007), when NCLB burst upon the public stage, it altered the already complex role of superintendent. While the three roles were not likely to disappear, the stringent accountability standards of NCLB refocused the superintendent's instructional role. Among other things, NCLB gave parents choices if their public school was failing in its adequate yearly progress (AYP), and school improvement plans had to demonstrate that remediation was based on "scientifically based research" (Lashway, 2002). Glass and Franceschini recognized NCLB as
the "most contentious educational issue today" (2007, p. xvi). The educational environment has shifted ever more dramatically to the instructional role.

In summary, there existed both a history and a need for the continual scrutiny of the high-stakes position of superintendent of schools, a position largely held by men. In an era of heightened accountability and changing expectations for school leadership, the renewed national spotlight shines on school leadership positions. Because of the need for highly qualified school superintendents, an examination of gender differences among school leaders remains in a position of prominence on the national agenda.

Construction of the Male Superintendent Profile

Extrapolating the data from Glass and Franceschini's (2007) recent AASA study, in which over 78% of the sample was male, the typical superintendent today can be viewed to be (a) a mean age of 54.5 years old, (b) most likely male (78.3%), (c) most likely to enter the superintendency from the position of principal (although 43% enter from a central office position), (d) in possession of an earned master's degree (80%) and/or a doctoral degree (50%), and (e) employed a mean tenure of 5.5 years. The male
superintendent has spent an average of five years in the classroom (Dana & Bourisaw, 2006).

The male superintendent is most likely to have had coaching experience (Schuster & Foote, 1990; Young, 2007). The skills associated with a coaching background are viewed as the ability to organize, motivate, communicate, deal with conflict, and accept the reality of onerous time commitments of the job, skills applicable to leadership positions. Young (2007) studied the element of coaching as a characteristic of the high school principal. Young noted that research supported the fact that 56% of principals had coaching experience as well as 79% of superintendents (Fish, 1976, as cited by Young, 2007). The significance of this was unmistakable: Most superintendents enter the superintendency from the position of principal (Fish, 1976; Gates et al., 2003; Mertz, 1988; Wolverton, 1999; Wyatt, 1992, as cited by Young, 2007). Young concluded that 76.5% of Alabama principals surveyed had coaching experience. When considering only male participants, the figure rose to 83.6%. However, in an analysis of qualitative interviews, Young concluded that although male participants exhibit a desire to compete and win, characteristics often attributed to males, the men also demonstrated a strong emphasis on
building relationships and nurturing children, in direct contradiction to traditional notions of masculinity. Young called for more research to examine if contemporary male leaders might be struggling to redefine “masculinity.”

The male superintendent is most likely to exhibit a transactional style of leadership. Eagly and Johannesen-Schmidt (2001) conducted a meta-analysis of leadership style studies and described a tendency for researchers to use labels of “transactional” when discussing leadership styles of males, and “transformational” when discussing leadership styles of women (Bennis, 1989; Burns, 1978, as cited by Bolman & Deal, 2003). According to Bolman and Deal (2003),

transactional leaders “approach their followers with an eye to trading one thing for another: jobs for votes, subsidies for campaign contributions” (p. 4). Transforming leaders are rarer. As Burns describes them, they evoke their constituents’ better nature and move them toward higher and more universal needs and purposes. They are visionary leaders whose leadership is inherently symbolic. Symbolic leaders follow a consistent set of practices and rules. (p. 361)

In the context of the Four Frame Model, transactional leadership can best be viewed within the structural and political frames (Bolman & Deal, 2003). Transformational leadership can be best viewed in the context of the human resource and symbolic frames. In the context of the Three-
Dimensional Model of Power, transactional leadership can best be viewed within the first and second dimensions of power. Transformational leadership can best be viewed within the third dimension of leadership.

The male superintendent is most likely to use a construct of power based upon dominance or authority. The literature has supported differences in the use of power as the distinction between "power over" (social control model of power, dictatorial, authoritarian), and "power to" (social production model of power, democratic collaborators, and facilitators; Brunner & Schumaker, 1998; Gold, 1990). Brunner and Schumaker (1998) concluded that men were more likely to exert power to achieve their view of the common good. Women, on the other hand, were more likely to view power as a collaborative process moving to the good of a collectively decided upon understanding of the common good. A subsequent study of 47 school superintendents yielded similar findings (Brunner & Schumaker, 1998, p. 38).

According to Barr (2007), researchers (e.g., Gilligan, 1997; Helgesen, 1995) suggested that socialization factors of gender could explain perceived differences, i.e., there are certain expectations in society regarding the conduct of men and women. Men are expected to be controlling, assertive,
confident, aggressive, dominant, forceful, independent, and competitive (Eagly & Johannesen-Schmidt, 2001, p. 783). Women, on the other hand, are expected to be helpful, kind, sympathetic, sensitive, nurturing, and gentle. Bolman and Deal also noted that leadership is associated with "maleness" and women face the "double bind" of acting "too masculine" when aggressive or assertive (2003, p. 347). Blount similarly commented that men faced a peculiar standard of proving "manliness" (1999).

The male superintendent is most likely to communicate in a dominant, aggressive, argumentative, and dramatic style (Glass, 1992, as cited by Zuckerman, 2005; Tannen, 1990). Females exhibit communication styles that are friendly, open, empathetic, and include more nonverbal cues, such as making eye contact and facial expressions. Superintendents spend 67% to 75% of their time talking (Gronn, 1983, as cited by Fowler, 2004) and power is usually communicated through language (Corson, 1995, as cited by Fowler, 2004).

Baron-Cohen (2003) also posited that brain research supported the theory that "the female brain is hard-wired for empathy. The male brain is predominantly hard-wired for understanding and building systems" (p. 1). Baron-Cohen described this theory in terms of the "E" brain and the "S"
brain. While careful to note that the theory did not suggest that all females and all males operated one way or the other, Baron-Cohen presented a persuasive argument that females are predominantly empathizers and males are predominantly systemizers, a theory that supports findings that women leaders fall more predominantly within the human resource frame and are transformational leaders, while male leaders fall more within the definition of structural or political leaders and are transactional leaders. Baron-Cohen noted the high incidence of autism among males to also support the theory of the male “S” brain. This theory would not support the feminist view of social construction of gender and is highly controversial.

In summary, the literature paints a stereotyped portrait of the male superintendent as a former coach and principal in his mid-50s. The male superintendent has been depicted as an aggressive communicator who is perceived as a transactional leader with a “power over” style of leadership. This research study examines whether or not the male superintendent in New Jersey fits the traditional mold of superintendent or transcends the stereotype in the new millennium and the era of NCLB.
Leadership and Gender

Skrla (2000) emphasized the importance of distinguishing the terms "sex" and "gender." The term "sex" was defined as referring to "biological categories, male and female, into which one is classified at birth based on genitalia or before birth on chromosomal typing" (Reskin, 1991; West & Zimmerman, 1991, as cited by Skrla, 2000, p. 295). "Gender" was defined as a term used "for the explicit purpose of creating a space in which socially mediated differences between men and women can be explored apart from biological differences" (Hare-Mustin & Marecek, 1990, as cited by Skrla, 2000, p. 295). Skrla added that gender is produced through social interaction and is something a person "does" according to social rules, rather than something a person "is or has" (West & Zimmerman, 1991, as cited by Skrla, 2000, p. 296).

Ridgeway defined gender as "an institutionalized system of social practices for constituting males and females as different in socially significant ways and organizing inequality in terms of those differences" (2001, p. 637). Ridgeway enlisted an expectation states theory to examine gender, status, and leadership. Ridgeway believed that gender was "deeply entwined with social hierarchy and
leadership because the rules for the gender system that are encoded in gender stereotypes contain status beliefs at their core" (Wagner & Berger, 1997, as cited by Ridgeway, 2001, p. 637). Ridgeway noted the congruency of expectation states theory to the social role theory of Eagly and Johannesen-Schmidt (2001).

Eagly and Johannesen-Schmidt's (2001) social role theory examined differences and similarities in leadership styles between men and women from a slightly different perspective. Gender roles were described as "agentic" or "communal." Agentic roles were stated to be used most in the description of males as "assertive, controlling, and confident tendency . . . aggressive, ambitious, dominant, forceful, independent, daring, self-confident, and competitive" (p.783). Communal roles were stated to be assigned more often to females, displaying a "concern with the welfare of other people . . . affectionate, helpful, kind, sympathetic, interpersonally sensitive, nurturant, and gentle" (p. 783). Commonly held assumptions found in the literature included the position that women were viewed as collegial, process-oriented, and fluid (Helgesen, 1990, 1995, as cited by Chliwniak, 1997, p. 14), while men focused on structure, rules, outcomes, and tasks.
Gosetti and Rusch presented an overview that male dominance in educational leadership rose out of "embeddedness" (Dunlap & Schmuck, 1995, p. 11).

"Embeddedness" was described as an acceptance of undisputed assumptions that resulted from a one-sided, male dominated profession in which women exercised a role of silence. Gosetti and Rusch argued, as did the prevailing feminist viewpoint (e.g., Gilligan, 1982, 1997; Helgesen, 1990; Shakeshaft, 1987) that leadership models were crafted according to prevailing norms as seen through a white, middle-class heterosexual male lens. Gosetti and Rusch posited that even recognized leaders in organizational theory who espoused multifaceted leadership frameworks, such as Bolman and Deal, represented traditional perspectives of leading with examples drawn from a white-male, corporate, or sports world. Gendered examples for their frames frequently are stereotypes. Despite their value for moral and ethical perspectives, Bolman and Deal miss many opportunities in this leadership text to expand perspectives about diversity and equity. (Dunlap & Schmuck, 1995, p. 23)

In their analysis of leadership styles, Eagly and Johannesen-Schmidt (2001) described a tendency for researchers in the 1980s and 1990s to use labels of "transactional leaders" when discussing leadership styles
of males and "transformational leaders" when discussing leadership styles of women (Bennis, 1989; Burns, 1978, as cited by Bolman & Deal, 2003). According to Bolman and Deal,

transactional leaders "approach their followers with an eye to trading one thing for another: jobs for votes, subsidies for campaign contributions" (p. 4). Transforming leaders are rarer. As Burns describes them, they evoke their constituents' better nature and move them toward higher and more universal needs and purposes. They are visionary leaders whose leadership is inherently symbolic. Symbolic leaders follow a consistent set of practices and rules. (2003, p. 361)

The conclusions found in the literature are compatible with the Four Frame Model of leadership, particularly when viewing the structural and political frames in tandem (transactional) and the human resource and symbolic frames together (transformational). Bolman and Deal (2003) recognized that any frame might act alone or in concert with other frames depending on context, i.e., a leader was not necessarily branded as one type of leader over other frame contexts. Bolman and Deal also noted leadership was associated with "maleness" and that women often faced the "double-bind" of acting "too masculine" when aggressive or
assertive or "too feminine" if not acting aggressively or assertively (p. 347).

Candidates for the position of superintendent often have a traditional career path of five years of teaching experience, and assistant principal, principal, assistant superintendent, and superintendent experience (Dana & Bourisaw, 2006). That track is frequently elongated for women. Female candidates are often viewed as lacking the mobility to move, weak on discipline and finance, older, lacking the prerequisite experience, and are interviewed by predominantly male school boards and search consultants. Law and policy makers are predominantly male in the state houses of America. Even though preparation programs now enroll nearly 50% females, growth in the number of female superintendents has not kept pace (Bjork, 2000; Keller, 1999, as cited by Dana & Bourisaw, 2006).

Leadership Orientation Style

Bolman and Deal were among the leading researchers in the area of organizational leadership. Bolman and Deal (2003) developed the Four Frame Model based on their study of dominant organizational practice and leading theory in the social sciences. The underlying rationale for the Four Frame approach was recognition that in today's ever-
changing and complex organizational climate, the ability to problem solve from numerous perspectives was an essential leadership skill. Thus, the ability to continually "reframe," or study a problem from several viewpoints, was advocated as a promising tool for aspiring leaders to effectively improve professional practice. Bolman and Deal asserted that leadership style could be measured (Durocher, 1996, p. 38), and they developed the Leadership Orientation (Self) Survey in 1990. Since the inception of the development of the Leadership Orientation (Self) Survey, a nagging question for researchers has been, "Do women and men lead differently?" (Bolman & Deal, 2003, p. 346).

Bolman and Deal maintained they found "no differences in frame orientation among men and women" (2003, p. 344), and that "for the most part, the available evidence suggests that men and women in comparable positions are more or less alike than different" (p. 346). Others have argued that, at best, the evidence is inconclusive and lacking enough women in the samples to make meaningful conclusions. Dunlap and Schmuck (1995), although critical of Bolman and Deal, offered no evidence to support their position that significant differences exist between male and female leaders. On the other hand, some studies have
supported the proposition that significant differences existed between men and women in terms of leadership style (Helgesen, 1990; Rosener, 1990) and that traditional models of leadership failed to incorporate an appreciation of male and female differences. The literature of the 1990s shaped a new interest in the feminine perspective of leadership as seen through a female lens of leadership (e.g., Gilligan, 1997; Helgesen, 1995). As an outgrowth of the literature, studies increasingly examined the female role of superintendent of schools as it differed from the male role of superintendent. Results have remained mixed (Eagly, Johannesen-Schmidt, & Van Engen, 2003; Eagly & Johnson, 1990; Van Engen & Willemsen, 2000, as cited by Barr, 2007).

Estler (1987) conducted one of the early studies of male and female school administrators in Maine to include full-time principals and superintendents. The study used the Maine School Administrator Competency Survey, a self-perception survey that predated the Bolman and Deal Leadership Orientation (Self) Survey. Although most findings did not note statistically significant differences, Estler reported women scored higher in their self-perceptions across most administrative roles, significantly so in people-related and cognitive
competencies (p. 11). The few areas where men scored higher tended to relate to "things," such as facilities management, computer usage, and collective bargaining. Estler noted that the findings fit with stereotyped notions of "sociological and psychological theories of sex-role socialization and psychological development."

Other studies generally supported the hypothesis that there were no differences between male and female leadership styles or noted the absence of enough women in the sample to analyze gender differences (Bolman & Deal, 1991a). Bolman and Deal stated,

In this sample, gender shows remarkably little relationship to any of the variables (see Table 7). Stereotypically, we might expect that women would rate themselves higher on the human resource frame (warm, supportive, participative) and lower on the political frame (powerful, shrewd, aggressive). But the data give those stereotypes no support. (1991a, p. 15)

In a subsequent study, Bolman and Deal (1992, as cited by Davis, 1996, p. 40) compared school administrators in the United States to administrators in Singapore. The study found that men and women exhibited similar leadership styles. Yerkes et al. (1992) conducted a study of a random sample of faculty members of schools of education across the United States using Bolman and Deal's Leadership
Orientation (Self) Survey. The conclusion of the study was "a statistically significant propensity toward the human resource frame" of the entire sample" (p. 8). Yerkes et al. posited that one interpretation of the data could be that educators, by the very nature of schooling as a "helping profession," were more oriented to the human resource frame (p. 10).

As reported by Durocher (1996), Stickland's 1992 study of 91 Tennessee superintendents and Redman's 1991 study of American and Japanese administrators also concluded that the human resource frame was the dominant frame of all sample participants, followed by the structural frame. This finding has been of recurring interest, essentially finding both transactional and transformational leadership style characteristics at the forefront. The political and symbolic frames were of lesser usage, also an interesting match of what could be viewed as both transactional and transformational tendencies. These early studies were consistent with Bolman and Deal's (2003) research and reinforced the perceived need for multidimensional leadership skills to maximize effective leadership in an increasingly complex organizational environment.
Building upon the prior research, Durocher (1996) studied the leadership orientation styles of 100 of the nation's top administrators as identified in the 1993 issue of *The Executive Educator* using Bolman and Deal's Leadership Orientation (Self) Survey. A secondary purpose of Durocher's study was to analyze frame use in relation to gender, years as a practicing administrator, school district enrollment, and school district setting. Although Durocher found statistical significance for female superintendents in the number of frames used as compared to male superintendents (p. 88), Durocher found no reported significance of male and female administrators in self-perceptions of effectiveness (p. 93).

Gilson (1994) conducted a study of Missouri public higher education administrators in 13 public universities or colleges using Bolman and Deal's Leadership Orientation (Self) Survey. The study findings found no relationship between leadership framing styles and gender, but called for more studies in a time of complex changes in American culture.

Davis (1996) studied gender differences between male and female secondary school principals in Pennsylvania
using the Leadership Orientation (Self) Survey of Bolman and Deal (1990) and a qualitative interview. Davis found significant gender differences in the human resource and symbolic frames, and that females were more likely to be multidimensional (p. 74). Davis found no significant gender differences across lines of gender in the structural and political frames. Additionally, Davis found no significant differences in the number of females and males using one, two, three, or four frames (p. 86).

Frick (1996) conducted a study of Southern California superintendents using Bolman and Deal’s (1990) Leadership Orientation (Self) Survey and reported findings of significant differences in superintendent orientations based on gender, years of experience as a superintendent, and their perceptions about change (p. 244). Frick concluded that the human resource frame was the highest scoring leadership orientation frame, followed by the structural frame, with the political and symbolic frames tied for third place (p. 251), a consistent finding as noted above. Frick found that female superintendents scored higher than males in all four frames of the leadership orientation frames (p. 251).
Skrla (1997) undertook a qualitative case study of three former female superintendents in Texas. This study used a series of in-depth interviews to gain better knowledge of the female view of the superintendency. Skrla (2000) stated that research studies until recently had ignored the female perspective and that studies tended to be conducted by men of men based on male or androgynous standards (e.g., Brunner & Grogan, 2007; Dana & Bourisaw, 2006; Shakeshaft, 1987). Skrla believed the “voices” of the women studied needed to be heard in narrative detail. Although a small sample, the three participants in the Skrla study described a role that emphasized a masculinized view of superintendency (p. 306). Skrla discovered, however, that the interviews of the women described a new role of superintendent, one in which women’s strengths, stereotypically viewed as curriculum and instruction and people skills, were more valued (p. 307). Skrla’s observations merit close consideration when noting that the AASA 2007 study and recent literature point to the effects of NCLB and its corresponding emphasis on increased accountability as a factor to account for the higher number of women with curriculum and instruction experience who are...
moving into assistant superintendent and superintendent positions. The unmistakable importance of qualitative data, which gave amplifying voice to the studies, began to emerge as a significant observation to this researcher.

Chliwniak (1997) studied women leaders in higher education. According to Chliwniak, Mintzberg’s 1989 studies concluded that male leadership styles were associated with completing tasks, achieving goals, hoarding information, and wanting to win, a finding consistent with views of men as transactional leaders. Chliwniak compared Mintzberg’s studies to Helgesen’s 1995 research that described female leadership to include emphasis on relationships, sharing, and process (p. 8). Chliwniak posited that “if leadership approaches are different, the gender gap may represent an impediment to potential institutional improvements,” thereby reinforcing the value of gender studies of leadership.

The findings of Chliwniak (1997) were congruent with theories of “transactional” and “transformational” leadership styles developed by Burns (1978) and Bass (1985). According to Rosener (1990), the theories of Burns and Bass stated that men were more likely to view
themselves as "transactional," using rewards and punishment and a position of power based on authority. Women were more likely to view themselves as "transformational," inspiring workers beyond a sense of self-interest to the interests of the whole organization, thereby ascribing their power base to personal skills and charisma versus that of authority figure (p. 120). Rosener's conclusions align with the theory of the Four Frame Model (Bolman & Deal, 2003) and the Three-Dimensional Model of Power (Bendix, 1960; Galenta, 1980; Lukes, 1974; Weber, 1986; Wrong, 1979, as cited by Fowler, 2004), which acknowledged differing leadership frameworks and power sources.

Other Contemporary Studies

Halloran (2007) surveyed Massachusetts school committee members to determine if leadership styles differed between male and female superintendents using the Leadership Practices Inventory-Observer (LPI) instrument. The study found no significant differences in observation of leadership style.

Armanetti (1999) surveyed Illinois school superintendents using the Individual Behavior Questionnaire (IBQ). Armanetti found that women rated higher in interpersonal relations, such as responding to others’
needs, motivating and inspiring others, giving recognition to others, listening to others, and communicating, consistent themes in the literature, but noted a small number of female participants in the sample served to caution the reader regarding the significance of the findings.

Truslow (2004) studied a sample of 500 male and 500 female superintendents across the United States using the Thomas-Kilmann Inventory (TKI), an open-ended interview protocol, and the Organizational Leadership Effectiveness Inventory. Truslow found that men and women demonstrated significantly different conflict management styles in a study using the Synergistic Leadership Theory Model. The study found men to be more competitive and compromising, and women, more compromising and collaborative. The style differences, according to Truslow, affected how men and women related to and interacted with all constituencies.

Barr (2007) surveyed 58 female superintendents of the Rocky Mountain region using the Leadership Practices Inventory-Self and Sources of Influence instrument. A qualitative interview of five superintendents was also conducted after the surveys were administered. Barr concluded that the female superintendents of the survey
were classroom teachers for 11.63 years, held 4.14 administrative positions prior to assuming the superintendency (46 had been principal; 18, curriculum director; 21, assistant superintendent; and 2, financial officer), and predominantly served in districts with fewer than 2,500 students. Barr concluded that the women in the study overall described themselves as transformational leaders, and although reluctant to discuss power, categorized themselves as exercising reward "influence" (p. 116).

Barr raised the issue that discussions of leadership characteristics today did not necessarily raise stereotyped notions of leadership based on gender (2007, p. 115). Barr noted that the leadership position pattern of the female superintendents in the study aligned closely to the instructional emphasis of NCLB today: The women in the study had more classroom experience and various curricular roles that propelled them into the superintendency. The women did not view their gender as a significant factor in examining leadership characteristics and rejected traditional notions of "male" and "female" leadership characteristics.
Barr (2007) reinforced the position that transformational leadership is necessary in today's technological environment, essentially using the "world is flat" philosophy of Friedman (2007). The world is getting smaller and there is a need to collaborate in an increasingly decentralized environment (see also Matusak, 2001, as cited by Barr, 2007, p. 122). And finally, the women in the study noted a significant change of focus occurred when becoming superintendent: The needs of the board often outweighed the educational needs of the staff and students (Barr, 2007).

Linehan (1999) studied 167 veteran superintendents in Wisconsin, defined as having a minimum of five years experience. Linehan noted that the superintendents of the study, both male and female, held the view that the role of superintendent had evolved in significant ways. Superintendents recognized that changing issues and priorities had resulted in diminished ability of local decision makers to take charge and that school decision making was "moving to the state house" (Linehan, 1999).

Lutz (1990) conducted a study of 16 male and 16 female superintendents in California. Lutz used quantitative surveys, to include the internal and external barriers
questions of the AASA Questionnaire, 1982, the attitudes
towards women in administration (WAM) survey, the
leadership behavior (TP-Q) survey, and general questions
seeking demographic information.

Lutz (1990) found few significant differences in
internal/external barriers, but concluded that men were
generally more anxious about the effects of the job on family, and that women were more anxious about the negative perception of their gender. Attitudes towards women administrators were found to be favorable for both male and females, and perceptions of leadership behaviors were similar for both male and female participants. Both expressed high regard for people and a low to moderate concern for production.

Hummel (1988) used data from the 1982 AASA study of male and female superintendents and compared it with results drawn from a 1987 sample of male and female superintendents in the Midwest. Hummel found that superintendent perceptions of leadership did not vary significantly between males and females, but that they did possess different views of equity and discrimination.

Dunkin (2000) studied eight male and eight female superintendents of large suburban Illinois school districts
through the use of qualitative interviews. Dunkin concluded that all superintendents perceived political, managerial, and educational aspects in the role of superintendent. Dunkin found that women, however, gave more "voice" to educational priorities and males gave more priority to the political aspects of the job.

Parent (2004) surveyed and interviewed 125 male and female superintendents in Oregon and 68 school board chairs. Parent also conducted focus group interviews. Parent concluded that women were older when entering the first superintendent position, had more classroom experience, and had fewer years of superintendent experience. A factor that distinguished Parent’s study was its dedication to a conceptual framework of relational leadership developed by Regan and Brooks in 1995 that blended traditional notions of "male" and "female" characteristics. Using this framework, Parent determined that women placed a higher value on instructional tasks, described as "understandable," as most women have had more classroom experience.

McLean (2006) completed a qualitative study of five female superintendents in California. McLean found that women accounted for 28% of the state’s public school
superintendents, a ratio well above the national norm at that time (Glass et al., 2000). However, the California educational system remains very different from the decentralized, local control profile of New Jersey districts. McLean (2006) pointedly noted the impact of NCLB on school leadership today.

The rich qualitative data of McLean’s (2006) study also resulted in other perceptions by the researcher of the female superintendency. McLean described the varied career paths of the five women studied, noting the absence of in-depth studies of female career paths in the literature. McLean found some support for the premise that women are motivated by different factors than men, such as a desire to help children succeed (a concept also found in Young’s 2007 study of male Alabama principals). McLean (2006) found that women reported significant participation in community service organizations, such as Rotary and Kiwanis, much more so than men (Brunner, 1999; Gotwalt and Towns, 1986, as cited by McLean, 2006). All of the women of the study had doctorates, a factor that the women believed contributed to their success. According to McLean (2006), Davila (2002) and Tallerico (2000) also found that women had more diverse professional and administrative experience
than men. Additionally, the women of the study related stories of tenacity and risk-taking in the pursuit of superintendent or administrative positions, often jumping around from position to position in order to accomplish their goals, the “stealth career paradox” (Schuler, 2002, as cited by McLean, 2006).

In summary, studies of leadership style and gender continue to produce mixed results in the study of leadership orientation style differences across lines of gender. The research also reflected a recognition that the role of superintendent has changed dramatically since the passage of NCLB. Perhaps we have finally come to rest in a place where the goal is simply “to get the job done,” seeking leaders based on criteria directly related to leadership skills that produce results in a contemporary and “flattened” world. Perhaps women have not only burst through the glass ceiling, but men have also broken out of the chains of forced societal views of manliness. And finally, the infusion of rich qualitative data in the study of the superintendency demonstrated its value in order to expand and enrich our understanding of the role of superintendent in a complex environment. In the aftermath of a recent flurry of female superintendent studies, the
male voices have been overlooked. This study fills a gap in the literature through examination of the male superintendency in New Jersey and the evolving role of the male superintendent in post-NCLB times.

Power and Gender

Brunner (1999) defined power as (a) exercising dominance or authority over another or (b) simply collaborating with others. Research has addressed the issue of power and gender over the last several decades. Gold (1990) discussed the need to understand the relationship of power and the competing models of "power over" and "power to" in the study of management and leadership. Chliwniak reviewed numerous studies on the subject of gender and power (e.g., Kelley, 1991; Schael, 1985, as cited by Chliwniak, 1997) and noted Kelley's conclusion that women tended to exercise a "power to" style of management, while men tended towards a style of "power over" (1990, p. 55). The literature generally supported the position that women are reluctant to discuss use of power (e.g., Barr, 2007; Edmunds, 2007), and power often carries a negative connotation, when in fact power should be viewed as neutral (Foucault, 1975, as cited by Bolman & Deal, 2003; Sheff Kohn, 1995). The literature also suggested that the
exercise of power is more a factor of social expectations along stereotyped notions of what constitutes appropriate male and female behavior than any inherent gender specific attribute (Gilligan, 1982, 1997; Helgesen, 1990, 1995).

Sheff Kohn (1995) concluded in a qualitative study of four Massachusetts superintendents that (a) power is linked to the character of the individual, (b) interactions with others are influenced by family, (c) the superintendent must be able to use persuasion and consensus building and cannot rely on title and position, (d) with experience a superintendent shifts from "power over" to "power to," and (e) a formula exists to mobilize organizations in reaching goals. These conclusions are helpful in understanding the contemporary findings of studies of gender and power.

Carli (1999) examined gender and power using French and Raven's 1959 model of five sources of power: reward, coercive, expert, legitimate, and referent power. Carli found French and Raven's model attractive because it acknowledged that power could be based on relationships and not just on the possession of external status or resources (p. 83). Carli believed that referent, expert, and legitimate power "have the most relevance for understanding the relation of gender and power to social influence" (p.
83). Carli cited numerous studies that gave the advantage to men in issues of both expert power and legitimate power. On the other hand, women's "likeableness" gave them an advantage in the area of referent power. Carli concluded that research on social influence provided the "most compelling evidence of gender differences in power" (p. 95).

The Three-Dimensional Model of Power (Bendix, 1960; Gaventa, 1980; Lukes, 1974; Weber, 1986; Wrong, 1979, as cited by Fowler, 2004) was developed as a model of power by compiling and summarizing the work of leading theories of power. The three dimensions included (a) explicit uses of power, (b) mobilization of bias (implicit uses of power), and (c) shaping of consciousness. According to Fowler, the first dimension of power is characterized by mechanisms of force, economic dominance, authority, and persuasion (2004, p. 30). The second dimension of power is characterized by custom, norms, organizational structures, procedures, rules of the game, social usages, and traditions. The third dimension of power is associated with communication processes, myths, and symbols. As Fowler stated, "Real life is more complex than textbook models. In most social
settings, all three dimensions operate simultaneously, and several types of power are used" (p. 30).

The Three-Dimensional Model of Power is consistent with the Four Frame Model of Bolman and Deal (2003): Both accept as a foundation the belief that multiple perspectives are needed by successful leaders and that clearly "one size does not fit all," nor can any one frame be adaptable to all problems or situations. The Four Frame leadership model of Bolman and Deal (2003) and the Three-Dimensional Model of Power (Fowler, 2004) can be viewed as models that recognize diversity of leadership style and exercise of power as uniquely personal to an individual and the organization.

Bolman and Deal (2003) discussed power in the context of the four frames. Authority was associated with the structural frame, the human resource frame preferred the concept of empowerment, and the political frame used a multiperspective. In the symbolic frame, "a leader's power is less a matter of action than of appearance" (p. 285) and "you are powerful if others think you are" (p. 284). Bolman and Deal adhered to a view of power as more positive than negative, referencing Foucault's perspective that "power
produces; it produces reality" (as cited by Bolman and Deal, 2003, p. 192).

In summary, the literature demonstrates the need to view the world from different lenses when examining leadership style and power. As Rosener recognized, "effective leaders don’t come from one mold" (1990, p. 119) and "what is important is how you perform" (p. 125).

A Recent New Jersey Study of Female Superintendency Edmunds (2007) surveyed leadership styles of female superintendents in New Jersey using Bolman and Deal’s Four Frame Leadership Model. The purpose of the study was to examine the dominant leadership styles and use of power for New Jersey female superintendents.

The study used both quantitative and qualitative methods. As part of the quantitative study, female superintendents in New Jersey were mailed a copy of the Leadership Orientations (Self) Survey, developed in 1990 by Bolman and Deal (2003) for the purpose of examining leadership style. The Four Frame Model includes the structural frame (the factory), the human resource frame (the family), the political frame (the jungle), and the symbolic frame (the theater).
The survey instrument was constructed in three sections: behaviors, leadership style, and overall rating with responses sequenced according to the continuum of structural, human resource, political, or symbolic identification. Additionally, Edmunds (2007) gathered demographic data in order to construct a demographic profile of the female New Jersey superintendent.

The Edmunds study (2007) also developed a qualitative interview format based on the Four Frame Model. Six superintendents were selected using a structured process to capture a cross-section of New Jersey superintendents proportionately distributed across the state according to urbanicity, district size, geographic location, configuration, and district factor grouping.

The study concluded that New Jersey female superintendents report a clear preference for the human resource frame, followed by the symbolic frame, the structural frame, and the political frame (Edmunds, 2007). The study reported that New Jersey female superintendents overwhelmingly placed outside Bolman and Deal’s theoretical design of the political frame, a frame described as “networking and building coalitions, agenda setting, mapping the political terrain, and bargaining and
negotiating” (Bolman & Deal, 2003, p. 205). Edmunds concluded that New Jersey female superintendents conceptualized power as “task accomplishment,” and stated,

From the data provided by the interviews, women tended to rely more on using forms of personal power rather than their positional power. Hence, a central theme of this research, therefore, is that women tended to feel an uncomfortable tension when discussing the jungle frame. (2007, p. 175)

Edmunds concluded, however, that for the most part, “the glass ceiling had been broken in New Jersey” (p. 183).

The female study provided rich data to include a demographic profile and the examination of leadership style and power in the context of the Four Frame Model of Bolman and Deal (2003). The current study collected similar data for male superintendents in order to draw conclusions regarding the demographic profile and leadership style preferences of the contemporary New Jersey male superintendent. The study examines the similarities and differences, if any, between male and female leadership style and use of power in New Jersey.

Summary

Superintendency has been largely constructed along lines of male normed standards and stereotypes. While early studies suggested that men and women lead in similar ways,
more recent studies remain have indicated that men and women demonstrate significant differences in leadership orientation style and views of power. However, the findings remain mixed, and there is growing evidence of the changing nature of the role of school superintendent.

The literature suggests that the role of superintendent is being redefined in the complex, highly visible era of accountability. As the number of women in the role continues to rise and role expectations evolve, the superintendency may well be a more receptive environment for differing leadership styles, regardless of gender. The research study examines data collected from New Jersey male superintendents and compares it to Edmunds's 2007 study in order to examine implications for further research, policy, and practice in the areas of educational leadership.
CHAPTER III
Methodology

Overview

The primary purpose of the research study is to examine the demographic profile, leadership orientation style, and use of power of sitting New Jersey male superintendents using Bolman and Deal's Four Frame Model of leadership style and the Three-Dimensional Model of Power (Fowler, 2004). The secondary purpose of the research study is to compare the findings of the New Jersey male superintendent study with a recent 2007 study of New Jersey female superintendents.

Research Design

The research design is a cross-sectional study of 430 full-time New Jersey male superintendents employed during the 2007-2008 and/or 2008-2009 academic years. The research study uses a mixed methodology of quantitative and qualitative research methods.

The quantitative section of the study invited 430 New Jersey male superintendents to complete the Leadership Orientations (Self) Survey developed by Bolman and Deal
(1990) as a means of testing the Four Frame Leadership Model (Bolman & Deal, 2003). The quantitative survey additionally asked questions designed to construct a demographic profile. The data were analyzed using descriptive statistics and factor analysis.

The qualitative section of the study utilizes a semistructured interview format of 11 male New Jersey superintendents, who were solicited using criteria of geographic location, district size, and DFG in order to represent a diverse cross-section of New Jersey public school districts. Superintendents interviewed represented a range of experience from one to over 21 years in New Jersey. The interview data were analyzed using grounded theory (Corbin & Strauss, 2008; Strauss & Corbin, 1997, 1998).

Sample Population

This cross-sectional research study initially identified 436 New Jersey male superintendents employed on a full-time basis during the 2007-2008 academic year. The superintendent identities were obtained from the NJDOE Web site. Acting or interim superintendents were not included in the research study. Subsequent to approval by the Seton Hall University Institutional Review Board, a letter
identifying the study along with a copy of the Leadership Orientation (Self) Survey, the demographic questions, and a stamped, self-addressed return envelope were mailed to the identified superintendents. Return of the anonymous survey was stated to signify consent to participate. Of the 436 surveys mailed, one was returned by the U.S. Postal Service shredded and undeliverable, and five were rejected because they were either incomplete or returned by previously unidentified interim superintendents. Thus, the sample was reduced to 430, of which 154 surveys were returned. This represents a response rate of 35.8% (n = 154).

Eleven active New Jersey male superintendents were also solicited to participate in a one-hour, semistructured interview conducted by the researcher. A letter identifying the study and an informed consent form were mailed to a purposeful sampling of superintendents. The sample was determined using criteria to establish as closely as possible divergent representation of male superintendents in New Jersey. For example, the participants were solicited on the basis of geographic location and district factor grouping in order to include representation from northern, central, and southern sections of New Jersey. Geographic location was defined as Group A (Atlantic, Burlington,
Camden, Cape May, Cumberland, Gloucester, Ocean, and Salem counties), Group B (Hunterdon, Mercer, Middlesex, Monmouth, and Somerset counties), and Group C (Bergen, Essex, Hudson, Morris, Passaic, Sussex, Union, and Warren counties).

Instrumentation

The survey instrument used in the quantitative portion of the research study is the Leadership Orientation (Self) Survey developed by Bolman and Deal (1990). The survey was developed to measure leadership orientations style based on a Four Frame Model: (a) structural (factory) frame, (b) human resource (family) frame, (c) political (jungle) frame, and (d) symbolic (theater) frame (Bolman & Deal, 2003). Permission to use the survey instrument was granted by e-mail dated March 4, 2008 by Dr. Lee G. Bolman. As a condition of use, the researcher agreed to provide Dr. Bolman with a copy of the study results as well as a copy of any publications that may result.

The survey instrument consists of three sections. Section I is entitled "behaviors." Participants are asked to answer 32 Likert scaled items according to how often the behavior was true of the individual. The items are scaled as follows: (1) never, (2) occasionally, (3) sometimes, (4) often, and (5) always. For example,
I. Behaviors. You are asked to indicate how often each of the items below is true of you. Please use the following scale in answering each item: 1) Never, 2) Occasionally, 3) Sometimes, 4) Often, 5) Always. So, you would answer “1” for an item that is never true of you, “2” for one that is occasionally true, “3” for one that is 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 all the time from the things that you do seldom.

1. Think clearly and logically.
2. Show high levels of support and concern for others . . . (Bolman & Deal, 1990)

Section II is entitled “leadership styles” and asks the participant to describe a series of six traits. Each item contains four responses to be rated by the participant using a Likert scaled response. Responses are scored by assigning a “4” to the phrase that best describes you, a “3” to the next best item, and so on, down to “1” for the item least like you. For example,

II. Leadership Style. This section asks you to describe your leadership style. For each item, give the number “4” to the phrase that best describes you, “3” to the item that is next best, and on down to “1” for the item that is least like you.

1. My strongest skills are a. analytic skills, b. interpersonal skills, c. political skills, d. ability to excite and motivate
2. The best way to describe me is a. technical expert, b. good listener, c. skilled negotiator, d. inspirational leader. (Bolman & Deal, 1990)
Section III is an overall rating in which the participant is asked to self-assess overall effectiveness first as a manager and second, as a leader. The rating is represented on a scale from 1 to 5. A response of "1" or "2" represents lower quintiles designated, for example, as the bottom 20%; a response of "3" represents the middle 20%; and a response of "5" represents the top 20%. For example,

III. Overall rating. 
Compared to other individuals that you have known with comparable levels of experience and responsibility, how would you rate yourself on  
1. Overall effectiveness as a manager  
   1 2 3 4 5  
2. Overall effectiveness as a leader  
   1 2 3 4 5 (Bolman & Deal, 1990)

The survey instrument also includes Section IV, which asks 18 demographic questions of each participant. This section was developed by Edmunds (2007) and her dissertation committee. Written permission to draw from the 2007 study was obtained from Dr. Maribeth Edmunds on March 10, 2008, in a written reply to the researcher's letter of February 25, 2008. The researcher's mentor and dissertation committee reviewed the demographic questions for face validity. When appropriate, questions were amended for
gender specificity. For example, sample questions in the demographic inquiry included

1. How many years have you been in your current job?
2. How many total years of experience do you have as a manager?

The survey instrument is appended as Appendix A.

The semistructured interview questions of the Edmunds (2007) study were also used for the research study. The questions were slightly revised for gender specific questions and added questions that addressed the Three-Dimensional Model of Power. Questions addressing interscholastic coaching experience, communication style, and the influence of family were added. The researcher and the dissertation committee reviewed the semistructured interview questions for face validity. Questions include

1. How many total years have you been a superintendent of schools in New Jersey, either in this district or another?
2. Is this your first position as superintendent?
3. If this is not your first superintendent, in how many other school districts were you a superintendent?
4. Have you had a contract as superintendent renewed?

5. Did you work in the district in which you become employed as superintendent? (Edmunds, 2007)

The semistructured interview question format is appended as Appendix B. Edmunds and her dissertation committee developed the questions for the semistructured interview of the participants in the context of the Four Frame Model of Bolman and Deal (2003). The researcher and her dissertation committee also reviewed the revised format for face validity.

The questions of the semistructured interview format are related to the Four Frame model and are preceded by a description of the Four Frame model in order to assist the participants in understanding the purpose of the research. Sample questions include

1. What kind of administrative structures do you believe most influence your work? For example, an administrative structure in schools might be the line and staff chart.

2. Describe your views on human resources in your particular district?

3. What is your definition of power?
4. What are the most important symbols in your school system? (Edmunds, 2007).

Validity and Reliability

Bolman and Deal tested the Leadership Orientation (Self) Survey for validity and reliability (1990). A variety of methods were used to include split-half correlation, Spearman-Brown coefficient, Guttman (Rulon) coefficient, and coefficient alpha. Bolman advised of low reliability of the instrument, however, and recommended use of the second survey instrument developed entitled "Report for Others." Validity and reliability as reported are appended as Appendix C. Because the companion survey was designed for a co-worker or supervisor of the self-survey participant, the second survey was not used in order to maintain the confidentiality and anonymity of the participants. The study replicates as closely as possible Edmunds's study of female superintendents.

The demographic questions of the survey and the semistructured interview questions were reviewed for face validity by the researcher and the dissertation committee.

Data Collection

The quantitative survey was comprised of the Bolman and Deal survey instrument and demographic questions
developed by the Edmunds 2007 study as modified by the researcher and the researcher's dissertation committee. Subsequent to approval by the Seton Hall University Institutional Review Board, the survey instruments were mailed with self-addressed, return envelopes in mid-June 2008 to the 436 full-time superintendents identified from the NJDOE Web site. Return of the anonymous survey in the return envelope signified informed consent. One survey was returned shredded by the U.S. Postal Service.

By mid-July, 159 surveys were returned to the researcher anonymously and confidentially. Of the 159 surveys returned, four surveys reflected completion by previously unidentified interim superintendents and were rejected. One survey was returned only partially completed and was rejected. The resulting survey sample was 154 surveys of 430 surveys, a number adjusted for the return of the shredded survey by the U.S. Postal Service and the rejection of the five surveys identified above \( n = 154 \) for a return rate of 35.8%. The frequency counts and demographic data were calculated and analyzed using descriptive statistical methods and factor analysis using the SPSS 16.0 software package.
The qualitative data were collected using a semistructured interview format. Subsequent to approval by the Seton Hall University Institutional Review Board, each interview participant was mailed a letter of solicitation and an informed consent form, which requested participation in the research study. Upon acceptance of the solicitation to participate, the interviews were scheduled by appointment by the researcher for approximately one hour at the office of the superintendent interviewed whenever possible. Overall, nine participants were interviewed personally by the researcher at the location of the participant’s choosing and two interviews were conducted by phone by mutual consent of the participant and the researcher. All interviews were recorded on a Sony Digital Recorder with written permission of the participant and subsequently were transcribed by the researcher. Interviews ranged from a length of 33 minutes to approximately two hours. The qualitative interviews were analyzed using grounded theory.

Data Analysis

The quantitative data collected from the survey data are analyzed using descriptive statistics and factor analysis in order to draw conclusions regarding the
demographic profile, leadership style, and use of power of
the New Jersey male superintendent. The descriptive
analysis determines, for example, frequency counts and mean
percentages of the variables. The descriptive analyses
included compilation of demographic, personal, and work-
related characteristics of the New Jersey male participants
to include, for example, geographic location, district
size, age, years teaching experience, and years of
administrative experience.

The responses of the 32 leadership behavior questions
and the 24 leadership style questions were tallied and
entered into the SPSS 16.0 software package. Each question
was analyzed using descriptive statistics to determine the
mean percentage of each question response. The Behaviors
questions in Section I that align to the structural, or
factory frame, include questions 1, 5, 9, 13, 17, 21, 25,
and 29. The behaviors questions that align to the human
resource, or family, frame include questions 2, 6, 10, 14,
18, 22, 26, and 30. The behaviors questions that align to
the political, or jungle, frame include questions 3, 7, 11,
15, 19, 23, 27, and 31. The behaviors questions that align
to the symbolic, or theater, frame include questions 4, 8,
12, 16, 20, 24, 28, and 32. The survey instrument is attached as Appendix A.

The leadership style questions in Section II were also tallied. Questions that align to the structural, or factory, frame include questions 1a, 2a, 3a, 4a, 5a, and 6a. The leadership style questions that align to the human resource, or family, frame questions include questions 1b, 2b, 3b, 4b, 5b, and 6b. The leadership style questions that align to the political, or jungle, frame include questions 1c, 2c, 3c, 4c, 5c, and 6c. The leadership style questions that align to the symbolic, or theater, frame include questions 1d, 2d, 3d, 4d, 5d, and 6d.

The responses in Sections I and II were calculated, summarized by frame, and entered into the SPSS 16.0 software package for descriptive statistical analysis and factor analysis. Factor analysis of the responses of the Leadership Orientations Style (Self) Survey was performed using the Varimax Rotation Method and SPSS 16.0 software for the purposes of examining responses in the context of the Four Frame Model (Bolman & Deal, 2003).

The qualitative data of the semistructured interviews were audio-recorded, transcribed, and analyzed using grounded theory. Using grounded theory (Strauss & Corbin,
1998; Corbin & Strauss, 2008), the data were coded and analyzed using the "constant comparative method" (Patton, 2002) to give meaning and "voice" to the responses in order to draw conclusions regarding leadership orientation style and use of power. This involved line-by-line analysis to develop categories for the purpose of analysis using the Four Frame Model (Bolman & Deal, 2003).

Summary

The analyses of the quantitative and qualitative data of New Jersey male superintendents were conducted in the context of the four frames (Bolman & Deal, 2003) and the Three-Dimensional Model of Power (Fowler, 2004) in order to collect data and build theory regarding the leadership orientation style and use of power of the New Jersey male superintendent. The findings are compared with the findings of Edmunds's study of female superintendents in New Jersey and where possible, the most recent national data. The research study draws conclusions as related to policy, practice, and further research.
CHAPTER IV

Interpretation of the Demographic Data

The purpose of the research study is to examine the demographic makeup, leadership orientation style, and construct and use of power by New Jersey public school male superintendents. The secondary purpose of the study is to compare the findings to Edmunds’s 2007 study of New Jersey female superintendents. In this chapter, the demographic characteristics of the 154 superintendents in the New Jersey male superintendent study are examined and compared to the broader findings of the recent study of New Jersey female superintendents. Where possible, findings are compared to the most recent national AASA study (Glass & Franceschini, 2007). A demographic profile of the 11 participants in the qualitative interviews is also constructed at the end of chapter 4.

This chapter presents a demographic portrait of the research study participants. The demographic profile created is presented into the following sections: (a) the contextual setting of the participants, (b) the DFG grouping of the participants, (c) the personal
characteristics of the participants, and (d) the work related characteristics of the participants. The findings of the research study are compared and contrasted with the findings of Edmunds's 2007 study of female superintendents and to the 2006 AASA National Study, where possible (Glass & Franceschini, 2007). Table 1 reports information on the district context of the research participants.

**School District Context**

Table 1 reports nonsocioeconomic variables of the district contextual setting in which the research study participants were employed ($n = 154$). The findings report the following:

1. Approximately 16% of the male superintendents were employed in urban districts, 66% in suburban districts, and 17.6% in rural districts.

2. In terms of county groupings, 37% worked in southern districts (Atlantic, Burlington, Camden, Cape May, Cumberland, Gloucester, Ocean, and Salem counties), 20.1% in central districts (Hunterdon, Mercer, Middlesex, Monmouth, and Somerset counties), and 42.9% in northern districts (Bergen, Essex, Hudson, Morris, Passaic, Sussex, Union, and Warren counties).
Table 1

School District Context of the New Jersey Male Superintendent in the Research Study (n = 154)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context</th>
<th>New Jersey</th>
<th>Male  (n = 154)</th>
<th>Female (n = 71)</th>
<th>National data (n = 1338)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Urbanicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td></td>
<td>15.7%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td></td>
<td>66.0%</td>
<td>69.0%</td>
<td>28.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td></td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
<td>41.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Special Population</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statewide</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small town</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>County groups</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern</td>
<td></td>
<td>37.0%</td>
<td>33.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td></td>
<td>20.1%</td>
<td>36.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern</td>
<td></td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>28.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size by student population</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 1,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>32.0%</td>
<td>52.1%</td>
<td>31.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000-2,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>22.9%</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>32.6%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,000-5,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>35.3%</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
<td>13.8%**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000-10,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 10,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>School configuration</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-8</td>
<td></td>
<td>39.6%</td>
<td>53.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-12</td>
<td></td>
<td>39.6%</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional</td>
<td></td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*population category 1,000-2,999
**population category 3,000-4,900
7. In contrast, the female superintendent study reported that 53.5% of the female study participants were employed in K-8 districts.

8. This raises a question of whether or not the role of elementary experience and elementary principal experience are possible factors to explain the data.

9. Neither the New Jersey male research study nor the female New Jersey superintendent study specifically used questions that examined elementary teaching or elementary administrative experience, although some respondents did specify their experience level in the open-ended questions in the male study.

Comparison of School District Context

A comparison with Edmunds’s 2007 study suggests the following:

1. Female superintendents are disproportionately overrepresented in smaller districts under 1,000 (52.1%), when compared to male superintendents who are underrepresented (32%).
2. Females are disproportionately overrepresented (53.5%) in the K-8 context, while males are underrepresented (39.6%).

3. Conversely, in the K-12 context, male superintendents are disproportionately over represented (39.6%), when compared to females, who are underrepresented (16.9%).

4. Additionally, females are proportionately more highly represented in central New Jersey (36.6%) than their male peers (20.1%), while males are proportionately more highly represented in northern (42.9%) and southern (37%) districts than are females (28.2% and 33.8%, respectively).

The 2006 AASA National Study reported that 35% of women superintendents were employed in suburban districts, 55.4% in rural districts, and 9% in urban districts (Glass & Franceschini, 2007). A similar breakdown of male superintendent employment was not reported. In general, a review of urbanicity is difficult in a national comparison because of the difficulties posed by regional differences. Additionally, the absence of a uniform definition of the terms urban, suburban, rural, and small town, both
nationally and at the state level, contribute to this difficulty.

Clearly, however, male (66%) and female (69%) superintendents in New Jersey were evenly represented in suburban districts (see Table 1). On the other hand, New Jersey male superintendents were disproportionately represented in urban districts (15.7%) when compared to New Jersey female superintendents (8.5%), and New Jersey female superintendents were proportionately overrepresented in rural districts (22.5%) when compared to their New Jersey male counterparts (17.6%). Overall, the New Jersey superintendent demographic profile does not entirely conform to national demographics in terms of urbanicity. This can be attributed to the fact that survey participants of the 2006 AASA study reported in greater numbers from the Midwest (41.7%), states not necessarily comparable to New Jersey, which is primarily a suburban state, and the fact that standard definitions are not in place.

A comparison of county groupings is not applicable on a national scale. The 2006 AASA study broke down survey respondents by regional percentages to include

1. 21.2% from Northeastern states
2. 41.7% from Midwestern states
In order to draw a comparison between the New Jersey data and the national data, which used slightly different district size groupings, the data of the research study are examined by looking at districts of under 1,000 or between 1,000 to 5,000 students. This examination yields the following:

1. While the percentage of male New Jersey superintendents employed in districts under 1,000 (32%) is comparable to the overall national data (31.7%), the percentage of female New Jersey superintendents is disproportionately overrepresented (52.1%).

2. When examining medium-sized districts of between 1,000 and 5,000 students, the percentage of New Jersey male superintendents employed in medium-sized districts (58.2%) exceeds the national data (46.4%), while the percentage of female New Jersey superintendents employed in medium-sized districts (38%) falls disproportionately below the national data.

3. The findings suggest that New Jersey female superintendents are disproportionately
from the male perspective in the New Jersey study. Glass and Franceschini (2007) posited that while most superintendents begin their careers in smaller districts, preparation programs and textbooks overwhelmingly prepare superintendents for larger districts. In this respect, the suggestion lingers that leadership programs in some respects may be misdirecting their efforts, especially in the preparation of female school leaders.

Table 1 reports that

1. A disproportionate percentage (16%) of New Jersey male superintendents work in urban settings when compared to females (8.5%).

2. The percentage of New Jersey male superintendents who reported their districts as suburban (66%) is consistent with the number of female superintendents (69%).

3. Proportionately more females reported their districts as rural (22.5%) when compared to males (17.6%).

4. The data suggest employment of male and female superintendents falls predominantly in suburban districts, a finding consistent with the suburban nature of New Jersey.
5. However, the data suggest that male superintendents are disproportionately employed in urban settings (15.7%) when compared to females (8.5%).

When viewed through the lens of Glass and Franceschini (2007), who stated that preparation programs do not prepare school leaders for larger districts, thus suggesting the importance of superintendent experience, a larger percentage of participation of males in an urban setting is not surprising. However, the observation that a disproportionate representation of females exists today in smaller districts in New Jersey suggests that by virtue of a projected increase of years of experience, female leaders may be well positioned to assume a more significant leadership role in larger districts in the future. On the other hand, the predominance of women in smaller districts may suggest bias in employment in larger districts. However, the data generally support Edmunds’s conclusion that the ranks of female superintendent leadership are rising dramatically in New Jersey (2007).

While the 2006 AASA study reported that nationally, female superintendents comprised 9% of urban districts, 35% of suburban districts, and 55.4% of rural districts, no
comparable statistics were reported relative to their male counterparts. Still, the data suggest a disproportionate representation of New Jersey males in urban settings and New Jersey females in rural settings.

In regard to county groupings,

1. 37% of the male participants were employed in southern counties, as compared to 33.8% of females.

2. Female superintendents are disproportionately overrepresented in central counties (36.6%) when compared to males (20.6%).

3. Male superintendents are disproportionately overrepresented in the northern counties (42.9%) when compared to their female peers (28.2%).

4. The findings suggest that male superintendents are disproportionately overemployed in northern counties (42.9%), largely more urban in nature, than are females (28.2%), while females are disproportionately overrepresented in central counties (36.6%), perhaps viewed as less urban in nature, when compared to males (20.6%).
5. The findings support Edmunds’s conclusion that females are more highly represented in wealthy, suburban districts (2007).

Overall, the findings suggest that differences in district work context exist between New Jersey male and female superintendents. New Jersey male superintendents are more likely to be employed in suburban districts in southern or northern counties in small or midsized districts in both K-8 and K-12 settings. In contrast, Edmunds’s study suggests that New Jersey female superintendents are employed largely in suburban districts under 1,000 in a K-8 setting in the central counties and are disproportionately underrepresented in northern counties (2007). This raises implications for preparation programs of school leaders (Glass & Franceschini, 2007). The data suggest that the New Jersey superintendent profile does not entirely conform to the national profile in terms of district context.

District Factor Grouping and Socioeconomic Context

District factor grouping (DFG) is defined by the New Jersey State Department of Education as “an appropriate measure of a community’s relative socioeconomic status (SES)” (NJDOE, 2007). DFG is recalculated every ten years
using six variables that include (a) percentage of adults with no high school diploma, (b) percentage of adults with some college education, (c) occupational status, (d) unemployment rate, (e) percentage of individuals in poverty, and (f) median family income.

Although DFG was initiated in 1975 primarily for the purpose of comparing student assessment on a statewide basis, DFG groupings have been used for other purposes, including aiding in the classification of public school districts seeking parity in school funding as a result of ongoing state litigation (Abbott v. Burke, 1985 to present). Abbott v. Burke challenged New Jersey school funding statutes to provide more adequate funding to poor, urban districts. Although numerous community characteristics play a part in Abbott classification, DFG classification within one of the two lower DFG categories ("A" or "B") is a requirement for Abbott status.

DFG classification ranges from "A" (lowest SES grouping) through "J" (highest SES grouping). The NJDOE website reported the following breakdown of district DFG classifications by number of districts in the state of New Jersey: (a) "A" districts, 39; (b) "B" districts, 67; (c) "CD" districts, 67; (d) "DE" districts, 83; (e) "FG"
districts, 89; (f) "GH" districts, 76; (g) "I" districts, 103; and (h) "J" districts, 25 (2007). The NJDOE reported that, without exception, student achievement increases as DFG ascends from "A" to "J."

The DFG grouping of the participants in the research study of male superintendents in New Jersey is reported in Table 2. Overall, the data report that

1. 5.2% of the research participants reported employment in "A" districts.
2. 12.3% reported employment in "B" districts.
3. 16.2% reported employment in "CD" districts.
4. 14.9% reported employment in "DE" districts.
5. 9.7% reported employment in "FG" districts.
6. 11.7% reported employment in "GH" districts.
7. 16.9% reported employment in "I" districts.
8. 3.2% reported employment in "J" districts.
9. 2.5% reported employment in other districts, and 7.1% were missing or unreported.

Viewed another way, 48.6% of male participants reported the four lower DFG groupings ("A" through "DE"), and 41.5% reported the four higher DFG groupings ("FG" through "J"). Of the remaining participants, 2.5% reported other (e.g., regional or vocational), and 7.1% declined to
Table 2

District Factor Grouping of the New Jersey Male Superintendent Study (n = 154)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DFG</th>
<th>Males (n = 154)</th>
<th>Districts (n = 549)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FG</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GH</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/missing</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

report, were uncertain, or overlooked the question.

Although the highest percentage of male participants reported "I" status (16.9%), the overall district grouping of the New Jersey male superintendents was slightly higher in the four lower DFG groupings (48.6%) when compared to females (46.6%) and proportionately lower (41.5%) in the four higher DFG groupings when compared to females (53.3%). Eleven (7.1%) of male survey participants declined to answer, were uncertain, or overlooked the question. Others
were employed in regional districts that did not report DFG. The data support Edmunds’s suggestion that hiring practices in wealthier districts may be more open to female leadership and suggest a need to study hiring practices of poorer, urban districts to determine factors, if any, that hinder the hiring of women leaders.

Comparison of DFG Socioeconomic Context

The Edmunds study reported that a majority of female superintendent participants are employed in wealthier districts (2007). Edmunds raised the question of whether or not professional people who tend to live in wealthier areas are more comfortable with female leadership than those in communities of less affluence. Arguably, Edmunds’s hypothesis is supported by the New Jersey male superintendent study, which does not suggest higher distribution of males in the upper socioeconomic groupings, but instead concludes that a slightly higher percentage of male superintendants are employed in lower socioeconomic settings. A familiar theme was found within the literature that suggests that board of education hiring practices, use of male consultants, and the gender makeup of boards of education may play a role in school leadership choice.
(Brunner & Grogan, 2007). This issue is ripe for further study in New Jersey.

Personal Characteristics

Table 3 reports the data regarding personal characteristics collected in the study to include education, age, and identification of a professional role model. For purposes of the study, male participants were asked to identify if they had benefited from a general role model, not identified as gender specific, in their work experience.

About 79.9% of the study respondents indicated the influence of a role model in their administrative career. This demographic question, however, did not specifically address the gender of the identified role model in the male study.

In terms of education level

1. 47.4% of male participants held a doctoral degree. Of those holding a doctoral degree, 15 superintendents (9.7%) reported the doctorate as a PhD and 42 superintendents (27.3%) reported the doctorate as an EdD. The remaining 16 superintendents (10.4%) did not specify.
Table 3

Personal Characteristics of the New Jersey Male Superintendent Study (n = 154)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>New Jersey</th>
<th>National data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male (n = 154)</td>
<td>Female (n = 71)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had role model?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>79.9%</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
<td>80.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s degree</td>
<td>52.6%</td>
<td>54.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>47.4%</td>
<td>45.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 50</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>53.2%</td>
<td>66.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 plus</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 50</td>
<td>77.9%</td>
<td>81.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Of those holding a master’s degree (52.6%), 13 superintendents (8.4%) reported two or more master’s-level degrees. The remaining 28 respondents (44.2%) did not specify number of degrees.

The age range of the participants indicates that

1. A majority of participants reported their age to be over 50 (77.9%).
2. 82 participants (53.2%) reported their age to be 50-59.
3. 38 participants (24.7%) reported their age to be 60 years or older.
4. 2 participants (1.3%) did not answer the question.

In summary, a profile of the New Jersey male superintendent reports him as over the age of 50 (77.9%), in possession of a master’s degree (52.6%), likely to hold a doctoral degree (47.4%), and having a former role model in his career (79.9%).

Comparison of Personal Characteristics

A comparison between male and female superintendents yields the following:
1. 19.7% of female participants reported a female role model in their administrative careers, while 79.9% of male superintendents reported a role model in their careers.

2. The female study specifically asked if participants reported a female role model. The male study participants were asked only if they had a role model and were not asked to be gender specific.

3. With respect to education level, male superintendents reported a proportionately higher percentage of doctoral completion (47.4%) when compared to that of females (45.1%).

4. When examining age, the proportion of New Jersey male superintendents under age 40 (5.2%) was higher than that of females (4.2%).

5. The percentage of male superintendents who reported 40-49 years of age (15.6%) was proportionately higher than that of females (14.1%).

6. The percentage of females who reported age 50-59 years of age (66.2%) was proportionately higher than that of males (53.2%).
7. The percentage of males over age 60 (24.7%) was proportionately higher than that of females (15.5%).

8. Viewed another way, the percentage of male superintendents under age 50 (20.8%) was proportionately higher than that of females (18.3%), while the percentage of females over age 50 (81.7%) was proportionately higher than that of males (77.9%).

9. The data suggest that New Jersey male superintendents enter the superintendency at a younger age than do females.

Table 3 reports that, according to the most recent national study (Glass & Franceschini, 2007), 23.3% of superintendents were under age 50 and 76.7% of superintendents were over age 50. The data of the national study were not reported with a gender breakdown. However, the data are consistent with the findings of both New Jersey studies, which reflected 20.8% of males and 18.3% of females were under age 50, while 77.9% of males and 81.7% of females were over age 50.

The 2006 APAA National Report reported the mean age of superintendents as 54.6 years. This represents the highest
mean average in the history of the national studies. Glass and Franceschini (2007) attributed the increase to a contemporary trend in the traditional administrative career path to include central office experience prior to assuming the position of superintendent. The growth of the central office position also can be attributed to a national increase in the number of larger districts and district consolidation.

The AASA study reported that nationally, 50% of superintendents in the study held a doctoral-level degree. This finding is consistent with the findings of the New Jersey superintendent studies, which approached the 50% mark for males (47.4%) and females (45.1%). The percentage of New Jersey female superintendents holding a doctoral degree trailed that of New Jersey males by 2.3% and nationally by approximately 5%.

The present study estimates from data recovered from the NJDOE Web site 2007-08 directory that New Jersey male superintendents accounted for approximately 73% of all superintendent positions during the 2007-08 academic year (2007). This figure, however, is problematic given the high percentage (9%) of interim superintendent positions (as calculated by the NJDOE) and the volatility and fluctuation
of the interim superintendent position, making precision difficult. Edmunds (2007) reported that female superintendents in New Jersey comprised 22% of superintendent positions in New Jersey in 2006-07, based upon an examination of the NJDOE Web site for the academic year. The finding is supported by the current study.

The national study suggested that female superintendents held 21.7% of superintendent positions in 2006 and predicted that 25-30% of superintendent positions would be filled by women in 2010. The findings of the New Jersey studies supported the prediction of the national data. Despite some differences, the New Jersey male superintendent study and the New Jersey female superintendent study closely mirror the national data in terms of age, gender, and education.

Work Characteristics

The present study examines work-related characteristics of male superintendents to include years of classroom experience, years of prior administrative experience, number of superintendent positions held, number of contract renewals, title held prior to assuming the position of superintendent, and other miscellaneous characteristics, such as first position as superintendent
and prior employment in district hired. Table 4 reports the work-related characteristics of the male superintendents in the research study.

An examination of the data reveals that

1. 91 (61.7%) of the male superintendents were employed in their first superintendency. Of those remaining, 34 superintendents (22.1%) served in one prior position, 20 (13%) in two prior positions, and 8 in more than two positions (5.1%).

2. Thus, 41.2% of male superintendents reported experience in more than the first superintendent positions. One respondent failed to answer the question. Overwhelmingly, 83.8% of the respondents were in either their first or second superintendent position.

Although 85.7% of the respondents indicated that they had a contract renewed, it is clear to the researcher that many superintendents were in their first multiyear contract and answered "yes" to this question if they had returned to their position after the first year. Accordingly, this response proves difficult in analysis, and the researcher
Table 4

Work Characteristics of the New Jersey Male Superintendent in the Research Study (n = 154)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work characteristic</th>
<th>New Jersey data</th>
<th>National data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male (n = 154)</td>
<td>Female (n = 71)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First superintendent position?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>61.7%</td>
<td>69.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>37.7%</td>
<td>31.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract renewed?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>85.7%</td>
<td>77.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenured</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title of prior position</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent or CSA</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant/associate/deputy superintendent</td>
<td>29.2%</td>
<td>35.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business administrator</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal (total)</td>
<td>46.7%</td>
<td>38.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal (generic)</td>
<td>34.4%</td>
<td>38.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS principal</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS principal</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-8 principal</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice principal</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum coordinator</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative assistant</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy commissioner</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work characteristic</td>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>National data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male (n = 154)</td>
<td>Female (n = 71)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean years experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom</td>
<td>9.80</td>
<td>10.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative</td>
<td>12.85</td>
<td>11.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current position</td>
<td>6.16</td>
<td>4.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior employment in district?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>39.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>60.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of other positions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>59.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>22.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total years as manager</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
draws no conclusions regarding this variable. One survey respondent reported tenure.

The career path of the male superintendent is varied:

1. 16 superintendents (10.4%) reported prior superintendent experience, and 45 superintendents (29.2%) reported assistant superintendent experience.

2. The position of principal is a significant point of entry into the superintendency. Although the research question was open-ended and asked only about prior positions, 10 superintendents (6.5%) reported their prior position was high school principal; 2 (1.3%), middle school principal; 1 (.6%), elementary principal; 53 (34.4%), principal; and 7 (4.5%), assistant or vice principal. Collectively, the principal position served as an entry point for 46.7% of the survey participants.

3. The remaining participants replied with varied career experiences, including director (5.2%), business administrator (3.9%), supervisor (1.4%), curriculum coordinator (.6%), administrative assistant (.6%), and deputy commissioner (.6%).
The mean years of classroom experience for male superintendents was 9.8007 years and ranged from 0 to 37 years of experience. Five superintendents (3.2%) reported 0 years of classroom experience, and one respondent reported 37 years of classroom experience. The median years of experience was 8.0 years. The mean years of administrative experience in the male study was 12.8539 years and ranged from 0 to 36 years of experience. One superintendent (.6%) reported 0 years of administrative experience, and one superintendent (.6%) reported 36 years of administrative experience. The median years of experience was 12.0 years. The mean years of experience in the current position was 6.16 years and ranged from 0.2 to 30 years. Median years of experience in the current position was 5.0 years. The survey participants reported a mean of 20.92 years as manager; responses ranged from 1 to 43 years experience. The median years of experience as manager was 22.0 years. Of the respondents, 61 superintendents (39.6%) reported employment in their districts prior to becoming superintendent; 93 superintendents (60.4%) reported employment outside the district prior to becoming superintendent.
Comparison of Work Characteristics

Table 4 reports that the percentage of male superintendents in their first position as superintendent (61.7%) is proportionately less than that of female superintendents (69%). This finding is consistent with data suggesting that males are more likely to hold multiple superintendent positions than are females. The finding, however, is also consistent with national trends suggesting the movement of more women into the superintendency (Brunner & Grogan, 2007; Glass & Franceschini, 2007).

The percentage of male superintendents with a contract renewal (85.7%) is higher than that of the female study (77%). Because the researcher has determined that many participants considered returning each year within a multiyear contract as a renewal, the researcher declines to draw conclusions in this area because of the inconsistent interpretation of the question by study participants.

Table 4 reports that the data suggest the dominant point of entry to the position of superintendent for males is the position of principal (46.7%). Central office experience (39.6%) as either assistant superintendent (29.2%) or superintendent (10.4%) follows. Although the male superintendent study indicated a higher percentage of
males entering the position from principal (46.7%) than did the female study (38%), females reflected a higher percentage of women entering the superintendency from a position as assistant superintendent (35.2%) than did males (29.2%). The female study, however, reported no participants who indicated prior superintendent experience when compared to 10.4% of male respondents. Male study participants also exhibited a wider range of diverse administrative experience than did the females, including business administrator, director, supervisor, curriculum coordinator, administrative assistant, and deputy commissioner.

The national data (Glass & Franceschini, 2007) reported in Table 4 suggest the position of assistant superintendent as a dominant entry point for females. The data support an emphasis on the importance of the central office position of curriculum and instruction, experience viewed as a historical advantage for women administrators and of particular importance in the post-NCLB era. The national study reported 50.5% of female participants reported assistant superintendent experience and 14% reported director experience. Conversely, the national study reflected that 33.4% of male participants reported
assistant superintendent experience and 4.8% reported
director experience (Glass & Franceschini, 2007). Although
the recent AASA study reported that 46.7% of all
superintendents assumed the superintendency from the
principalship, the study reported that an examination by
gender reported a proportionately higher percentage of male
participants (52.5%) enter from a position of principal
than that of females (23.5%). The national data reflect
that males report a higher percentage of responses of
"other" (11.9%) than do females (9.3%), suggesting more
diversity of prior employment for males.

Overall, the New Jersey data are consistent with the
national data, but report less disparity between the
percentage of men and women in the primary positions of
central office and principal than did the national study.
The data support a conclusion of the importance of prior
work experience when securing the first superintendent
position. The data support the national trend emphasizing
the importance of central office or curriculum and
instruction experience. The data also support the
importance of the role of principal as a career pathway to
the position of superintendent, one in which females are
proportionately underrepresented.
When comparing mean years of classroom experience of male and female New Jersey superintendents, male superintendents reported fewer years in the classroom (9.8 years) than did women (10.56 years). This finding is consistent with the literature (Shakeshaft, 1999, as cited by Brunner & Grogan, 2007) and prior AASA studies, including the 2000 AASA study (Brunner & Grogan, 2007; Glass et. al, 2000). However, the mean years of classroom experience reflected less disparity between males and females than did the national average. The 2000 AASA study reported that 40% of male respondents in the study reported less than five years in the classroom as compared to 41% of female respondents, who reported more than 11 years in the classroom (Brunner & Grogan, 2007).

The mean years of administrative experience for males was 12.85 years, as compared to 11.98 years for females. This finding is consistent with findings of Brunner and Grogan (2007), who estimated that, on average, female superintendents passed between 10 and 12 years at the building administration level prior to assuming district-level responsibilities. While the national data suggest a shorter career path to the superintendency for men than for women, the New Jersey studies report less disparity between
New Jersey male and female superintendents than the national data. This conclusion is consistent with Brunner and Grogan (2007), who stated that women superintendents showed a higher presence in mideastern states and the Great Lakes region. While the female superintendent study did not report the percentage of female superintendents hired from outside their respective districts, the male superintendent study reports that 60.4% of the male superintendents in the New Jersey sample were hired from outside, a fact consistent with national data that suggests male superintendents are more likely to be hired than women from outside the district (Brunner & Grogan, 2007).

The mean years in the current position for males was 6.16 years and ranged from 0.2 years to 30 years. The mean years in current position for females was 4.7254 years and ranged from 1 to 19 years. Although the data show some disparity, the data are consistent with the increasing participation of women in the superintendency in New Jersey. The AASA study (Glass & Franceschini, 2007) reported that nationally, the mean tenure of a sitting superintendent was 5.5 years. New Jersey males fell above the national average, and New Jersey females fell below the national average.
The majority of the New Jersey male participants were employed in their first position as superintendent (61.7%), were hired from outside the district (60.4%), and assumed the superintendent position primarily from a prior position as either principal (46.7%) or a major central office position of superintendent or assistant superintendent (39.6%). The mean years of teaching experience was 9.8 years, and the mean years of administrative experience was 12.85 years. Generally, the male superintendent had been employed in his current position for 6.16 years, above the national average.

In the female New Jersey superintendent study, 69.0% of females reported their current position was their first as superintendent and entered the position from either a position of assistant superintendent (35.2%), principal (38%), or director (12.7%; Edmunds, 2007). The mean years of teaching experience of the female superintendent was 10.56 years, and the mean years of administrative experience was 11.98 years. The mean tenure of the female superintendent in her current position was 4.73 years, below the national average.

Overall, the data support the literature that suggests men spend fewer years in the classroom prior to becoming
administrators and have a shorter career path in terms of time to the position of superintendent (Dana & Bourisaw, 2006). The New Jersey studies, however, report less disparity between males and females in mean years of both teaching experience and prior administrative experience than the national data. The data of the research study supports the literature suggesting that the principal position is a dominant entry point for the superintendency. New Jersey male superintendents reported a higher percentage of participant entry from the position of principal (46.7%) than female New Jersey superintendents (38%). However, in another important category, although the percentage of male superintendents who entered the position of superintendent from either superintendent or assistant superintendent employment was higher (39.6%) than that of women (35.2%), a higher percentage of females (35.2%) reported the assistant superintendent position as entry point than males (29.2%). This is important to note in the context of support in the literature (e.g., Brunner & Grogan, 2007; Glass & Franceschini, 2007) that the superintendency has placed a greater premium on central office and instructional leadership in recent years. Although the data reflect that male superintendents show
greater variety in their career pathway, the data also suggest that the profiles of the male and female superintendent in New Jersey tend to grow more similar and as such, are consistent with national trends.

Summary of Demographic Profile

The New Jersey male superintendent is primarily employed in a suburban (66%) K-8 (39.6%) or K-12 (39.6%) setting in southern (37%) or northern (42.9%) New Jersey in a district with a student population under 2,000 (54.9%). The New Jersey male superintendent is employed across varied DFG district groupings, but is more likely to be employed in a lower DFG district (48.6%) than in a higher DFG district (41.5%). The New Jersey male superintendent reports a role model in his administrative career (79.9%), possesses a master’s degree (52.6%), and approaches the national average (50%) for attainment of a doctoral degree (47.4%). The New Jersey male superintendent is most likely between 50 and 59 years of age (53.2%) or over age 60 (24.7%). The New Jersey male superintendent is likely to occupy his first position as superintendent (61.7%), reports a contract renewal (85.7%), and assumes the position primarily from either a prior central office position of superintendent or assistant superintendent
(39.6%) or principal (46.7%). His mean years of teaching experience is 9.8 years; his mean years of administrative experience is 12.85 years. His mean tenure in his current position is 6.16 years. Overall, the male New Jersey superintendent is represented throughout the state in most areas of district context and personal and work characteristics. However, male superintendents overwhelmingly report employment in suburban New Jersey (66%). The findings of the research study are generally consistent with recent national studies, except for rural employment, given the suburban nature of New Jersey. The findings construe less disparity in years of teaching and administrative experience than is reported in the literature (Dana & Bourisaw, 2006; Grogan & Brunner, 2005; Hummel, 1998).

In comparison, the New Jersey female superintendent is reflected as primarily employed in a suburban (69%) K-8 (53.5%) district with a student population under 1,000 (52.1%) in central New Jersey (36.6%; Edmunds, 2007). The New Jersey female superintendent is more likely to be employed in a higher DFG grouping (53.3%) than a lower DFG grouping (46.6%). The New Jersey female superintendent is unlikely to report a prior female role model or mentor
during her administrative career (19.7%). The percentage of female New Jersey superintendents in possession of a doctoral degree (45.1%) is proportionately lower than that of males (47.4%). However, both males and females approach the national average of 50%. The New Jersey female superintendent is most likely over age 50 (81.7%), as is the male superintendent (77.9%); however, the percentage of females under age 50 (18.3%) was found to be proportionately lower than that of the males (20.8%). The New Jersey female superintendent is primarily in her first position as superintendent (69%), reports a contract renewal (77%), and assumes the position from a prior central office position as assistant superintendent (35.2%). The female superintendent of the study does not report prior superintendent experience. With prior superintendent experience factored out, females report a higher percentage of assistant superintendent experience (35.2%) than do males (29.2%). Females show less diversity in their entry points into the superintendency and fall proportionately below (38%) both the overall national percentage (46.7%) and New Jersey male percentage (46.7%) of superintendents entering the position from the position of principal. The mean years of teaching experience for
females is 10.56 years; the mean years of administrative experience is 11.98 years. The findings suggest less disparity between male and female superintendents in years teaching and administrative experience than is extrapolated from the literature and national data. Mean tenure in the current position is 4.73 years, falling below the national average (5.5).

Although the findings report some differences, the findings are generally consistent with recent national studies.

Semistructured Interview Sample (n = 11)

Questions developed for the semistructured interview sample (n = 11) are based on the Four Frame Model of Bolman and Deal (2003) and are primarily drawn from Edmunds's 2007 study of New Jersey female superintendents. Permission to use the questions and to draw from Edmunds’s study was provided by Dr. Edmunds and is appended as Appendix B. The questions were, however, slightly modified by the researcher and her dissertation committee for the interviews. For example, the question regarding availability of a role model was not delimited to a female role model. The question asked the interview participants if they had a role model in their educational career.
Additionally, the study participants were asked to describe the influence of family on leadership style, if any, and whether or not they had interscholastic coaching experience. These questions were not asked in Edmunds's 2007 study. Also, questions on use of power were expanded and included a description of the Three-Dimensional Model of Power (Fowler, 2004).

Of the participants studied, 11 male superintendents were interviewed. Eight were interviewed in their office settings. One was interviewed in an off-campus location of his choosing because of mutual convenience for the participant and the researcher. Two were interviewed by phone with mutual consent of the researcher and the participant.

The researcher used purposeful sampling in the solicitation of participating superintendents to include superintendents from a cross-section of counties and district types. Overall, superintendents represented the following counties: Atlantic, Bergen, Burlington, Cape May, Middlesex, Monmouth, Morris, Ocean, Salem, and Sussex.

Final distribution of the interview sample reflects that urban districts were represented by 4 superintendents, suburban districts by 6 superintendents, and rural
districts by 1 superintendent. Further attempts to solicit a greater representation of rural districts were unsuccessful. Additionally, it should be noted that participants self-categorized their districts, absent a state definition of "rural." Southern districts were represented by 5 superintendents, central districts by 2 superintendents, and northern districts by 4 superintendents. Further attempts to solicit a greater representation of central districts were unsuccessful. However, southern and northern districts were proportionately represented and defined by 8 counties each as opposed to 5 counties in the definition of central.

District Context

In terms of district size, 9 of the 11 districts reported populations in the range of 1,000-5,000 students; districts under 1,000 and over 10,000 were equally represented by one district. Additional attempts to solicit representation in the 5,000-10,000 or under 1000 student population range were unsuccessful. In the category of school configuration, four K-8 districts were represented, and seven K-12 districts were represented. Other attempts to solicit representation from regional districts or additional K-8 districts were unsuccessful. In regard to
DFG grouping, 4 superintendents represented the lower four DFG groupings ("A" through "DE"), and 7 superintendents represented the four higher DFG groupings ("FG" through "J"). Attempts to solicit additional district superintendents of lower DFG groupings were denied. Overall, the researcher concludes that participants represented an adequate distribution of diverse districts.

Comparison of District Context

Table 5 reflects that the interview sample \((n = 11)\) of the research study generally aligns with the survey sample \((n = 154)\) in terms of urbanicity. However, urban districts were proportionately overrepresented, and rural districts were slightly underrepresented. The interview sample of the female study \((n = 6)\) was also not totally aligned with the survey sample of the female study, but was generally representative. In terms of the national data, both the male and female New Jersey superintendent studies did not reflect the higher incidence of rural districts of the national data. However, the suburban nature of New Jersey and a lack of definition of the categories could account for this disparity.

In regard to district size, Table 5 reports that the interview sample \((n = 11)\) of the research study reported
Table 5

District Context of New Jersey Male Superintendent Semistructured Interview Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Male Interview (n = 11)</th>
<th>Male Survey (n = 154)</th>
<th>Female Interview (n = 6)</th>
<th>Female Survey (n = 71)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>4 (36%)</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
<td>2 (33%)</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>6 (55%)</td>
<td>66.0%</td>
<td>2 (33%)</td>
<td>69.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>1 (9%)</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td>2 (33%)</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern</td>
<td>5 (45%)</td>
<td>37.0%</td>
<td>2 (33%)</td>
<td>33.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>2 (18%)</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
<td>2 (33%)</td>
<td>36.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern</td>
<td>4 (36%)</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>2 (33%)</td>
<td>28.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 1,000</td>
<td>1 (9%)</td>
<td>32.0%</td>
<td>2 (33%)</td>
<td>52.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000-2,000</td>
<td>4 (36%)</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,000-5,000</td>
<td>5 (45%)</td>
<td>35.3%</td>
<td>3 (50%)</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000-10,000</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 10,000</td>
<td>1 (9%)</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>1 (17%)</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>39.6%</td>
<td>2 (33%)</td>
<td>53.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>39.6%</td>
<td>2 (33%)</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td>2 (33%)</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5 (continued).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interview (n = 11)</td>
<td>Survey (n = 154)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FG</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GH</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some disparity when compared to the survey sample (n = 154). The female superintendent study also displayed some disparities between the interview sample (n = 6) and the survey sample (n = 71). However, the interview sample of the male study mirrored the survey sample in the respect that the majority of participants were from districts of under 5,000 students, as were those of the female study. Comparison to the national data reflects similar distribution under 5,000 students. The higher incidence nationally of districts over 10,000 students could be attributed to the fact that numerous states have county and
regional systems unlike New Jersey, which continues to exercise local control of public school districts.

The distribution of K-8 and K-12 districts in the interview sample (n = 11) of the research study generally aligns with the survey sample (n = 154). However, regional districts were not represented. The interview sample (n = 6) of the female superintendent study was underrepresented in the K-8 context when compared with the survey sample (n = 71). The most recent national data did not report district configuration (Glass & Franceschini, 2007).

Semistructured Interview Sample and Personal Characteristics

The preliminary questions of the interview format compiled a demographic portrait of the personal characteristics of the participants of the semistructured interview. Table 6 reports the overall findings of the personal characteristics of the interview sample participants.

All participants (100%) of the interview sample (n = 11) reported a prior role model in their professional careers. Of those interviewed, 4 (36.4%) reported a doctoral degree, and 7 (63.6%) reported a master’s degree. With respect to age, 3 (27.3%) reported their age to be
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n = 11)</td>
<td>(n = 154)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role model</td>
<td>11(100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education level</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>4(36%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s</td>
<td>7(64%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>3(27%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>6(55%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 60</td>
<td>2(18%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

under 40, 6 (54.6%) reported an age 50-59, and 2 (18.2%) reported an age over 60.

Comparison of Personal Characteristics

Table 6 reflects a comparison of the personal characteristics of the interview sample (n = 6) and the survey sample (n = 154). All 11 participants (100%) of the interview sample (n = 11) reported identification of a role model, as did a high percentage (79.9%) of participants in the survey sample (n = 154). The percentage of participants in the interview sample who possessed a doctoral degree
(36.4%) is proportionately lower than that of the survey sample (47.4%). This can be attributed to the percentage of superintendents in the interview sample who reported their age to be under 40 (27.3%), as compared to survey sample participants under 40 (5.2%). The semistructured interview sample reported no participants age 40-49. However, the interview sample is generally consistent with the survey sample.

In regard to the female superintendent study, the interview sample ($n = 6$) generally aligned to the survey sample ($n = 71$). However, no participants of the female study reported identification of a role model in their professional career and a much higher percentage of women held doctoral degrees (83%) than that of the survey sample (45.1%). The data generally conformed to national data with the exception of a higher percentage of males under age 40 and a higher percentage of females in possession of a doctoral degree.

The researcher declines to draw further conclusions based on the small size of the interview samples of both studies.
Work Characteristics

Table 7 reports the work characteristics of the interview participants of the research study. The work-related characteristics include information regarding the number of superintendent positions held, title prior to assuming the position of superintendent, mean years of experience in the current superintendent position, mean years of classroom experience, and mean years of administrative experience. Additionally, interview participants were asked whether or not their contracts had been renewed, how many additional superintendent positions were included in their work experience, whether or not their first superintendent position was in a district in which they had been employed, and if they had participated in interscholastic coaching experience.

Overall, 82% of the interview participants reported employment in their first superintendent position. The highest percentage for a prior title was for the position of principal (45%), but was closely followed by the assistant superintendent position (36%). The mean years of classroom experience was 8.5454 years, and the mean years of administrative experience was 11.045 years. The data indicate that 55% of the participants were employed in the
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interview (n = 11)</td>
<td>Survey (n = 154)</td>
<td>Interview (n = 6)</td>
<td>Survey (n = 71)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First position</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>9 (82%)</td>
<td>61.7%</td>
<td>3 (50%)</td>
<td>69.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2 (18%)</td>
<td>3 (50%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract renewed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>8 (73%)</td>
<td>85.7%</td>
<td>6 (100%)</td>
<td>77.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>3 (27%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior title</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asst. Superintendent</td>
<td>4 (36%)</td>
<td>29.2%</td>
<td>2 (33%)</td>
<td>35.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td>1 (9%)</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>1 (17%)</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business administrator</td>
<td>0 (100%)</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>1 (17%)</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal (incl. asst. &amp; vice)</td>
<td>5 (45%)</td>
<td>46.7%</td>
<td>2 (33%)</td>
<td>38.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy commissioner</td>
<td>1 (9%)</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of other positions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>9 (82%)</td>
<td>59.1%</td>
<td>3 (50%)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1 (18%)</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1 (18%)</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean years of classroom experience</td>
<td>8.5454</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>10.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean years of administration experience</td>
<td>11.045</td>
<td>12.85</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>11.98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7 (continued).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interview (n = 11)</td>
<td>Survey (n = 154)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed by district prior to appointment?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6(55%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>5(45%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interscholastic coaching experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6(55%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>5(45%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Years NJ superintendent</td>
<td>8.68</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

district prior to assuming the position of superintendent, and 55% had experienced interscholastic coaching experience in their careers. The mean years of New Jersey superintendent experience was reported as 8.68.

Comparison of Work Characteristics

Table 7 reflects that the work experience of the interview participants (n = 11) generally resembles that of the survey participants (n = 154). However, a higher percentage of interview participants (82%) reported serving in their first position as superintendent compared to the survey participants (61.7%). Although the percentage of participants who reported the prior title of principal
(45%) is consistent with the survey participants (46.7%), a higher percentage of participants reported the prior title of assistant superintendent (36.4%) than did survey participants (29.2%). The interview participants reported fewer mean years experience in the classroom (8.54 years) than the survey participants (9.8 years) and also reported fewer mean years of administrative experience (11.045 years) than the survey participants (12.8539).

The interview participants of the female superintendent study reported a higher mean years of teaching experience (9.5 years) than the participants of the male study (8.54 years), consistent with the current literature, but they reported a slightly higher mean years of administrative experience (11.2 years) than males (11.045 years) in contradiction to national trends. These differences can be attributed to the small sample size, the high number of first-time superintendents, and the higher percentage of male superintendents under age 40. The data of the work characteristics of both the male and female superintendent studies support current literature suggesting that the traditional career paths of male and female superintendents differ.
The survey participants of the male study were not asked for information regarding years of interscholastic coaching experience or employment in the district prior to assuming position of superintendent, making comparison to the interview participant profile in the research study impossible. Comparison of contract renewal data is problematic given the difficulty of the survey participants to interpret the question. The female superintendent study did not report information regarding interscholastic coaching experience or employment as superintendent in district of prior experience.

Overall, the interview participant profile generally aligns with that of the survey participants. The data generally support the national data and studies that have suggested the presence of coaching experience in the male superintendent profile (Young, 2007). The data support the trend toward central office or assistant superintendent experience and the impact of principal level experience on attaining the superintendency. The data also support studies that suggest that career paths to the superintendency differ between men and women.
Summary of Interview Demographic Profile

The research study solicited diverse participation in the interview portion of the study among superintendents statewide using criteria of geographic location, DFG grouping, district size, and district configuration. The researcher concludes that the male superintendent study adequately represents the survey participation. It is the conclusion of the researcher that an adequate cross-section of New Jersey superintendents is represented in the interview process to the extent possible.
CHAPTER V

Interpretation of the Survey Data

Introduction

The primary purpose of the research study is to examine the leadership style preference and use of power of the New Jersey male superintendent in the context of the Four Frame Model of Bolman and Deal (2003) and the Three-Dimensional Model of Power (Fowler, 2004). The secondary purpose of the research study is to compare the findings of male superintendents with those of female superintendents reported in a recent study (Edmunds, 2007).

Description of the Survey

The Leadership Orientations (Self) Survey is composed of two primary sections identified as “Behaviors” (Section I) and “Leadership Style” (Section II). The first 32 questions of the behaviors section ask participants to indicate how often a behavior is true of their leadership style based on a Likert scaled response from 1 (never) to 5 (always). Of the 32 items, eight questions are aligned with the structural (factory) frame, eight questions are aligned with the human resource (family) frame, eight questions are
aligned with the political (jungle) frame, and eight questions are aligned with the symbolic (theater) frame. Chapter 3 reports a description of the survey questions. The survey is appended as Appendix C.

Section II of the self-reporting survey is entitled "Leadership Style." This section asks participants to describe their leadership style in a series of six questions with four subparts. In each question, participants are asked to number the responses from 1 (least like you) to 4 (best describes you). Responses to each question are aligned with the Four Frame Model of Bolman and Deal (2003). Overall, six questions are aligned with each of the four frames (structural, human resource, political, and symbolic), for a total of 24 responses. Chapter 3 reports a description of the survey questions in Section II. The survey is appended as Appendix A.

Section III of the survey asks participants to rate themselves with an overall rating as a manager and as a leader. Question 1 asks participants to rate their overall effectiveness as a manager compared to others of comparable experience and responsibility on a scale from 1 (bottom 20%) to 5 (top 20%). Question 2 asks participants to rate themselves as a leader compared to others of comparable
experience and responsibility on a scale from 1 (bottom 20%) to 5 (top 20%). The findings of the overall rating section are not reported in the research study.

Reporting Process

Behaviors: The Structural (Factory) Frame

For purposes of the study, responses are calculated for each of the 32 questions of the behaviors section of the survey. In reporting the percentages in Table 8, responses of 5 (always) and 4 (often) are collapsed and viewed as positive responses. Responses of 3 (sometimes) and 2 (occasionally) are collapsed and viewed as negative responses. Few responses of 1 (never) were reported by participants and are noted where reported. Table 8 reports the findings for the behaviors for the structural (factory) frame and also reports the structural frame findings for the female study. Overall mean percentages for the frame are reported at the end of each column. Table 9 reports a summary of response percentages of all 32 behaviors across all four frames.
Table 8

Behaviors: Percentages for Items in Structural (Factory) Frame (n = 154)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item no.</th>
<th>Key terms</th>
<th>Male Always/often</th>
<th>Male Sometimes/occasionally</th>
<th>Female Always/often</th>
<th>Female Sometimes/occasionally</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Logical thinking</td>
<td>97.4</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>95.8</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Careful planning</td>
<td>77.3</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>76.1</td>
<td>23.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Logical analysis</td>
<td>90.9</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>87.3</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Clear policy</td>
<td>74.6</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>81.7</td>
<td>16.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Facts &amp; logic</td>
<td>89.6</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>88.7</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Goals</td>
<td>76.6</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>73.2</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Attention to detail</td>
<td>63.0</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>62.0</td>
<td>28.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Chain of command</td>
<td>83.1</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>73.3</td>
<td>26.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean %</td>
<td></td>
<td>81.56</td>
<td>18.25</td>
<td>79.6</td>
<td>19.82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 9
Leadership Behavior Response Percentages by Item for Male Participants (n = 154) and Female Participants (n = 71) Across the Four Frames

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item no.</th>
<th>Leadership behaviors</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Item no.</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 STR</td>
<td></td>
<td>97.4*</td>
<td>95.8</td>
<td>2 HR</td>
<td>94.8*</td>
<td>94.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 STR</td>
<td></td>
<td>77.3*</td>
<td>76.1</td>
<td>6 HR</td>
<td>86.4</td>
<td>95.8*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 STR</td>
<td></td>
<td>90.9*</td>
<td>87.3</td>
<td>10 HR</td>
<td>84.5</td>
<td>91.5*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 STR</td>
<td></td>
<td>74.6</td>
<td>81.7*</td>
<td>14 HR</td>
<td>70.8</td>
<td>85.9*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 STR</td>
<td></td>
<td>89.6*</td>
<td>88.7</td>
<td>18 HR</td>
<td>87.6</td>
<td>91.6*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 STR</td>
<td></td>
<td>76.6*</td>
<td>73.2</td>
<td>22 HR</td>
<td>81.2</td>
<td>90.2*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 STR</td>
<td></td>
<td>63.0*</td>
<td>62.0</td>
<td>26 HR</td>
<td>81.2</td>
<td>85.9*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 STR</td>
<td></td>
<td>83.1*</td>
<td>73.3</td>
<td>30 HR</td>
<td>87.7</td>
<td>93.0*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 POL</td>
<td></td>
<td>87.6</td>
<td>90.1*</td>
<td>4 SYM</td>
<td>87.6</td>
<td>92.9*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 POL</td>
<td></td>
<td>59.1*</td>
<td>35.2</td>
<td>8 SYM</td>
<td>63.0*</td>
<td>59.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 POL</td>
<td></td>
<td>83.1*</td>
<td>73.2</td>
<td>12 SYM</td>
<td>70.7</td>
<td>84.5*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 POL</td>
<td></td>
<td>71.4*</td>
<td>70.4</td>
<td>16 SYM</td>
<td>66.2*</td>
<td>64.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 POL</td>
<td></td>
<td>80.5*</td>
<td>69.0</td>
<td>20 SYM</td>
<td>85.7*</td>
<td>81.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 POL</td>
<td></td>
<td>73.4*</td>
<td>56.3</td>
<td>24 SYM</td>
<td>81.2</td>
<td>87.4*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 POL</td>
<td></td>
<td>81.8*</td>
<td>77.4</td>
<td>28 SYM</td>
<td>90.2</td>
<td>94.3*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 POL</td>
<td></td>
<td>87.0</td>
<td>87.3*</td>
<td>32 SYM</td>
<td>80.5</td>
<td>88.7*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Findings for Behaviors: Structural (Factory) Frame

Findings for behaviors associated with the structural (factory) frame reveal the following:

1. Males frequently engage in behaviors associated with the structural frame.

2. Males frequently engage in behaviors that involve logical thinking, including "thinking very clearly and logically" (97.4%), "approaching problems through logical analysis and careful thinking" (90.9%), and "approaching problems with facts and logic" (89.6%).

3. Males frequently engage in behaviors involving "clear structure and chain of command" (83.1%).

4. Males frequently engage in behaviors that involve planning and setting goals, including "emphasizing careful planning" (77.3), "setting specific and measurable goals" (76.6%), and "developing and implementing clear logical policies" (74.6%).

5. Males engage less frequently in behaviors that require "extraordinary attention to detail" (63%).
Overall, the mean percentage for behaviors for the structural frame is 81.56%. The data suggest that males frequently engage in each of the behaviors associated with the structural frame, especially those that involve logical thinking and analysis.

When comparing the two studies, males and females report many similarities:

1. Both males and females engage frequently in behaviors associated with the structural frame.
2. Both males and females reported high percentages for behaviors associated with thinking and logic. For the behavior ‘think very clearly and logically,’ males reported 97.4% and females, 95.8%. For ‘approach problems with facts and logic,’ males reported 89.6% and females, 88.7%. For ‘approach problems through logical analysis,’ males reported 90.9 and females, 87.3%.
3. Males reported a higher proportionate percentage for ‘clear structure and chain of command’ (83.1%) than did females (73.3).
4. Females reported a higher proportionate percentage for ‘develop and implement clear logical policies’ (81.7%) than did males (74.6%).
5. Both males (63%) and females (62%) reported a proportionately lower percentage for "extraordinary attention to detail," suggesting that both males and females place a low preference within the structural frame for emphasis on detail.

Overall, the mean percentages for the structural frame were similar for males (81.56%) and females (79.6%). The data suggest that both male and female New Jersey superintendents frequently engage in behaviors associated with the structural frame, especially those that involve logical thinking. Two areas of difference include clear, logical policies, proportionately represented more highly by females (81.7%) than by males (74.6%), and chain of command, proportionately more highly represented by males (83.1%) than by females (73.3%).

Leadership Styles: The Structural (Factory) Frame

Responses for the 24 leadership style items of Section II are also calculated. In reporting the percentages, responses of 4 (best describes me) and 3 (next best describes me) are collapsed and viewed as positive responses. Responses of 2 (third best describes me) and 1 (least like me) are collapsed and viewed as negative
responses. Responses in this section include those of 31 participants who did not correctly interpret the directions. Although the section is designed to produce forced responses, the 31 participants did not follow the specific directions of the survey, often using 5s and other combinations of responses between 1 and 4 in subparts of the items. After consultation with the researcher’s mentor, answers that were coded “5”—not a choice provided in the directions—were amended to reflect a 4. However, all other answers were recorded as reported. Therefore, the research study is limited by the ability of the participants to interpret or follow the directions of the survey.

Table 10 reports the findings for leadership styles for the structural (factory) frame for both the male and female superintendent studies and overall percentages for positive responses. Table 11 reports the percentages for males and females for all 24 leadership styles for each item across the four frames.

The findings for leadership style for the structural frame for male superintendents yield the following:

1. Male participants reported high engagement for “the ability to make good decisions” (70.8%).
Table 10

Leadership Styles: Percentages for Items in Structural (Factory) Frame (n = 154)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item no.</th>
<th>Key term</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.a</td>
<td>Analytical skills</td>
<td>55.9</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>47.9</td>
<td>50.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.a</td>
<td>Technical experts</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>63.7</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>69.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.a</td>
<td>Good decisions</td>
<td>70.8</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>73.3</td>
<td>25.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.a</td>
<td>Attention to detail</td>
<td>48.7</td>
<td>50.6</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>66.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.a</td>
<td>Thinking logically</td>
<td>68.8</td>
<td>29.9</td>
<td>63.5</td>
<td>33.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.a</td>
<td>Analysis</td>
<td>47.4</td>
<td>51.3</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>52.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean %</td>
<td>54.55</td>
<td>44.48</td>
<td>47.7</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 11

Leadership Style Response Percentages by Item for Male Participants (n = 154) and Female Participants (n = 71) Across the Four Frames

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item no.</th>
<th>STR A</th>
<th>HR B</th>
<th>POL C</th>
<th>THEA D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M 1</td>
<td>55.9%*</td>
<td>82.4%*</td>
<td>39.6%*</td>
<td>56.5%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 1</td>
<td>47.9%</td>
<td>80.3%</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
<td>53.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 2</td>
<td>35.7%*</td>
<td>68.2%</td>
<td>46.1%*</td>
<td>76.6%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 2</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
<td>76.0%</td>
<td>28.2%</td>
<td>70.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 3</td>
<td>70.8%</td>
<td>68.2%*</td>
<td>37.0%*</td>
<td>56.5%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 3</td>
<td>73.3%</td>
<td>57.8%</td>
<td>28.2%</td>
<td>46.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 4</td>
<td>48.7%*</td>
<td>73.3%</td>
<td>64.9%*</td>
<td>46.7%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 4</td>
<td>31.0%</td>
<td>80.3%</td>
<td>56.3%</td>
<td>38.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 5</td>
<td>68.8%*</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td>28.6%*</td>
<td>57.1%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 5</td>
<td>63.5%</td>
<td>76.1%</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
<td>39.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 6</td>
<td>47.4%*</td>
<td>75.4%*</td>
<td>36.4%*</td>
<td>67.5%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 6</td>
<td>45.0%</td>
<td>73.2%</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
<td>64.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Males reported low engagement for "technical experts" (35.7%).

3. Males reported a low preference for leadership styles associated with "attention to detail," (48.7%), consistent with findings of the behaviors.

4. Males reported a preference for "analytical skills" (55.9%) and "clear logical thinking" (68.6%), consistent with findings for the behaviors that suggest males frequently engage in behaviors associated with logical thinking.

5. The overall mean percentage for males (54.55%) was proportionately higher than for females (44.48%).

6. Percentages for male responses for leadership style were proportionately higher for males than for females, with the exception of "good decisions" (see Table 10).

Findings for Leadership Styles: The Structural (Factory) Frame

The findings for leadership styles generally support the findings for behaviors. The findings report that males engage in leadership styles associated with the structural
frame, especially those associated with logical and analytical thinking. Males view themselves highest in "make good decisions" (70.8%) and lowest in "technical expert" (26.8%). Overall, males reported proportionately higher responses for all leadership styles, with the exception of "good decisions," than did females. The findings, however, are limited by the fact that 31 participants did not correctly interpret the directions.

When comparing the findings of the male study to those of the female study, the findings reveal the following:

1. There are similarities and differences between males and females in terms of leadership style.

2. Like males, females consider themselves good decision makers and reported a proportionately higher percentage for "good decision makers" (73.3%) than did males (70.8%).

3. Like males, females did not report themselves as technical experts. However, females reported a proportionately lower percentage for "technical expert" (26.8%) than did males (35.7%).

4. While females, like males, reported a preference for engagement in logical thinking (63.5%) and analysis (47.9%), percentages for males were
proportionately higher, 68.8% and 55.9% respectively.

5. While males and females reported similar percentages for "analyst best describes me," males reported a proportionately higher percentage (47.4%) than did females (45%).

6. While both males and females reported a low preference for attention to detail, males reported a proportionately higher percentage for "attention to detail" (48.7%) than did females (31%).

7. Male participants reported a higher overall mean percentage (54.55%) than did females (47.7%).

Overall, male and female superintendents reported many similarities for leadership style for the structural frame. Both males and females perceived themselves as good decision makers who use logic and analytical skills. Both males and females shared a similar perception that technical expertise does not best represent their leadership style. However, males overwhelmingly reported proportionately higher percentages for leadership styles than did females, with the exception of "good decisions" (see Table 11). The data are limited by the fact that many
male participants did not correctly interpret the survey directions. However, the data generally support the findings of the behaviors that suggest that males and females share many similarities within the structural frame and frequently engage in leadership practices associated with the frame.

**Behaviors: The Human Resource (Family) Frame**

Table 12 reports the findings for the behaviors for the human resource (family) frame reported in both superintendent studies. Mean percentages for the human resource frame are also reported.

An examination of the behaviors for the human resource frame reveals the following:

1. New Jersey male superintendents frequently engage in behaviors associated with the human resource (family) frame (84.28%).

2. Males reported a high percentage of engagement for "shows high levels of support and concern for others" (94.8%).

3. While the behavior "shows levels of support and concern for others" represents the highest percentage for male responses, it is seemingly inconsistent with related responses for "helpful
Table 12

Behaviors: Percentages for Items in Human Resource (Family) Frame (n = 154)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item no.</th>
<th>Key terms</th>
<th>Male Always/often</th>
<th>Male Sometimes/occasionally</th>
<th>Female Always/often</th>
<th>Female Sometimes/occasionally</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>High support</td>
<td>94.8</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>94.4</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td>86.4</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>95.8</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Sensitivity &amp; concern</td>
<td>84.5</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>91.5</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Decisions involvement</td>
<td>70.8</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>85.9</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Helpful &amp; responsive</td>
<td>87.6</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>91.6</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Listen well</td>
<td>81.2</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>90.2</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Give recognition</td>
<td>81.2</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>85.9</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Participative</td>
<td>87.7</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>93.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean 84.28 16.96 91.0 8.975
and responsive” (87.6%), “show sensitivity and concern” (84.5%), “listen well” (81.2%), and “give personal recognition” (81.2%), which show proportionately lower percentages.

4. Equally distinctive is the finding that while males reported “involvement in decision making” as the lowest percentage (70.8%), a disparity exists for “build open and collaborative relationships” (86.4%) and “am a highly participative manager” (87.7%).

5. The overall mean percentage for behaviors in the human resource frame is 84.28%.

Table 12 also reports findings for the human resource frame for the female superintendent study (Edmunds, 2007). A comparison of the findings for males and females yields the following:

1. For the behavior “show high levels of support and concern for others,” males reported a proportionately higher percentage (94.8%) than did females (94.4%).

2. Females reported a proportionately higher percentage for “build trust through open and collaborative relationships” (95.8%) when
compared to males (86.4%), "show sensitivity and concerns for others" (91.5%) when compared to males (84.5%), "foster participation and involvement in decisions" (85.9%) when compared to males (70.8%), "am helpful and responsive to others" (91.6%) when compared to males (87.6%), "listen well and am receptive to other people’s ideas" (90.2%) when compared to males (81.2%), "give personal recognition" (85.9%) when compared to males (81.2%), and "highly participative manager" (93%) when compared to males (87.7%).

3. Females reported a higher overall mean percentage (91%) for the human resource frame than did males, who reported a proportionately lower percentage (84.28%), and proportionately higher percentages for seven of the eight behaviors than males.

Findings for Behaviors: The Human Resource (Family) Frame

Overall, the data suggest that males frequently engage in behaviors associated with the human resource frame. However, females reported consistently higher proportionate percentages when compared to males, with one exception—"show high levels of support and concern." Findings support
the literature that suggests females tend to lead in a more collaborative, caring manner (Hegelsen, 1990, 1995).
However, the study suggests that the contemporary New Jersey male superintendent also views himself as a caring, collaborative leader.

Leadership Styles: The Human Resource (Family) Frame

Table 13 reports the findings of leadership style for the human resource (family) frame. Additionally, Table 13 reports the findings for the female superintendent study and mean percentages for the frame for both studies.

An examination of male leadership styles associated with the human resource frame reveals that

1. Males reported a high percentage for "my strongest skills are interpersonal skills" (82.4%).
2. Males reported a proportionately higher percentage for "concern for people" (73.3%), "caring and support for others" (71.4%), "humanist" (75.4%), "coach and develop people" (68.2%), and "good listener" (68.2%) than did females.
Table 13

Leadership Styles: Percentages for Items in Human Resource (Family) Frame (n = 154)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item no.</th>
<th>Key term</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Female</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.b</td>
<td>Interpersonal skills</td>
<td>82.4</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>80.3</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.3 M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.b</td>
<td>Good listener</td>
<td>68.2</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>76.0</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.3 M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.b</td>
<td>Coach &amp; develop people</td>
<td>68.2</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>57.8</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.3 M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.b</td>
<td>Concern for people</td>
<td>73.3</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>80.3</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.9 M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.b</td>
<td>Caring &amp; support</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>76.1</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.9 M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.b</td>
<td>Humanist</td>
<td>75.4</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>73.2</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.9 M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td></td>
<td>73.15</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>60.5</td>
<td>49.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>73.9*</td>
<td>24.01*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*recalculated mean
M = missing
N = never
3. Males reported a proportionately higher mean percentage (73.15%) than did females (60.5%).

Findings for Leadership Styles: The Human Resource (Family) Frame

Overall, the data support the findings of the behaviors and suggest that males frequently engage in leadership styles associated with the human resource frame. While the data are inconsistent with the findings of the behaviors that reported a proportionately higher mean percentage for females (91%) as compared to males (84.28%), the data are limited by the high number of participants who did not correctly interpret the directions of the leadership styles section.

Table 13 also reports a comparison of male and female leadership style associated with the human resource frame. It yields the following:

1. Females reported a proportionately higher percentage for "concern for people" (80.3%) than did males (73.3%), "care and support for others" (76.1%) than did males (71.4%), and "good listener" (76%) than did males (68.2%).

2. Males reported a proportionately higher percentage for "coach and develop" people (68.2%)
than did females (57.8%), "interpersonal skills" (82.4%) than did females (80.3%), and "humanist" (75.4%) than did females (73.2%).

3. Males reported a proportionately higher overall mean percentage (73.15%) than did females (60.5%).

A comparison of leadership style, overall, reports mixed findings. While both males and females reported leadership style preferences associated with the human resource frame, a proportionately higher percentage of females reported being a good listener, and a proportionately higher percentage of males reported being coaches and developers of others. The findings support the idea of females as collaborators and males as mentors. This conclusion suggests that females, a proportionately lower percentage of whom reported coaching others and mentors in their own careers, may not in turn model mentoring to the same extent as males. Although these findings are inconsistent with the findings that females reported these behaviors at a proportionately higher rate than males for all but one behavior, the findings for leadership style are limited by the fact that many male participants did not correctly interpret the instructions of the survey.
Behaviors: The Political (Jungle) Frame

Table 14 reports the findings for behaviors associated with the political (jungle) frame. Table 14 also reports the findings for the female superintendent study (Edmunds, 2007) and the overall mean percentages for males and females.

Findings for Behaviors: The Political (Jungle) Frame

The data suggest that males frequently engage in each of the behaviors associated with the political frame:

1. Males reported high percentages for engagement in “ability to mobilize people” (87.6%), “succeed in the face of conflict and opposition” (87%), “unusually persuasive and influential” (83.1%), “develop alliances” (81.8%), “effective in getting support from people with influence and power” (80.5%), “politically sensitive and skillful” (73.4%), and “deal adroitly with conflict” (71.4%).

2. Males reported the lowest percentage of engagement in “am skillful and shrewd negotiator” (59.1%).

3. Males reported an overall mean percentage of 77.98%.
Table 14

Behaviors: Percentages for Items in Political (Jungle) Frame (n = 154)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item no.</th>
<th>Key terms</th>
<th>Male Always/often</th>
<th>Male Sometimes/occasionally</th>
<th>Female Always/often</th>
<th>Female Sometimes/occasionally</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ability to mobilize</td>
<td>87.6</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>90.1</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Shrewd negotiator</td>
<td>59.1</td>
<td>40.9</td>
<td>35.2</td>
<td>64.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Persuasive</td>
<td>83.1</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>73.2</td>
<td>26.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Deal adroitly</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>70.4</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Influence &amp; power</td>
<td>80.5</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>69.0</td>
<td>31.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Politically sensitive</td>
<td>73.4</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>56.3</td>
<td>43.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Develop alliances</td>
<td>81.8</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>77.4</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Succeed in face of conflict</td>
<td>87.0</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>87.3</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean %

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>77.98</td>
<td>61.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29.7*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* recalculated mean
M = missing
N = never
The data support the literature that suggests males are more likely to be viewed as transactional leaders (Eagly & Johannesen-Schmidt, 2001) and are comfortable with the exercise of power. The data also support a suggestion that the negative connotation of the word “shrewd” may account for the lower percentage reported for the behavior (59.1%).

A comparison of the findings for the male study and the female study reports similarities and differences between males and females:

1. Female participants reported proportionately higher percentages for “ability to mobilize people” (90.1%) and “succeed in the face of conflict and opposition” (87.3%) than did males (87.6% and 87% respectively).

2. Females reported a proportionately lower percentage (35.2%) for “shrewd negotiator” than did males (59.2%).

3. However, males reported proportionately higher responses than females for most behaviors.

4. The overall mean percentage for males (77.98%) is proportionately higher than that of females (61.0%).
5. Thus, while some similarities occur, the data support a suggestion that males are more comfortable with power and the political frame than are females and engage more frequently in behaviors associated with the political frame. The findings support Edmunds’s conclusion that New Jersey female superintendents are uncomfortable with power (2007), but suggest that males also experience some discomfort with power.

Overall, the data reveal that males, for the most part, reported proportionately higher responses across behaviors associated with the political frame than did females and therefore, are clearly more comfortable with the political frame. The findings support Edmunds’s conclusion that New Jersey female superintendents are, more so than males, uncomfortable with the concept of power. However, the data suggest that both males and females report some discomfort with power and the political sphere.

Leadership Styles: The Political (Jungle) Frame

Table 15 reports the findings for leadership style for the political frame. Table 15 also reports findings for the female superintendent study (Edmunds, 2007) and the overall mean percentages for both studies.
Table 15

Leadership Styles: Percentages for Items in Political (Jungle) Frame (n = 154)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item no.</th>
<th>Key term</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Best</td>
<td>Least</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.c</td>
<td>Political skills</td>
<td>39.6</td>
<td>59.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.c</td>
<td>Skilled negotiator</td>
<td>46.1</td>
<td>51.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.c</td>
<td>Building alliances</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>61.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#4.c</td>
<td>Succeed in face of conflict</td>
<td>64.9</td>
<td>33.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#5.c</td>
<td>Tough &amp; aggressive</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>69.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#6.c</td>
<td>Politician</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>61.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean %</td>
<td></td>
<td>42.1</td>
<td>56.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data report that males engage in Leadership Styles associated with the political frame. The data reveal that 1. Males reported a percentage of 64.9% for “succeed in the face of conflict,” a percentage proportionately higher than other leadership styles associated with the political frame.
2. Males reported a percentage of 28.6% for “toughness and aggressiveness,” a percentage proportionately lower than other leadership styles associated with the frame.

3. Although males reported a percentage of 46.1% for “skilled negotiator,” which is seemingly inconsistent with the findings of the behaviors reported in Table 13, participants might have viewed “skilled” in a more positive light than “shrewd” when contemplating the response for “negotiator.”

4. The overall mean percentage for positive responses is 42.1%, suggesting that while males frequently engage in leadership styles associated with the political frame, males may tend to place a lower priority on political acumen than the literature suggests.

Findings for Leadership Styles: The Political (Jungle) Frame

The data generally support the findings of the behaviors, suggesting that while males are comfortable with the concept of power, they experience some discomfort with leadership styles associated with “toughness and
aggressiveness” (28.6%), “political skills” (39.6%), and being a “politician” (36.4%).

A comparison of leadership style for male and female participants for the political frame (Table 15) reveals that

1. Males reported a proportionately higher percentage for all items associated with the political frame than did females.

2. Although males and females shared the highest proportionate percentage for “succeed in the face of conflict,” males reported a proportionately higher percentage (64.9%) than did females (56.3%).

3. Although males and females shared the lowest proportionate percentage for “politician,” males reported a proportionately higher percentage (36.4%) than did females (16.9%).

4. Males reported an overall mean percentage for positive responses proportionately higher (42.1%) than their female peers (29.6%).

The findings suggest that males are more comfortable with the exercise of power than are females and support Edmunds’ conclusion that New Jersey female superintendents
do not strongly identify with the political frame (2007). The findings support the literature that suggests that women are reluctant to talk about power (Barr, 2007; Edmunds, 2007) and that power carries a negative connotation (Bolman & Deal, 2003). For example, women and men both report a lower proportionate percentage for “toughness and aggressiveness,” words which connote a more negative interpretation than do “skilled,” “build,” or "succeed.” The data for the political frame also suggest an aversion by males, if not abhorrence by females, for the word “political.” While the findings generally support those of behaviors, the study is limited by the inability of numerous male participants to interpret the directions for leadership style.

Behaviors: The Symbolic (Theater) Frame

Table 16 reports percentages for behaviors for the symbolic (theater) frame for the male superintendent study. Table 16 also reports findings for the female superintendent study (Edmunds, 2007) and overall percentages of positive responses for both studies.

The data reveal that males frequently engage in behaviors associated with the symbolic frame. The findings yield the following:
Table 16

Behaviors: Percentages for Items in Symbolic (Theater) Frame (n = 154)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item no.</th>
<th>Key terms</th>
<th>Always/often</th>
<th>Sometimes/occasionally</th>
<th>Always/often</th>
<th>Sometimes/occasionally</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Inspire others</td>
<td>87.6</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>92.9</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Charisma</td>
<td>63.0</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>59.1</td>
<td>39.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Inspirational model</td>
<td>70.7</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>84.5</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Imagination</td>
<td>66.2</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td>64.8</td>
<td>35.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Communicate vision</td>
<td>85.7</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>81.7</td>
<td>18.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Generate opportunity</td>
<td>81.2</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>87.4</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Loyalty &amp; enthusiasm</td>
<td>90.2</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>94.3</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Aspirations &amp; values</td>
<td>80.5</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>88.7</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean %   | 78.14         | 21.49         | 81.6         | 18.14         |
1. Males reported a high percentage of engagement for behaviors associated with "generate loyalty and enthusiasm" (90.2%), "inspire others to do their best" (87.6%), "communicate vision and mission" (85.7%), "generate new opportunities" (81.2%), and "serve as inspirational model" (80.5%), characteristics generally associated with transformational leadership style (Bolman & Deal, 2003).

2. Males reported a high percentage of engagement in behaviors associated with "loyalty and enthusiasm" (90.2%), characteristics generally associated with transformational leadership style (Bolman & Deal, 2003).

3. Males reported a low percentage of engagement with behaviors associated with "charisma" (63%) and "imagination and creativity" (66.2%), characteristics also associated with transformational leadership style (Bolman & Deal, 2003).

Findings for Behaviors: The Symbolic (Theater) Frame

Overall, males reported that they frequently engage in behaviors associated with the symbolic frame. New Jersey
male superintendents reported behaviors associated with inspirational leadership and vision, characteristics usually attributed to transformational leadership and associated more often with female leadership style than male (Bennis, 1989; Burns, 1978, as cited by Bolman & Deal, 2003; Eagly & Johannesen-Schmidt, 2001).

A comparison of the findings for the male and female superintendent studies reports similarities and differences between the two studies:

1. Females frequently engage in behaviors associated with the symbolic frame, but reported proportionately higher percentages for most behaviors when compared to males.

2. Females reported proportionately higher percentages for "generate loyalty and enthusiasm" (94.3%) when compared to males (90.2%), "inspire others to do their best" (92.9%) when compared to males (87.6%), "influential model of organizational aspirations and values" (88.7%) when compared to males (80.5%), "generate exciting new opportunities" (87.4%) when compared to males (81.2%), and "inspiration to others" (84.5%) when compared to males (70.7%), characteristics
generally associated with transformational leadership (Bolman & Deal, 2003).

3. Males reported proportionately higher percentages for "communicate vision and mission" (85.7%) when compared to females (81.7%), "imaginative and creative" (66.2%) when compared to females (64.8%), and "charismatic" (63%) when compared to females (59.1%).

4. The overall mean percentage for behaviors for women (81.6%) is proportionately higher than that of their male peers (78.14%), suggesting that women identify themselves more broadly with the symbolic frame than do men.

The findings for the symbolic frame support the literature that has suggested women are more likely to be viewed as transformational leaders (Bennis, 1989; Burns, 1978, as cited by Bolman & Deal, 2003; Eagly & Johannesen-Schmidt, 2001). However, the high percentages reported by male participants arguably support a similar claim for New Jersey male superintendents. The data continue to suggest that New Jersey male and female superintendents engage in multidimensional leadership practices.
Leadership Styles: The Symbolic (Theater) Frame

Table 17 reports the findings for leadership style for the symbolic (theater) frame. Table 17 also reports the findings for the female superintendent study and the overall mean percentages for both studies.

The data suggest that males engage in each of the leadership styles associated with the symbolic frame. An examination of Table 17 reports the following:

1. Males report engagement in leadership styles associated with inspirational, visionary leaders, including "inspirational leader" (76.6%), "visionary" (67.5%), "energize and inspire others" (56.5%), and "ability to excite and motivate" (56.5%), consistent with the findings for behaviors.

2. Males report a proportionately lower percentage of engagement in "charisma" (46.7%) and "imagination" (57.1%), consistent with the findings for behaviors.

3. Males report an overall mean percentage for leadership style of 60.15%, suggesting that males frequently engage in leadership styles associated with the symbolic frame.
Table 17

Leadership Styles: Percentages for Items in Symbolic (Theater) Frame (n = 154)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item no.</th>
<th>Key term</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.d</td>
<td>Excite &amp; motivate</td>
<td>56.5, 41.6, 1.9 M</td>
<td>53.5, 43.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.d</td>
<td>Inspirational leader</td>
<td>76.6, 22.1, 1.3 M</td>
<td>70.5, 29.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.d</td>
<td>Energize &amp; inspire</td>
<td>56.5, 41.6, 1.9 M</td>
<td>46.5, 50.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.d</td>
<td>Charisma</td>
<td>46.7, 51.9, 1.3 M</td>
<td>38.1, 50.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.d</td>
<td>Imagination</td>
<td>57.1, 40.2, 2.6 M</td>
<td>39.5, 54.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.d</td>
<td>Visionary</td>
<td>67.5, 30.5, 1.9 M</td>
<td>64.8, 31.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean %

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60.15</td>
<td>52.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

M = missing
N = never

A comparison of the findings for the male and female superintendent studies reports similarities and differences. The data reveal that

1. Males and female New Jersey superintendents frequently engage in leadership styles associated with the symbolic frame.
2. Females reported proportionately lower percentages for all leadership styles than did males.

3. Although males and females reported high percentages for "inspirational leader," males reported a proportionately higher percentage (76.6%) than did females (70.5%).

4. Although males and females reported a low percentage for "charisma," males reported a proportionately higher percentage (46.7%) than did females (38.1%).

5. The overall mean percentage for males is proportionately higher (60.15%) than for females (52.15%).

Findings for Leadership Styles: The Symbolic (Theater) Frame

The findings suggest that males and females tend to view themselves as inspirational, visionary leaders and engage frequently in leadership styles associated with the symbolic frame. Although the data suggest that males engage more frequently in leadership style for the symbolic frame (60.15%) than do females (52.14%), a finding seemingly inconsistent with the findings for behaviors, the data are
limited by the fact that a large number of male participants did not correctly interpret the directions of the survey. Generally, the findings for behaviors are consistent with those of leadership style. The data suggest that both male and female New Jersey superintendents view themselves as transformational leaders and exhibit multidimensional leadership style.

Summary of Descriptive Statistics for the Four Frames

Table 18 summarizes the mean percentages for the four frames for both studies. Table 18 reports overall mean percentages for positive responses for behaviors and leadership styles for each frame.

Table 18

Summary of Mean Percentages for Behaviors and Leadership Styles in Male (n = 154) and Female (n = 71) Superintendent Studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frame</th>
<th>Male Behavior</th>
<th>Male Styles</th>
<th>Female Behavior</th>
<th>Female Styles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Factory</td>
<td>81.56</td>
<td>54.55</td>
<td>79.76</td>
<td>47.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>84.28</td>
<td>73.15</td>
<td>91.00</td>
<td>60.50*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jungle</td>
<td>77.98</td>
<td>42.10</td>
<td>61.00**</td>
<td>29.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theater</td>
<td>78.14</td>
<td>60.15</td>
<td>81.67</td>
<td>52.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A comparison of the two studies reveals similarities and differences between male and female New Jersey superintendent leadership style and reports the following:

1. New Jersey male superintendents reported the highest mean percentage for behaviors for the human resource (family) frame (84.26%), followed closely by the structural (factory) frame (81.56%), the symbolic frame (78.14), and the political frame (77.98%).

2. New Jersey male superintendents reported the highest mean percentage for leadership styles for the human resource frame (73.15%), followed by the symbolic frame (60.15%), the structural frame (54.55%), and the political frame (42.1%). However, the findings for leadership style were limited by the inability of some of the participants to interpret the directions correctly.

3. Although New Jersey male superintendents reported a high percentage of engagement in behaviors and leadership styles associated with the human
resource frame, they generally reported a multidimensional leadership style, suggesting frequent engagement in each of the four frames.

4. New Jersey male superintendents reported a lower percentage of engagement in behaviors and leadership styles associated with the political frame, but clearly reported engagement in the frame, suggesting males are comfortable with the concept of power.

5. New Jersey male superintendents engage in behaviors and leadership styles associated with both transactional and transformational leadership characteristics.

6. New Jersey male superintendents do not conform to the stereotypical profile of male leaders as solely aggressive, political leaders.

7. New Jersey female superintendents reported the highest mean percentages for behaviors for the human resource (family) frame (91%), followed by the symbolic (theater) frame (81.67%), the structural (factory) frame (79.76%), and the political frame (61%).
8. New Jersey female superintendents reported the highest mean percentages for leadership styles for the human resource frame (60.5%), followed by the symbolic frame (52.15%), the structural frame (47.7%), and the political frame (29.6%).

9. Although New Jersey female superintendents generally reported a multidimensional leadership style, they reported a proportionately higher percentage of engagement in behaviors associated with the human resource frame (91%) than did males (84.28%) and a proportionately higher percentage of engagement for behaviors associated with the symbolic frame (81.67%) than did males (78.14%), suggesting a tendency towards transformational leadership characteristics.

10. Although New Jersey male superintendents generally reported a multidimensional leadership style, they reported proportionately higher percentage of engagement in behaviors associated with the structural frame (81.56%) than did females (79.76%) and a proportionately higher percentage of engagement in behaviors associated with the political frame (77.98%) than did
females (61%), suggesting a tendency towards transactional leadership.

11. Although both males and females reported proportionately lower percentages for behaviors for the political frame, females reported a lower proportionate percentage (61%) than did males (77.98), supporting Edmunds's conclusion that females are uncomfortable with the exercise or discussion of power (2007).

12. Although the data suggest that both males and females engage in multidimensional leadership styles, the greatest disparities between both studies were reported by females, who reported both the highest mean percentage (91% for the human resource frame) and lowest mean percentage (61% for the political frame) for behaviors and the lowest mean percentage for leadership style for the political frame (29.6%).

Overall, the male and female superintendent studies reported more similarities than differences. Tables 19 and 20 show striking similarities for highest and lowest mean percentages of the survey by item and frame for both
studies. The findings suggest that differences are more of degree than of substance.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frame</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Behavior no.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High item</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>97.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low item</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>63.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human resource</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High item</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>94.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low item</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>70.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High item</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>87.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low item</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>59.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symbolic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High item</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>90.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low item</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>63.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 20

Summary of High and Low Items of Leadership Styles of Male (n = 154) and Female (n = 71) Superintendent Studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frame</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Style no.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High item</td>
<td>3.a</td>
<td>70.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low item</td>
<td>2.a</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human resource</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High item</td>
<td>1.b</td>
<td>82.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low item</td>
<td>2.b</td>
<td>68.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High item</td>
<td>4.c</td>
<td>64.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low item</td>
<td>5.c</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symbolic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High item</td>
<td>2.d</td>
<td>76.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low item</td>
<td>4.d</td>
<td>46.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Additionally, both males and females reported a proportionately higher percentage of engagement for the human resource frame and a lower percentage of engagement for the political frame. Both males and females reported relative parity for the structural frame and the theater frame with some juxtaposition of preference between the two.

Both males and females reported multidimensional leadership characteristics. However, although both males and females reported a proportionately higher percentage for the human resource frame, females clearly reported proportionately higher identification with the human resource frame (91%) than did males and proportionately lower identification with the political frame (61%) than did males (77.98%). The findings support the literature that suggests women tend to be caring, collaborative leaders and Edmunds's findings that women superintendents are uncomfortable with the concept of power (2007). The findings suggest that males, although multidimensional, report a tendency toward transactional leadership style characteristics, and females, although also multidimensional leaders, report a tendency towards transformational leadership.
Factor Analysis

The research study additionally conducted a factor analysis for the 32 leadership behaviors and the 24 leadership styles of the New Jersey superintendent study. The factor analysis used the Varimax Rotation Method. Table 21 reports the findings for the factor analysis of the leadership behaviors of the Bolman and Deal (Self) Survey (1990). Table 22 reports the findings for the leadership styles of the Bolman and Deal (Self) Survey.

The results of the factor analysis for the 32 leadership behaviors reflect six factors. Factors run from strongest to weakest as follows: Factor 1 explains 28.207% of the variance and Factor 6 explains 3.488% of the variance. All of the items for leadership behaviors loaded on one or more factors.

Of the eight behaviors aligned with the human resource (family) frame, all eight loaded on Factor 1, identifying it as the most important factor. Six items loaded solely on Factor 1. This included behaviors 2 (.733), 6 (.681), 10 (.775), 14 (.683), 18 (.737), and 22 (.714). Behavior 26 split three ways on Factor 1 (.453), Factor 3 (.447), and Factor 5 (.405). Behavior 30 split on Factor 1 (.412) and Factor 3 (.388). Overall, the eight items of the human
Table 21

Factor Analysis of Leadership Behaviors: Items Using Varimax Rotation Method

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item no.</th>
<th>Frame</th>
<th>Key term</th>
<th>Load</th>
<th>Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Factory</td>
<td>Think clearly/logically</td>
<td>.770</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Family</td>
<td>Show levels of support and concern</td>
<td>.733</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Jungle</td>
<td>Mobilize people</td>
<td>.709</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Theater</td>
<td>Inspire others</td>
<td>.613</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Factory</td>
<td>Careful planning</td>
<td>.490</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.473</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Family</td>
<td>Open and collaborative</td>
<td>.681</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Jungle</td>
<td>Shrewd negotiator</td>
<td>.508</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.544</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Theater</td>
<td>Charismatic</td>
<td>.685</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Factory</td>
<td>Logical analysis</td>
<td>.784</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Family</td>
<td>Sensitivity and concern</td>
<td>.775</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Jungle</td>
<td>Persuasive and influential</td>
<td>.552</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Theater</td>
<td>Inspiration</td>
<td>.517</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.408</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Factory</td>
<td>Clear policies</td>
<td>.532</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.441</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item no.</td>
<td>Frame</td>
<td>Key term</td>
<td>Load</td>
<td>Factor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Family</td>
<td>Involvement</td>
<td>.683</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Jungle</td>
<td>Organizational conflict</td>
<td>.494</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Theater</td>
<td>Imaginative</td>
<td>.630</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Factory</td>
<td>Facts and logic</td>
<td>.653</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Family</td>
<td>Helpful and responsive</td>
<td>.737</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Jungle</td>
<td>Influence and power</td>
<td>.509</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Theater</td>
<td>Sense of vision</td>
<td>.331</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.393</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Factory</td>
<td>Specific goals</td>
<td>.509</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Family</td>
<td>Listen well</td>
<td>.714</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Jungle</td>
<td>Politically sensitive</td>
<td>.688</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Theater</td>
<td>New opportunities</td>
<td>.688</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Factory</td>
<td>Attention to detail</td>
<td>.779</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Family</td>
<td>Personal recognition</td>
<td>.453</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.447</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.405</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Jungle</td>
<td>Build alliances</td>
<td>.408</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.444</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item no.</td>
<td>Frame</td>
<td>Key term</td>
<td>Load</td>
<td>Factor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Theater</td>
<td>Loyalty and enthusiasm</td>
<td>.565</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Factory</td>
<td>Chain of command</td>
<td>.801</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Family</td>
<td>Participation</td>
<td>.412</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.388</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Jungle</td>
<td>Succeed in face of conflict</td>
<td>.559</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Theater</td>
<td>Aspirations and values</td>
<td>.440</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

resource frame cluster according to the expectations of Bolman and Deal (2003), but indicate multidimensional aspects. The findings are consistent with the overall findings of the research study.

Of the eight behaviors associated with the structural (factory) frame, all eight loaded or split on Factors 3 and 4. Factor 3 explains 7.823% of the variance, and Factor 4 explains 5.469% of the variance. Behaviors 21 (.509), 25 (.779), and 29 (.801) loaded on Factor 3. Behaviors 1 (.770), 9 (.784), and 17 (.653) loaded on Factor 4. Behavior 5 split on Factor 3 (.490) and Factor 4 (.473).
Behavior 13 also split on Factor 3 (.532) and Factor 4.
Table 22

Factor Analysis of Leadership Styles: Items Using Varimax Rotation Method

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item no.</th>
<th>Frame</th>
<th>Key term</th>
<th>Load</th>
<th>Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.a</td>
<td>Factory</td>
<td>Strongest skills analytical</td>
<td>.570</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.b</td>
<td>Family</td>
<td>Strongest skills interpersonal</td>
<td>.748</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.c</td>
<td>Jungle</td>
<td>Strongest skills political</td>
<td>.849</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.d</td>
<td>Theater</td>
<td>Strongest skills excite and motivate</td>
<td>.731</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.a</td>
<td>Factory</td>
<td>Best described as technical expert</td>
<td>.674</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.b</td>
<td>Family</td>
<td>Best describe as good listener</td>
<td>.781</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.c</td>
<td>Jungle</td>
<td>Best described as skilled negotiator</td>
<td>.635</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.d</td>
<td>Theater</td>
<td>Best described as inspirational</td>
<td>.786</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.a</td>
<td>Factory</td>
<td>Good decisions helped most</td>
<td>.837</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.b</td>
<td>Family</td>
<td>Coaching and developing people helped most</td>
<td>.714</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.c</td>
<td>Jungle</td>
<td>Building alliances helped most</td>
<td>.734</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.d</td>
<td>Theater</td>
<td>Energizing and inspiring helped most</td>
<td>.832</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.a</td>
<td>Factory</td>
<td>People notice attention to detail</td>
<td>.843</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 22 (continued).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item no.</th>
<th>Frame</th>
<th>Key term</th>
<th>Load</th>
<th>Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.b</td>
<td>Family</td>
<td>People notice concern for others</td>
<td>.807</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.c</td>
<td>Jungle</td>
<td>People notice success in face of conflict</td>
<td>.709</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.d</td>
<td>Theater</td>
<td>People notice charisma</td>
<td>.634</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.a</td>
<td>Factory</td>
<td>Most important trait is logical thinking</td>
<td>.835</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.b</td>
<td>Family</td>
<td>Most important trait is care and support for others</td>
<td>.832</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.c</td>
<td>Jungle</td>
<td>Most important trait is toughness and aggressiveness</td>
<td>.624</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.d</td>
<td>Theater</td>
<td>Most important trait is creativity</td>
<td>.679</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.a</td>
<td>Factory</td>
<td>Best described as analyst</td>
<td>.751</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.b</td>
<td>Family</td>
<td>Best described as humanist</td>
<td>.816</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.c</td>
<td>Jungle</td>
<td>Best described as politician</td>
<td>.882</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.d</td>
<td>Theater</td>
<td>Best described as visionary</td>
<td>.685</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Of the eight behaviors, three loaded exclusively on Factor 3, three items loaded exclusively on Factor 4, and the remaining two items split between Factors 3 and 4. Thus, the structural frame demonstrates a commonality between Factor 4 and Factor 3. Combined, Factors 3 and 4 explain 13.292% of the variance. All eight behaviors cluster similarly according to the expectations of Bolman and Deal (2003). Results are consistent with the overall findings of the research study.

Of the eight behaviors associated with the symbolic (theater) frame, three behaviors loaded on Factor 2 to include behavior 16 (.630), 24 (.688), and 32 (.440). Behavior 20 split on Factor 2 (.331) and Factor 5 (.393). Behavior 12 split on Factor 5 (.517) and Factor 6 (.408). Behavior 4 loaded on Factor 5 (.613), and Behavior 8 loaded on Factor 6 (.685). Behavior 28 loaded on Factor 1 (.565). Although the behaviors of the symbolic frame cluster to a lesser extent, there are commonalities observed in the clustering of behaviors in the symbolic frame. Factor 2 explains 8.412% of the variance and is consistent with the overall findings of the research study, which report some fluctuations within the symbolic frame and glimpses of multidimensional leadership style. However, the findings
diverge to a degree from the expectations of Bolman and Deal (2003), perhaps as a result of a slightly different interpretation of behaviors by the participants as Edmunds suggested in the female study (2007).

Three behaviors in the political frame also loaded on Factor 2 to include behaviors 19 (.509), 23 (.688), and 31 (.559). Behavior 7 loaded on Factor 2 (.544) and Factor 6 (.508). Behavior 15 loaded on Factor 2 (.494) and Factor 4 (.354). Behaviors 3 (.709) and 11 (.552) loaded on Factor 5. Behavior 27 loaded on Factor 1 (.408) and Factor 3 (.444). The findings illustrate commonalities within the clustering of behaviors of the political frame and commonalities with the symbolic frame. The findings are consistent with the findings that suggest a multidimensional leadership style among New Jersey male superintendents. The findings diverge somewhat from the expectations of Bolman and Deal (2003), but may result from a different interpretation of the items by the New Jersey participants (Edmunds, 2007).

Overall, the results of the factor analysis for leadership behaviors report the following:
1. For the human resource (family) frame, six items loaded on Factor 1; one item split on Factors 1, 3, and 5; and one item split on Factors 1 and 3.

2. For the structural (factory) frame, three items loaded on Factor 3, three items loaded on Factor 4, and two items split on Factors 3 and 4.

3. For the symbolic (theater) frame, three items loaded on Factor 2, one item split on Factors 2 and 5, one item split on Factors 5 and 6, one item loaded on Factor 5, one item loaded on Factor 6, and one item loaded on Factor 1.

4. For the political (jungle) frame, three items loaded on Factor 2, one item loaded on Factors 2 and 6, one item loaded on Factors 2 and 4, two items loaded on Factor 5, and one item loaded on Factors 1 and 3.

The findings support the expectations of Bolman and Deal (1990) that behaviors within each frame will cluster in a similar manner. Although there are some inconsistencies, overall, similar patterns and overlaps are reported, suggesting multidimensional aspects of the frame or slightly different interpretations of behaviors by the New Jersey participants (Edmunds, 2007).
Additionally, the results support conclusions of the research study that suggest New Jersey male superintendents are multidimensional leaders, predominantly aligned with behaviors associated with the human resource (family) and structural (factory) frames. Noting the cluster pattern of the political frame around Factor 2, the findings for the factor analysis can be interpreted to suggest that the political frame, proportionately reported when compared to the other frames, plays a more integral or intertwined role within the frames, and among New Jersey male superintendents in particular, than the data may suggest at first blush. All of the factors for the behaviors loaded on one or more factor.

A factor analysis for the 24 items for leadership styles was also conducted in order to further study the alignment of the survey items according to the expectations of Bolman and Deal's Four Frame Model (2003). The findings for leadership style, however, are limited because of the inability of some participants to interpret the directions of the survey.

The factor analysis reports that all 24 items loaded on one of seven factors. Factors run from strongest to weakest: Factor 1 explains 18.278% of the variance, and
Factor 7 explains 4.341% of the variance. All of the items loaded on one or more factors.

Five of six items in the human resource (family) frame loaded on Factor 1, identifying it as the most important frame, to include leadership styles 1.b (.748), 2.b (.781), 4.b (.807), 5.b (.832), and 6.b (.816). Leadership style 3.b (.714), which reports the lowest proportionate percentage of the frame ("coach and develop people"), loaded on Factor 7. The items of this frame clustered as expected and were consistent with the expectations of Bolman and Deal (1990, 2003). The findings are consistent with the findings that the human resource (family) frame reports the highest mean percentage among the four frames in the leadership styles. Factor 1 explains 18.278% of the variance.

For the symbolic (theater) frame, four leadership styles loaded on Factor 3 to include 1.d (.731), 2.d (.786), 3.d (.832), and 4.d (.634). Leadership styles 5.d (.679) and 6.d (.685) loaded on Factor 6, seemingly inconsistently with the finding that leadership styles 5.d ("creativity") and 6.d ("visionary") report proportionately high percentages for the symbolic frame. Therefore, while the findings of the factor analysis are consistent with
both the expectations of Bolman and Deal (1990, 2003) and the findings of the research study, it is inconsistent with the findings to observe that "creativity" and "visionary" failed to cluster with the other items of the symbolic frame. Factor 3 explained 12.733% of the variance.

For the structural (factory) frame, four leadership behaviors loaded on Factor 4 to include 1.a (.570), 2.a (.674), 4.a (.843), and 6.a (.751). Leadership styles 3.a (.837) and item 5.a (.835) loaded on Factor 5. Although the findings are consistent with the expectations of Bolman and Deal (1990, 2003) that items within each frame will cluster, leadership styles 3.a ("good decisions") and 5.a ("logical thinking") report the two highest mean percentages for the structural frame. It is therefore, inconsistent that the two leadership styles failed to cluster. Factor 4 explains 9.569% of the variance.

For the political frame, five leadership styles loaded on Factor 2 to include 1.c (.849), 2.c (.635), 3.c (.734), 5.c (.624), and 6.c (.882). Leadership style 4.c (.709) loaded on Factor 6. Because leadership style 4.c ("succeed in the face of conflict") reports the highest percentage for the political frame, it is inconsistent with the findings to observe its failure to cluster with the other
items for the political frame. However, the findings are consistent overall with the expectations of Bolman and Deal (1990, 2003). The findings are generally consistent with the research study, however, the factor analysis suggests that the political frame plays a stronger role in male superintendent leadership style than is revealed by the overall survey results. Factor 2 explains 15.821% of the variance.

Overall, the researcher observed that items generally clustered within the frames as conceptualized by Bolman and Deal (1990, 2003). The summary reports the following:

1. For the human resource (family) frame, five items loaded on Factor 1, and one item loaded on Factor 7.
2. For the symbolic (theater) frame, four items loaded on Factor 3, and two items loaded on Factor 6.
3. For the structural (factory) frame, four items loaded on Factor 4, and two items loaded on Factor 5.
4. For the political (jungle) frame, five items loaded on Factor 2, and one item loaded on Factor 6.
Although the findings report some anomalies, the findings generally cluster within the frames in a similar manner according to the expectations of Bolman and Deal (2003) and the Leadership Orientations (Self) Survey (1990). The inconsistencies can be explained by the limitations noted for the study or by the possibility that the frames possess multidimensional subsections (Edmunds, 2007). Additionally, it is possible that the participants applied different interpretations of the leadership styles section.

The factor analysis is generally consistent with the findings of the research study and the suggestion that New Jersey male superintendents are multidimensional leaders. The inconsistencies of the findings are reported primarily within the political frame. These inconsistencies can be attributed to the limitations of the study noted, but alternatively, the findings can also be interpreted to conjecture that the political frame is integrally intertwined throughout the frames and plays a more significant role in leadership style than is suggested by the survey data.
Comparison of Factor Analysis

The findings for the factor analysis for leadership behaviors are compared to the findings for the factor analysis for the female superintendent study (Edmunds, 2007). In both studies, the human resource, structural, and symbolic frames report the clustering predicted by the Bolman and Deal (1990, 2003). However, for the political frame, the female superintendent study reported that only one of eight behaviors loaded, splitting between two factors. In the male superintendent study, all eight behaviors for the political frame loaded on one or more factors, predominantly on Factor 2, which explains 8.4% of the variance. This finding can be interpreted to support Edmunds’ conclusion that female superintendents in the New Jersey study struggle with the conceptualization of power or view it differently (2007). This finding can be interpreted to also support critics of the Bolman and Deal survey (Dunlap & Schmuck, 1995), who suggest that contemporary leadership survey instruments are biased toward male stereotypes of leadership and power.

The research study also compares the findings of the factor analysis for leadership styles to the findings for the female superintendent study (Edmunds, 2003). The
researcher, however, notes the limitations of the study as a result of the fact that a number of male participants did not correctly interpret the specific directions of the survey. Both the male superintendent and the female superintendent studies generally support the expectations of Bolman and Deal (1990, 2003) that items aligned with each frame will cluster in a similar manner. However, the leadership styles do not generally load consistently with the findings of the research study.

Only two leadership styles failed to load in the female superintendent study, and both are associated with the political frame. The four remaining leadership styles associated with the political frame, however, loaded predominantly on Factor 1, identifying it as the most important frame. The leadership styles associated with the human resource frame, loaded on Factors 3 and 5, and the leadership styles associated with the symbolic frame loaded on Factors 1, 4, and 6. All leadership styles associated with the structural frame loaded on Factor 2.

In the male superintendent study, leadership styles associated with the human resource frame loaded predominantly on Factor 1, identifying it as the most important frame. Of the items associated with the political
frame, five of six loaded on Factor 2, and the remaining item loaded on Factor 6. The leadership styles for the symbolic frame loaded primarily on Factor 3, and those of the structural frame loaded primarily on Factor 4.

Thus, the findings for the two studies in regard to leadership style for the political frame are seemingly inconsistent with the overall findings of the research study. For example, one of the items associated with the political frame that failed to load in the female study, item 4.c ("ability to succeed in the face of conflict"), was also the only item in the male superintendent study that did not cluster on Factor 2, loading on Factor 6 (all five other items clustered on Factor 2). This finding suggests that item 4.c may be an anomaly worthy of study for its interpretation by both males and females. The findings also suggest that the political frame may play a more prominent role superintendent leadership style for both males and females than is suggested by the overall findings of both studies. However, the findings are reported in the context of the study's limitations.

Summary of Quantitative Findings

The quantitative findings suggest that the New Jersey male superintendent is a multidimensional leader. While no
one frame is dominant, the New Jersey male superintendent views his leadership style primarily through the human resource (family) lens, followed closely by the structural (factory) and symbolic (theater) frames. The least-reported frame is the political frame. However, the data suggest that the political frame may play a role that is woven throughout the four frames.

A comparison of the findings with the female superintendent study (Edmunds, 2007), suggests more similarities than differences. Both males and females reported a proportionately higher percentage of engagement in the human resource (family) frame; both males and females reported a proportionately lower percentage of engagement in the political (jungle) frame. While the data suggest that both males and females exhibit characteristics of multidimensional leadership style, the data clearly support a conclusion that females report a proportionately higher engagement in the human resource frame than males and a proportionately lower percentage of engagement in the political frame than males. The study suggests, however, that the use of power by New Jersey public school superintendents plays a pervasive, dominant role and is in need of further study.
CHAPTER VI

The New Jersey Male Superintendency: Construction of Leadership Style Using a Qualitative Approach

Introduction

Chapter VI utilizes grounded theory to build data and construct theory in regard to leadership preference style and use of power of the contemporary New Jersey male superintendent. Using a semistructured interview format, 11 interviews were conducted by the researcher with currently employed New Jersey male superintendents. The interview framework was developed by Edmunds (2007) for a recent study of female New Jersey superintendents, but was slightly modified for the male study.

Analysis of the qualitative data was conducted through a line-by-line reading and rereading of the transcript data, followed by coding, developing categories with properties and dimensions, and relating the central concepts (Corbin & Strauss, 2008; Strauss & Corbin, 1998). The analysis is organized into three sections. Section I presents findings and conclusions formed in the context of the Four Frame Model of Leadership (Bolman and Deal, 2003).
Section II presents findings and conclusions formed in the context of the Three-Dimensional Model of Power (Fowler, 2004). Section III presents findings and conclusions formed in the context of development of a contemporary leadership profile of the New Jersey male superintendent. Findings are compared to a recent New Jersey female superintendent study where applicable (Edmunds, 2007).

Purpose

The purpose of the research study is to examine the leadership preference style and the use of power of the New Jersey male superintendent in the context of the Four Frame Model (Bolman & Deal, 2003) and the Three-Dimensional Model of Power (Fowler, 2004). The Four Frame Model includes the structural (factory), human resource (family), political (jungle), and symbolic (theater) frames. The Three-Dimensional Model of Power includes explicit exercises of power, the mobilization of bias, and the shaping of consciousness (Fowler, 2004). The research study identifies dominant leadership style preference, if any, of contemporary New Jersey male superintendents and examines their use of power in the superintendency. Additionally, the research study compares and contrasts its findings with
the findings of the recent study of New Jersey female superintendents (Edmunds, 2007).

The qualitative interviews were scheduled with 11 currently employed male superintendents throughout the state of New Jersey. The researcher solicited a cross-section of participants based upon geographic or county location, student population size, DFG grouping, and superintendent experience. The researcher personally interviewed 9 superintendents in their offices or other setting of choice; 2 superintendents were interviewed by phone by mutual agreement of the superintendent and researcher.

In order to protect the anonymity and confidentiality of the participants in the research study, they are identified as Suburban Superintendent Andrew (#1, DFG, J), Urban Superintendent Ben (#2, DFG, GH), Suburban Superintendent Charles (#3, DFG, FG), Urban Superintendent Dan (#4, DFG, FG), Urban Superintendent Edward (#5, DFG, A), Rural Superintendent Frank (#6, DFG, GH), Suburban Superintendent Greg (#7, DFG, FG), Suburban Superintendent Hank (#8, DFG, DE), Suburban Superintendent Ivan (#9, DFG, CD), Suburban Superintendent Jack (#10, DFG, I), and Urban
Superintendent Ken (#11, DFG, A). Chapter IV reports the overall demographic profile of the interview participants.

Section I: The Four Frames

Section I analyzes the responses of the participants to questions developed in the Edmunds's 2007 study in regard to the Four Frame Model of Leadership (Bolman & Deal, 2003). Section I is divided into four separate subsections to include the structural (factory) frame, the human resource (family) frame, the political (jungle) frame, and the symbolic (theater) frame. Each subsection is summarized with a table that describes the central category, subcategories, properties, and dimensions of the frame that were developed by the researcher. Additionally, the findings for each frame are compared and contrasted to the findings of the New Jersey female superintendent study (Edmunds, 2007).

The Four Frame Model of Leadership: Research Questions 1 and 2

1. To what extent are leadership behaviors and styles of New Jersey male superintendents understood by applying the Four Frame Model of Bolman and Deal? What dominant frames, if any, are identified?
2. To what extent do the findings compare to the findings of a recent study of leadership preferences of New Jersey female superintendents (Edmunds, 2007)?

**Structural (Factory) Frame**

Participants were given a brief overview of the Four Frame Model of Bolman and Deal (2003). The structural (factory) frame was described as follows: "Factories suggest that the work of schools as an organization is similar to a well-oiled machine that can be adjusted through structures to operate smoothly and efficiently" (Edmunds, 2007). The brief description was followed by three questions that asked the participants what kind of structures they believed most influenced their work, whether or not they had recently reorganized their administrative structure and if so, what positive or negative effects resulted, and to identify any other administrative structures that were essential to their work (Edmunds, 2007). Table 23 reports the findings for the central category, subcategories, dimensions, and properties of the structural (factory) frame.
Table 23

Central Category of Structural (Factory) Frame: District Structures Exist to Support Accountability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Central category</th>
<th>Properties</th>
<th>Dimensions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Structure supports accountability</td>
<td>District outputs</td>
<td>Achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Financial oversight</td>
<td>Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Role of key stakeholders</td>
<td>Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mandates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subcategory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central office as catalyst</td>
<td>Define expectations</td>
<td>Communicate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Define responsibilities</td>
<td>Delegate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Set tone</td>
<td>Instruct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prominent role of curriculum and instruction</td>
<td>Supervisory team</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strong principals</td>
<td>Visibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Credibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Autonomy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political acumen/use of power</td>
<td>Internal staff</td>
<td>Communicate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>External stakeholders</td>
<td>Reassign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Political insight</td>
<td>Eliminate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Central category: District structures exist to support accountability. Participants identified administrative structures and described their purpose as to support accountability. Structures were viewed primarily in terms of key personnel, often at the central office or building principal level. Not surprisingly, smaller districts emphasized the necessity of multidimensional
responsibilities, and larger districts identified central office staff and building principals as prominent leaders in day-to-day accountability. Suburban Superintendent Jack, for example, stated, "Were the central office not in place, I, or we, would not have been as successful as we are without our central office in place that we presently have. That's for sure." Participants were mindful of doing more with less and emphasize student achievement and budget accountability.

Three participants described alignment of key personnel structures with building configuration. Urban Superintendent Edward realigned district elementary schools and reorganized additional curricular positions. Suburban Superintendent Ivan closed two elementary schools, and Suburban Superintendent Hank reported, "We took the assistant principals from (those) schools and moved them to the intermediate level where the population shifts."

Restructuring was viewed to aid monitoring of achievement accountability, budget accountability, and mission accountability.

Most participants reported a need for clear lines of authority and chain of command. Urban Superintendent Ben stated, "It's important that we have a chart of
organizational accountability primarily at the central office level." Suburban Superintendent Hank stated, "I think our chain of command is very important . . . you want to be accessible to people but you also want people to deal at the appropriate level." Chain of command was linked to communication and building autonomy.

Several participants stated the importance of the ability of key players to crossover and support others. Urban Superintendent Edward stated, "In other words, everybody crosses, we don't have any real clear lines so everybody can cross over and support the other person. Everyone has a responsibility, and everybody tries to hold each other accountable." Suburban Superintendent Ivan stated, "And both persons have been cross-trained in all the curriculum areas, so if you can't get one supervisor, you can get the other." The underlying theme was recognition that stakeholders understand responsibilities and communicate with others and at the same time, support each other.

Participants frequently identified mandates and constraints that overshadowed their leadership. Suburban Superintendent Jack stated, "Many of the state mandates that we're now subject to are directly implemented via the
Suburban Superintendent Greg described his inability to fill a key curriculum and instructional position and stated, "There's a budget limitation, and, of course, the state always has their limitations because of the administrative costs decree." Only one participant, Urban Superintendent Dan, included a reference to technology in the structural context.

**Subcategory: Central office is a catalyst and prominent player in the role of curriculum and instruction.**

In the current context of NCLB and federal and state mandates, the role of the central office as a catalyst and prominent player in instructional leadership is not surprising. Suburban Superintendent Ivan stated, "We've reorganized our supervisors of curriculum and instruction . . . so what we finally decided to call them was supervisors of curriculum, instruction, and assessment, because that's what it's all about, especially today."

Suburban Superintendent Jack stated, "We have added some supervisory positions for curriculum, which have been very, very beneficial, focusing on literacy, math, and science."

Superintendent Ken stated, "The supervisors . . . are much more visible in the classroom and are providing much more
support to teachers than they've ever done before, which is part of the rationale for going in the direction." Active, pervasive supervision of instruction and curriculum were described as an integral component of accountability structures.

Subcategory: Political acumen and use of power are necessary. The structural analysis detects overtones of political acumen and use of power, a finding that supports the suggestion that the Four Frame Model possesses overlapping, multidimensional characteristics (Bolman & Deal, 2003). Superintendent Greg stated, "And I've always told them that there's two ways to do it. You can do it either with personal power or you can use positional power when it is a must." Several participants discussed personnel reassignment or position elimination in the district under the guise of restructuring. Suburban Superintendent Greg described creation of an assistant principal position to eliminate a problematic position at the high school. Urban Superintendent Dan discussed the realignment of the assistant superintendent position to assume more responsibility and strengthen the oversight of curriculum and instruction in a district described as "very, very contentious." Urban Superintendent Ken
described the reassignment and restructuring of a position of director of curriculum and instruction in order to strengthen the visibility and credibility of the position. Inherent in the personnel moves was political maneuvering to contain or eliminate problems as well as to strengthen curriculum.

Another theme that suggested political nuance was that of the importance of stakeholders and lines of communication. Suburban Superintendent Hank stated, "If there is one (thing) that's led to success in our community school, it's been the coalition of parents, staff members, and our school district, such that they work together in unison for a common goal." When discussing the district's long-range educational plan, Suburban Superintendent Andrew described a district committee designed to develop goals for the district. Several participants referenced regular meetings with administrative councils and principals, and most participants voiced the need for good public relations. For example, Suburban Superintendent Charles noted the importance of "presentation to various stakeholders to communicate our results." Overall, participants described an integral theme of communication and public relations that equates the use of political
savvy to structure the organization in such a way as to promote competence, credibility, and efficiency in the support of the district mission.

Summary of structural (factory) frame: Findings of New Jersey male superintendent study. The analysis concludes that the overriding theme of the structural frame is the ability of structures to support the accountability of the school mission. Structures are viewed primarily in the context of personnel to include key stakeholders of the district, especially the central office staff, but also include school configuration and realignment. The prominence of the role of curriculum and instruction and the need to establish supervisory ladders to support its delivery are viewed as key ingredients in achieving accountability.

The findings generally support the findings of the quantitative survey data. The data suggest that New Jersey male superintendents frequently engage in leadership styles and behaviors associated with the structural (factory) frame and that a theme of power lies within the structural frame. The data also support a conclusion that New Jersey male superintendent leadership conforms to a contemporary role of instructional leader and is thus nonconformant to
the stereotyped image of the male superintendent as primarily a managerial leader. The data support recent studies that have reinforced the prominent roles today of superintendent as the instructional, managerial, and political leader of the district (Cuban, 1998; Lashway, 2002). The data support Glass and Franceschini (2007) who suggested that NCLB has altered the already complex role of the superintendent.

Comparison of structural (factory) frame to findings of New Jersey female superintendent study. A comparison of the analysis of the structural (factory) frame reveals similarities and differences between the New Jersey male superintendent study and the New Jersey female superintendent study. The most compelling similarity is the conclusion in both studies that key structures are defined by the involvement of key personnel of the district. However, the male superintendent study reports little or no emphasis on board governance when discussing the structural (factory) frame and places a strong emphasis on central office staff. The female superintendent study reported an emphasis on board and union leadership as key structures. Both studies share to some extent the inclusion of strong principal leadership as important. Only one participant in
the male study identified union leadership as structure. None of the study participants discussed the board of education as a key player within the structural frame.

The Edmunds study noted the absence of several key structures, including "schedules, meetings, agendas, board of education meetings, the curriculum and/or curriculum cycle, the budget and the budget cycles" (2007, p. 98). In contrast, participants in the male study focused almost exclusively on the role of curriculum and instruction, accountability, and the impact of budget.

While the analyses can be interpreted to suggest differences in leadership style between male and female superintendents, the findings are limited in that even in the relatively short period of time separating the two studies, the emphasis on student accountability and an escalating budget crisis have dominated the front burner of New Jersey school leadership.

Human Resource (Family) Frame

Questions aligned with the human resource (family) frame were introduced with a brief description of the frame. The human resource frame was described as follows: "Families suggest that the work of an organization is primarily grounded in people and that the human resource is
the most important resource." Participants were asked to describe their views on human resources in their district, how relationships were developed and sustained with board members, and how relationships were repaired among administrators, staff, and parents (Edmunds, 2007).

Central category: People and relationships are key. The central category for the human resource (family) frame was characterized as follows: People and relationships are key ingredients. Participants reported an emphasis on teachers, children, parents, and board members and the development of deep ties and commitment to the community and culture. Table 24 reports a summary for the human resource frame.

Most participants stated that a district's biggest strength is its people. Suburban Superintendent Andrew stated, "I think human resources are the key component." Urban Superintendent Ben added, "I think probably our biggest strength is our human resources department." Suburban Superintendent Jack stated, "I guess one word to sum up, and I'll elaborate of course, critical. We are in the people business." Many participants immediately referenced teachers. Urban Superintendent Edward remarked, "It's the most important. We're only as good as our worst
Table 24

Central Category of Human Resource (Family) Frame: People and Relationships Are Key

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Properties</th>
<th>Dimensions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>People business</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>Caring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Children</td>
<td>Well-being</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mission</td>
<td>Belonging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conflict</td>
<td>Mediation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subcategory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiring practices are crucial</td>
<td>Recruit</td>
<td>Effective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Train</td>
<td>Diverse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Retain</td>
<td>Barriers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board relations are crucial</td>
<td>Know role</td>
<td>Availability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Relationship</td>
<td>Honesty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Artistry</td>
<td>Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Political acumen</td>
<td>Disclosure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Power bases</td>
<td>Comfort/fit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication is key</td>
<td>Articulation</td>
<td>Inclusive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mediation</td>
<td>Immediate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Role of media</td>
<td>Frequent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recognize</td>
<td>Visible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>resistance</td>
<td>Chain of command</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Power structures</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

teacher." Urban Superintendent Ken remarked, "The most important person in any school as it relates to student achievement is the teacher." Generally, participants agreed upon the importance of human resources, and teachers are primarily those first referenced.
Several participants extended the reference to teachers to include connections teachers make with children. Rural Superintendent Frank continued, "They do engage themselves quite deeply with their students, forming strong relationships, and using those relationships to help motivate the students and keep them working hard." Suburban Superintendent Ivan remarked, "I constantly say that our business is all about people. Programs don't change kids, connections do." Overall, participants reported the importance of teachers and students as the primary players when discussing human resources.

District size influenced perspective. Suburban Superintendent Greg emphasized the ability of staff members to perform multiple responsibilities, saying, "Being a small school and the fact that everybody knows everybody, I think it's really important, because we don't have the resources that bigger districts have." Suburban Superintendent Hank highlighted the efforts of his large district to address staff needs through employee benefit programs: "We want to keep our staff knowing that the school district is interested in them and their well being." Thus, smaller district superintendents often focused on human resources from the daily perspective of
getting the job done, while superintendents of larger
districts often pointed to employee programs and benefits.

Long-term employment within a district also influenced
perspective. Several participants rose through the ranks of
their districts to become superintendent. Although most
participants generally acknowledged the importance of
community when addressing the subject of human resources,
those with more years of experience—often their entire
careers—within a district were more explicit about doing
so. Suburban Superintendent Greg stated, “Being here for as
long as I have, I have strong ties to the community, the
parents, and right now the students that are coming into
our district are children of students that I had. There’s a
strong tie.” Deep ties and commitment to the district were
often discussed in the context of human resources.

Lastly, the concepts of conflict and power
occasionally surfaced in the context of human resources.
Suburban Superintendent Andrew described situations in
which, “I’ve had to become more authoritative; sometimes
I’ve had to back away.” Urban Superintendent Dan discussed
community power structures in the context of the human
resource frame: “So there’s definitely some elements of
family relationships in the community that include the
schools, include the teaching staff, include the board members, that’s very strong, and yet there’s been a contentiousness and divisiveness among the board members themselves." Participants generally associated human resources with the ability to resolve conflict. The role of the superintendent in conflict resolution was viewed as crucial and use of personal or positional power as necessary.

Overall, participants placed an emphasis on the importance of staff, especially the role of teachers, and the need to support and retain teachers. Only one participant, Urban Superintendent Ben, referenced diversity and multicultural consciousness. Participants voiced a general recognition that helping staff to do a better job when in the classroom is desirable. Mission accomplishment was directly tied to "connecting with kids." Suburban Superintendent Ivan discussed a learning pyramid, "I’ve trained every teacher that the first thing in the pyramid is belonging. Kids want to feel they belong." Yet inevitably, themes of organizational strife and the ability of the superintendent to mediate and resolve conflict through use of power, themes usually associated with the
political frame, arose in the context of human resource discussions.

**Subcategory: Hiring practices are crucial.** Closely related to the central category is the subcategory that superintendents carry important responsibilities in the area of hiring. Suburban Superintendent Andrew stated, “I think the role of hiring is the most important function that a superintendent has.” Suburban Superintendent Jack reinforced his role in district hiring practices: “Here we go to great lengths through the interview process to select teachers, support staff, maintenance, and custodians. Everyone who’s hired in this district sits in the seat you’re sitting in, and I interview them.” Generally, participants echoed that a crucial responsibility of superintendents is to build human capital.

Several superintendents extended discussion of hiring practices to include the recruitment, training, and retention of staff. Urban Superintendent Ben referred to, “How we recruit people, how we retain people, especially in getting a multicultural staff—and that will become clear as we talk more about the nature of my district.” Suburban Superintendent Hank added, “If the single most important thing you do in your job is to hire the right people, this
is the group you need to have a cohesive workplace. Otherwise, it's not going to happen.” Suburban Superintendent Jack emphasized support and retention. “We do everything in our power to help them: We support them, we give them phenomenal places to work. Our kids are great kids; our parents are very supportive.” Urban Superintendent Dan stated, “I tell the teachers my job is to support you. I’m here to get you resources, the resources you need to do your job.” Thus, the superintendent’s role was defined as one that hires, supports, and retains key staff.

Several participants specifically pointed to barriers that exist when dealing with personnel. Urban Superintendent Edward discusses union contracts: “There are association contracts, there are all kinds of things that we have to abide by so that the human resources, which are the most important and most valuable resource we have at times, are compromised, because you’re not able to make a quick decision. It takes you a long time to move people out of the way.” Unions, contracts, and tenure were generally perceived as barriers.

When discussing human resources in their districts, participants invariably shifted to discussion regarding the
importance of hiring qualified personnel and providing resources and support for their training and retention. Subtle themes of power structures and use of power are detected in the context of discussion of personnel management. Overall, most participants generally agreed that hiring and retaining competent staff is one of the most important responsibilities of the superintendent.

**Subcategory: Board relations are crucial.** Participants acknowledged the importance of developing and sustaining relationships with board of education members. Most viewed the ability to build and sustain board relationships as vital to success and longevity. Suburban Superintendent Andrew stated, "That’s really an artistry question in my mind." Urban Superintendent Ken described board relationships as "more art than science." Superintendent Dan stated, "The developing and sustaining of relationships is really the key of the superintendent’s success." Trust, honesty, and respect were recurring dimensions of the relationships described.

The exercise of political acumen and the ability to recognize formal and informal power bases to build coalitions, surfaced in discussions of human resources. Urban Superintendent Ben noted, "One of the things I
learned very quickly as superintendent [was that] politicking, meeting with board members, schmoozing board members, having lunch with board members, is critical to everyone's success." Urban Superintendent Dan called it "a critical piece. I've spend time personally with each one of them." Repeatedly, themes of the political frame surfaced within the human resource context, especially when discussing board relationships.

Deep ties and commitment to the district were common for participants who experience long-term employment in their districts, often working their way up the ladder to the position of superintendent. These superintendents described development of personal power as a result. Urban Superintendent Edward stated, "You have to understand, that becomes a real different situation in every community. I live in this community. I've worked in this community for 30-some years. I know every board member as a board member, and I know them as friends." Suburban Superintendent Greg stated, "Again, being here as long as I have, most of the members of the board I've known prior to even being an administrator. I was a teacher. I'm open with them. I will keep them informed to everything. They let me do my job." Participants viewed the exercise of personal power as
preferable to positional power when discussing the human resource frame.

The importance of trust, honesty, and transparency were reiterated by the participants. When speaking of board relationships, Superintendent Frank discussed the importance of transparency: “I think in the end if you go for complete disclosure and honesty, there's always the opportunity to sort of bring things back and sit down and repair wounds that may have been caused in conflict, and out of it, I think, grows some respect for the honesty and transparent approach that you take.”

Discussion of board relationships reinforced participants' emphasis on the importance of the role of hiring. Suburban Superintendent Hank remarked, “The board of education is the single most important body because they are the body that votes, and they are the body that hires. If the single most important thing you do in your job is to hire the right people, then this is the group you need to have a cohesive workplace. Otherwise, it's not going to happen.”

Overall, relationships with board of education members centered on trust, honesty, respect, and acknowledgment of separate roles. Several superintendents
stated an insistence upon ground rules of “no surprises” between board and superintendent and insisting upon “children first.” Suburban Superintendent Andrew stated, “That being said, there’s a tremendous amount of responsibility, which I think has to be based on trust between the board and superintendent. If the board doesn’t trust and respect the superintendent, the relationship is not productive.” Suburban Superintendent Charles noted, “You definitely have to keep them informed. Be honest even when you’re telling them something they don’t want to hear, and you always have to be professional.”

Communication was a recurring theme; it was closely aligned with themes of collaboration. Suburban Superintendent Jack stated, “Open communication. Communication is critical, right from the top down.” Suburban Superintendent Ivan noted, “To me I believe in the three Cs: communicate, collaborate, and celebrate,” while Urban Superintendent Ben reinforced the importance of “Face to face talking. Nothing replaces one-on-one communication.” Suburban Superintendent Hank added the dimension of media and the Internet age. He described the proliferation of communication mediums and the problems associated with dealing with misinformation that can spread
like wildfire. He stated, "The rumors and innuendo, that has really changed the position of how you really need to work very closely with your administration and faculty."

Inevitably, a discussion of relationships is linked to an emphasis on communication. Relationships are also commonly linked to conflict, and conflict is ultimately linked to communication. Several participants noted that even the best communication style is unsuccessful if not met halfway by the listener. Suburban Superintendent Greg stated, "Rational people, you can sit down and talk to; irrational people can talk until you're blue in the face, and it won't matter what you say." Urban Superintendent Edward stated, "I have found that things are best when you can change the very fiber of your soul; you can be changed. You can't make change unless you change yourself."

Several participants raised issues of power and political maneuvering in the context of communication. Suburban Superintendent Ivan stated, "We try to do that in a positive way, because, once again, politically, you send out an angry parent, you're going to have a no vote at budget time. But if you can, try and work it out. And I always say, Let's try to solve it at the lowest level."
Summary of human resource (family) frame: Findings of New Jersey male superintendent study. The analysis concludes that recurring themes emphasize the importance of people and relationships to ensuring the success of the school mission. Relationships have many dimensions, the most important of which are students, teachers, and board governance. Communication and the subtle exercise of power also overlap. The importance of hiring good teachers stands out as a superintendent priority. This is coupled with recognition of the importance to train and retain them.

The findings generally support the findings of the quantitative data, suggesting that New Jersey male superintendents frequently engage in leadership behaviors and styles associated with the human resource frame and are multidimensional leaders. The data support the suggestion that New Jersey male superintendents conform to a contemporary role of instructional leaders and have broken from the mold of a traditional managerial leader.

Comparison of human resource (family) frame to findings of New Jersey female superintendent study. The findings of the male and female studies report similarities and differences. Both males and females place a high priority on relationships, especially in terms of those
with students and teachers. Themes of trust, respect, communication, and teamwork are also reiterated.

In terms of differences, male participants emphasized hiring practices as compared to female participants, who emphasized the observation and supervision process. This may be explained partially by considering the literature that has suggested that women, more so than men, spend more time in the classroom and often work in positions for curriculum and instruction (Dana & Burisaw, 2006). Language choice also identifies subtle differences, suggesting gender roles. For example, male participants generally did not use the word "nurture" when speaking about teaching staff, instead using words such as "support" or "provide." Edmunds (2007) reported female participants "nurtured" staff, and one participant, although in a negative context, used the word "mothering." This supports the literature suggesting females identify more strongly with gender roles and the family frame (Bolman & Deal, 2003). Finally, males comfortably made references to the role of power in the context of the human resource frame, while Edmunds reported that females were uncomfortable with discussion of power. However, overall, both males and females reported a preference for the human resource frame and those behaviors
and styles associated with it. These findings are consistent with the findings of the quantitative survey data.

Political (Jungle) Frame

The questions regarding the political (jungle) frame were introduced with a brief description of the frame as follows: "Jungles represent the notion that the work of the leader relies most heavily on a power play or political interplay in which building coalitions and leveraging power with stakeholders is critical" (Edmunds, 2007). The brief description was followed by three questions that asked participants which coalitions in their district were most helpful, which coalitions were the most resistant to change, and how the balance of resources was controlled in the district.

Central category of political (jungle) frame. The central category is identified, as all politics are local. The analysis concludes that identification of community standards and power sources, both formal and informal, and skillful use of communication tools are necessary to build and sustain coalitions in the leadership model. The responses of several participants paint a portrait of a successful school leader as one who is deeply committed to
community and strongly bound to it by experience. In this context, the school leader often relies upon personal, not positional, power and prefers an inclusive approach to governance, but governance where central responsibility remains the domain of the superintendent. Power is discerned to emanate from years spent earning respect and building relationships that culminate with confidence. Less experienced participants acknowledged these aspects of the position and perhaps relied more heavily on stakeholder involvement. All participants accepted the political nature of the job as necessary in order to accomplish the school's mission and support the overall community, in which schools play a central role.

All participants acknowledged stakeholder involvement as necessary in order to pass budgets, and budget was an overriding, practical concern across the four frames. Subcategories borne from the analysis include the necessity of involvement of stakeholders, use of communication as a powerful tool, the emergent role of state and local government in school governance, and prioritizing resources around students and goals. Table 25 reports the summary of the political frame.
Table 25

Central Category of the Political Frame: All Politics Are Local

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Central category</th>
<th>Properties</th>
<th>Dimensions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All politics are local</td>
<td>Prominence of BOE</td>
<td>Deep ties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Power sources</td>
<td>Respect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resistance</td>
<td>Relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consensus</td>
<td>Political acumen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subcategory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build and maintain coalitions</td>
<td>Presence</td>
<td>Stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Visibility</td>
<td>Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teambuilding</td>
<td>Watchdogs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teamwork</td>
<td>Deep ties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication as a powerful tool</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Explanation</td>
<td>Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unification</td>
<td>Relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Persuasion</td>
<td>Power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mediation</td>
<td>Deep listening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergent role of state and local government</td>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>Autonomy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>Relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Teamwork</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prioritize resources around students and goals</td>
<td>Instruction</td>
<td>Limitations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mission</td>
<td>Concessions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consistently different</td>
<td>Fairness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dialogue</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Central category: All politics are local. Most superintendents related stories during the interview that suggested that mastering the unique political aspects of their communities was crucial to attaining success, especially to pass budgets. Suburban Superintendent Andrew described several community organizations, best characterized as "watchdogs," that challenged various district initiatives, especially those involving aesthetic or environmental issues for the community. He described one incident with the Appearance Committee over plans to install a neon sign in front of the high school. After driving around one evening through the community and area towns, he took note of the garish nature of the proposed sign. In a subsequent meeting regarding the sign, Suburban Superintendent Andrew told an exuberant constituency, "I'm not going to proceed with the sign, because I don't think it is in keeping with this community." Rural Superintendent Frank pointed out, "On our board of education there is a certain power structure to it, and there is a coalition there that helps me reach the nonschool citizens in town: seniors, older adults with children that have moved on, and that's an important power base." Suburban Superintendent Greg described strong ties to local government to include
the mayor and police. Suburban Superintendent Hank reported the importance of learning to deal with negative forces in a community to build success. Suburban Superintendent Ivan related calculated efforts to establish relationships with the township. Later, he added, "I tell the board, don't give up those meetings four times a year with them because you will strike upon something."

Reinforcing the suggestion of the interrelatedness of the four frames of the Bolman and Deal's (2003) model, Urban Superintendent Dan discussed a local "power base" in the context of the human resource frame. Later, in discussion of the political frame, Urban Superintendent Dan repeated, "I described the two basic ones that I see: the old Italian folks and the new Korean community, which is very active and very well organized." He added, "All those coalitions can be helpful if I can work with them building relationships. I'm just beginning to do that."

Forming coalitions and identifying opposition are common themes of both the political and human resource frames. Overlapping themes of building relationships, communication, and resolving conflict are present. Related to this is additional overlap with the structural frame in the context of meetings to build cohesiveness and
communicate. These findings strengthen the suggestion that
the frames are multidimensional and may share
characteristics that are difficult to separate out.

Subcategory: Stakeholder involvement is necessary.
Prominent aspects of the central category are those of
building relationships and forming coalitions, themes also
identified in the human resource frame. Participants
described the importance of teamwork and exercising
fairness among constituents.

Participants described an abundance of partners in the
district. These are most commonly described as the board of
education, central office staff, parent organizations,
teachers, municipal government, the business community,
clergy, and senior citizens. A recurring theme is the
crucial nature of the central office staff. Urban
Superintendent Edward stated, "My staff, my people who work
for me, are the most important. My assistant
superintendent, my administration team, are very important
to me. After that, I fight with everybody." Suburban
Superintendent Ivan stated, "Without a doubt, the best
coalition is my central office administration team. It's
open dialogue. It's trust."
The value of coalitions often takes on aspects of budget strategies. Suburban Superintendent Ivan described the over-55 community in his district. He reported conducting board meetings at clubhouses. He bussed kids to perform plays. Later, he described efforts to bring senior citizens into the school as volunteers. Networking to pass referendums was a related theme. Suburban Superintendent Andrew discussed a referendum initiative: "What I did was I had about 50 meetings with anybody who would meet with me."

Coalitions with state government arose primarily within the context of participants of urban districts. Urban Superintendent Edward stated, "I have great connections with our senators and assemblymen. I talk to them all the time. I am a single minded political person. I'm only concerned about ( )." In this sense, the discussions evoked aspects of influence and power.

Subcategory: Communication is a powerful tool. The power of communication is closely tied to building successful coalitions. In this sense, Fowler noted, "Discourse, especially speech, has always been an important instrument of power for school leaders and power interconnect" (2004, p. 48). Participants discussed communication as a tool to identify problems, mediate
disputes, and arrive at consensus. Suburban Superintendent Hank stated, “In schools, that’s so important that you have everyone, not so much agreeing, but working together with getting the right message out as to what we’re trying to accomplish as a school district.” Suburban Superintendent Ivan stated, “There will always be ways you find commonalities rather than differences.”

Overall, the value of communication is reflected as power to educate, explain, unify, persuade, mediate, change, and attain goals. Communication is a thread woven tightly throughout the four frames.

Subcategory: The role of state and local government in school governance is escalating. Against a backdrop of NCLB accountability and a dismal economic outlook, participants voiced a perceived loss of autonomy and looming budget pressures. Two participants represented Abbott Districts (DFG, A). As Abbott Districts, these districts are under state control and receive substantial annual funding from the state of New Jersey. However, they are also subject to heightened scrutiny. Urban Superintendent Edward referenced “accountability staff” to “deal with data.” He related a series of scenarios involving the use of leverage to obtain concessions from teachers and staff and in one instance, a
community organization. He explained numerous savings negotiated in regard to health care costs, transportation costs, staffing, and contract language. Urban Superintendent Edward was one of the few participants to openly discuss measures of pressure on staff in the area of budget. His overt references to power might have been a result of several factors to include superintendent tenure, an umbrella of state control, and the commanding confidence of his district.

Among the other participants, references were more subtle. Suburban Superintendent Jack stated, “I’m sure you’re aware the state has taken a lot of that autonomy away from us in terms of—you know—we have a hard cap.” Suburban Superintendent Hank noted significant administrative downsizing over the years in “dealing with budget constraints.” Suburban Superintendent Jack stated, “Normally, under circumstances five and seven years ago, we would just go ahead and do. Now we go to the taxpayer and ask them for approval on certain projects. We’re limited.” The encroaching role of state government was a recurring theme among the four frames.

Several participants, however, carried the suggestion further, to the municipal level. Suburban Superintendent
Ivan referenced measures to bolster relationships with the township governance, noting that, "You're now vying for the same state dollars." He added, "Sometimes the governor and the legislature in their wisdom are now pitting municipalities against the school board for dollars."

Suburban Superintendent Greg stated, "I've built strong ties to the local government where we help each other: the mayor, the police chief, and so forth." References to current issues of shared services and regionalization were topics interspersed in discussion.

Subcategory: Prioritizing resources must be directed at student needs and board goals. Bolman and Deal (2003) defined the allocation of scarce resources as a dimension of the political frame. Interview participants generally acknowledged fairness and the needs of children as paramount concerns in the allocation of resources, but wanted flexibility in its distribution. Suburban Superintendent Charles stated, "I try to approach things with a motto of 'consistently different.'" Instructional needs of teachers and students were priorities. For example, Suburban Superintendent Ivan stated, "If the balance has to be tipped, the winner is curriculum and
instruction." Participant focus remained centered on instructional priorities and relationships.

**Summary of political (jungle) frame: Findings of New Jersey male superintendent study.** The central category of the political frame is summarized as a belief that all politics are local. Participants recognized distinctive characteristics that defined their districts. They stressed the need to read the political climate in order to prioritize, problem solve, and form coalitions. Identification of power sources, stakeholder involvement, formation of relationships and coalitions, fostering communication, recognizing the role of government, and prioritizing resources were dominant themes. The use of power was suggested as integrally woven throughout the frame, being viewed primarily in the context of communication and the ability to lead through the development and exercise of personal power. Accountability and supporting the best interests of children were overriding concerns.

The findings generally support the findings of the survey data. The data suggest that New Jersey male superintendents frequently engage in leadership styles associated with the political frame and maintain a level of
comfort with discussion of power and power bases, giving voice to the findings of the quantitative data. The findings suggest that New Jersey male superintendents conform to a contemporary role of superintendent as an instructional leader driven by meeting the needs of children, but remain uninhibited in exercising distinct attributes of personal or positional power if necessary. The findings support the suggestion that New Jersey male superintendents exercise multidimensional leadership style and are comfortable with use of power.

**Comparison of political (jungle) frame to findings of New Jersey female superintendent study.** The findings of the political frame report similarities and differences between males and females. While male participants reported a preference for consensus building, they stated no reluctance to exercise personal or positional power if necessary. Edmunds (2007) reported that female participants are uncomfortable with discussion of power.

**Symbolic (Theater) Frame**

Questions for the symbolic (theater) frame were introduced with a brief description. The symbolic frame was described as follows: "Theaters suggest that in order to motivate individuals in an organization, leaders must work
through symbolism, metaphor, and tradition" (Edmunds, 2007). Participants were asked three questions regarding the frame, including what were the most important symbols or "sacred cows" in their districts; how were symbols, traditions, or metaphors used to achieve goals; and how were individuals motivated to put their hearts and minds into their work.

The central category of the symbolic frame was categorized as follows: Symbols serve both motivational and utilitarian purposes. Participants described symbols that motivated, excited, and moved the district forward toward accomplishment of goals. Symbols were linked to promoting individual professional growth, fostering connections to children and community, forming coalitions to achieve goals, and passing budgets necessary to provide resources and support. Table 26 reports the summary of the symbolic frame.

Central category: Symbols serve motivational and utilitarian purposes. Participants consistently reported use of symbols in their organizations. Frequently mentioned symbols were animals, slogans, buildings, athletic teams, and music programs. Symbols were linked to motivational
Table 26

Central Category of Symbolic (Theater) Frame: Symbols Serve for Motivational and Utilitarian Purposes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Central Category</th>
<th>Properties</th>
<th>Dimensions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Symbols are motivational and utilitarian</td>
<td>Goals, Values, Resources, Mission</td>
<td>Power, Relationship, Coalitions, Passion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subcategory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symbols communicate connection</td>
<td>Bonds, Tradition, Identity</td>
<td>Learning, Engagement, Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symbols communicate success</td>
<td>Excellence, Cohesiveness, Community</td>
<td>Achievement, Autonomy, Pride</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symbols communicate intrinsic values</td>
<td>Citizenship, Spirituality, Community, Diversity</td>
<td>Service, Integrity, Commitment, Tolerance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symbols communicate power</td>
<td>Political, Personal, Communal</td>
<td>Power bases, Growth, History</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

strategies and defining district values. Passion and pride were recurring themes. Suburban Superintendent Andrew reported he encouraged administrators to routinely speak of district “pride” to staff, “because it was important for them to reflect on what they’ve been part of and how they
contributed to that. We want the new people to hear and understand what we meant by that.” Suburban Superintendent Hank stated, “We want people with passion for their job, because without passion, you just can’t succeed. And we want people that are going to go that extra mile and be everything they can be in whatever job they do to help the district achieve its goals and to create opportunities for kids.” Participants described the importance of symbols as fostering connection and commitment among stakeholders.

Participants returned again to themes of hiring. They searched for people predisposed to take on meaning in their lives and make a difference in the lives of others. Participants described symbols as facilitating the connection of teachers, students, and community. Symbols served to achieve cohesiveness and identity. Suburban Superintendent Ivan described a new school logo, “that tells anybody that comes to us what we are.” Suburban Superintendent Jack described district signs of “excellence in education” placed on every major roadway leading into the community to tell the world, “Education is king here.” Most participants reported a high level of association with
relationships were viewed as essential. Urban Superintendent Edward stated, "All my people are motivated. I will tell you that because of relationships. That's how they get motivated. We have relationships." Urban Superintendent Ken emphasized use of symbols: "Those are the things that I try to use to really get people to see: how important they are in the lives of the children, particularly children who come from environments that are not conducive of them achieving or being successful in school and beyond school in life." Suburban Superintendent Ivan described the learning pyramid, a symbol he placed strategically in every classroom. It represented "the most powerful thing that I believe, the connection between the teacher and the student. You can have all the best curriculum and instruction, but if you don't have a connection with the kids, you've lost." Symbols elicited themes of connection, relationship, and bringing about unity.

References to teamwork were also common. Suburban Superintendent Ivan stated, "I say, 'I need your help. I
can’t do it alone.’ Teamwork, those types of things are very important, and I try to model that mode of hard work.” Suburban Superintendent Jack stated, “It’s not about me. It’s about the team. Teaming is very important here.” Suburban Superintendent Andrew stated, “But some of the symbols that are used in the community are the sporting symbol of the herd and the idea that a herd has a tremendous amount of power even though individually [we] might not. They can have a tremendous amount of power moving forward.”

Symbols were also reported in the context of more practical concerns, like managing power bases and passing budgets. Suburban Superintendent Andrew described the role of symbols and how they can hold a system together or promote different things: “When we were doing a referendum, there were a number of very complex issues that we had to get people to understand, so we had to get it down to specific statements about what we’re trying to accomplish. So we created some of those things, which became kind of symbolic of what it is that we’re doing.”

Power bases were often described as board of education members or influential district coalitions, such as unions
and senior citizens. Urban Superintendent Edward stated, "If you talk to bus drivers—without bus drivers, this district would fall apart. That’s your sacred cow. If you talk to the teachers’ association—without teachers, this place would be out of business. We care about administrators; we don’t need that. So, there are many different sacred cows.” Suburban Superintendent Hank added, "We work very diligently in keeping labor peace and keeping our employees happy at what they do because a happy, satisfied employee is more productive.”

Several participants asserted that symbols could be fickle or even volatile in nature. Urban Superintendent Edward described the fluctuating nature of symbols and their manipulative value: “What happens is you use them in accomplishing what you’re trying to accomplish.” He added, “There are sacred cows all over the place. Whoever’s agenda you’re talking about that day is what the sacred cow would be.” Within the symbolic frame, suggestions of power and political maneuvering were common.

Competing symbols created tension. When describing competing programs of football and music, Urban Superintendent Dan stated, “I think I would put the
football program and the music program up as the primary sacred cows. It's ingrained in the culture, although the football program is ingrained in the old Italian culture, and the music program is ingrained in the new Korean culture. And there's resentment." He stated later, "I think that one of the things I need to do is to try and put an end to, or at least to mitigate, some of the resentment that some board members feel toward the music program."

Thus, symbols were described as both initiating and resolving conflict. Inherent in discussion of symbols was their usefulness in building district cohesiveness and healing district strife.

Subcategory: Symbols communicate connection. Fostering connection was a dominant theme. Participants reiterated the importance of forming deep bonds with children, the community, and each other. The role of tradition was frequently cited as giving meaning to the district and setting goals to which one could aspire. Buildings were frequent symbols cited that serve to unite communities. Urban Superintendent Edward stated, "The old high school is a symbol. They all want to keep it forever. They don't want to tear it down, so I won't tear it down, because that
would be the end of the world.” Later he added, “They talk it like we have to keep history: ‘Don’t take history away, our symbols are so important to us.’” Suburban Superintendent Hank described the original high school in a district now running three large high schools: “There are a lot of people in town that still think there is one high school and that it’s [the original] high school, . . . the tradition in the district.” Later he added, “But there’s still that thing that exists here about the original high school. It goes back, and it’s very deep with graduates.”

Holidays were another source of connection and identity. Suburban Superintendent Hank described a holiday of deep meaning to the community: “We have this thing for Halloween where everybody dresses up at Halloween. This district is unique. Halloween down here is like a national holiday, and it kind of alters the education program. So we’ve had some interesting discussion about, Can we tone that down a little bit?” Later, he added, “I think each community probably would have some things that may be part of the community that has always been, and some are worth taking on, and some are not. I think you have to use that judgment and see how important it is.” Participants
described the importance of the ability to identify symbols linked to district identity and warn of their elimination or interference without careful thought of the political consequences. Thus, symbols carried political risks and benefits in their use or misuse, raising the specter of the political frame.

Visibility was reported as connection. Suburban Superintendent Ivan stated, "But people need to see you. They need to know who you are and what you believe in, and that's very important." Recognition of others was also reported as connection. Suburban Superintendent Ivan stated, "Communicate, collaborate, and celebrate. And that's so important. We celebrate all the time for just about everything." Common themes of trust, loyalty, and pride surfaced in the context of the symbolic frame.

Subcategory: Symbols communicate success. Symbols were viewed as communicating success. Athletic teams were frequently mentioned in this context. Suburban Superintendent Andrew stated, "I think there's a kind of gravitation that brings people to the success of those teams." Suburban Superintendent Greg stated, "It's football, basketball, baseball. They've been doing well. I
coached football, and I remember a lot of my support as I moved up through the ranks was founded on the fact of being a football coach, because I built all those relationships with people, with players who are parents now.” Success in this respect served to facilitate connection.

Success was equated with excellence in achievement. When discussing use of symbols, Urban Superintendent Edward stated, “We have to look at results. If we were selling cars, if we sold no cars, we’d be out of business. If we go ahead and turn around and not educate children and say we’re doing a good job, then we have a problem.” Inherent in these discussions was the perception that symbols evoke the aura of success and thus, communicate district success to the public. In this respect, symbols become public relations tools and enter the political arena.

Subcategory: Symbols communicate intrinsic values.
Participants reported that symbols served to promote the moral development and good citizenship of children. Urban Superintendent Ben stated, “The students we’re responsible for, not only the academics, but social, to create citizens, people with good judgment, right from wrong.” Suburban Superintendent Andrew described two middle school
symbols, the meerkat, representing communal values, and the giraffe, promoting "sticking one's neck out for others." Suburban Superintendent Greg stated, "Our town motto is 'Small enough to know you, big enough to serve you.'" He described the motto as a "rallying cry, regardless of whether it's academics, the arts, or athletics." Symbols were described as supporting district values of service, kindness, and "doing the right thing."

Fostering diversity and tolerance were also themes that arose in the context of the symbolic frame, usually in urban settings. Urban Superintendent Ben raised diversity as a major concern in his district: "In terms of what you are talking about, symbolism, importance of being very conscious of ethnicity, culture, religious sensitivity." Suburban Superintendent Ivan described a new business card: "I said, I want kids and want it ethnically diverse because we have 37 languages spoken here. It's like the United Nations, and I said, I want to see kids because I want the parents to know." In the context of diversity, symbols served to promote and teach tolerance, but also served a utilitarian purpose in smoothing tensions and differences.
between groups, often for the purposes of moving forward political agendas and passing budgets.

Subcategory: Symbols communicate power. Power is a theme subtly woven throughout the four frames, and the symbolic frame is no exception. Participants described use of symbols to identify and manage power bases, often in order to avoid controversy or failure. Symbols were recognized as effective public relations tools, facilitating practical pursuits, such as passing budgets and enabling student achievement. The power of symbols to establish district cohesiveness, define district values and goals, and both initiate and resolve conflict, was generally described by the participants. While the power and identity of symbols were recognized to vary from day to day, symbols generally represented long-standing traditions, goals, values, and priorities of districts.

Summary of symbolic (theater) frame: Findings of New Jersey male superintendent study. The analysis of the symbolic frame concludes that the overriding themes of the frame are the importance of relationships, connection, values, and power. The overall purpose of the symbolic
frame is described as promoting goal and mission attainment both in terms of human and district potential.

The findings generally support the findings of the quantitative survey data. The data suggest that New Jersey male superintendents frequently engage in leadership styles and behaviors associated with the symbolic frame and that an intertwined theme of power lies within it. The data support the suggestion that the contemporary New Jersey male superintendent exercises a multidimensional leadership style with both transactional and transformational characteristics, whose profile lies outside the stereotypical image as solely a managerial leader.

**Comparison of symbolic (theater) frame to findings of New Jersey female superintendent study.** The findings of the two studies in the context of the symbolic frame report similarities but also clear differences. Both males and females recognized motivational and utilitarian advantages that resulted from use of symbols. Both males and females recognized the power of symbols to establish relationships and bridge connections. Differences, however, were reported by males who described a political dimension in their association with the symbolic frame.
Summary: Research Questions 1 and 2

Section I reports the qualitative findings related to research questions 1 and 2:

1. To what extent are leadership behaviors and styles of New Jersey male superintendents understood by applying the Four Frame Model of Bolman and Deal? What dominant frames, if any, are identified?

2. To what extent do the findings compare to the findings of a recent study of leadership preferences of New Jersey female superintendents (Edmunds, 2007)?

New Jersey male superintendents reported a multidimensional leadership style. Recurring and overlapping themes of accountability, relationship, political maneuvering, and use of symbols permeated discussions. The importance of communication, connection, power structures, and symbols were common subcategories. Fostering district strategies to meet the needs of children, teachers, and community were major themes reported across the four frames.
When asked to choose the frame that best characterized their districts, a majority of the participants reported a preference for the family frame. Of the participants, 2 stated that their districts were characterized by all four frames; 1, the family and theater frames; 2, the jungle and theater frames; 3, the family and jungle frames; and 3, the family frame.

Thus, while the family frame is clearly a style preference, the data suggest an interrelated presence of the political frame across the four frames. The data suggest the political frame as an integral factor in New Jersey male superintendent leadership style. Rural Superintendent Frank aptly explained the Jungle dichotomy:

I know this is probably a weird combination, but I think both family and jungle. Well, family comes to mind right away because there is true care and concern for others in the fact we really believe the strength of the organization is based on the people that are a part of it, and I believe that to be true as well. But I also find that there are small town politics associated with running a district like this, and sometimes in order to create change or get things done, it’s important to have coalitions and support in place. So, in that way you certainly rely on your jungle metaphor to sometimes build support that we’re looking to do.

The findings differ from the stereotyped profile from the literature that has suggested that males exhibit
primarily an aggressive, transactional leadership style. The New Jersey male superintendent profile conforms more closely to a prototype of the contemporary instructional leader, whose focus is on the best interests of children and achievement. In that pursuit, the male superintendent prototype uses a cross-section of leadership styles that facilitate accountability, relationship, connection, and communication with constituents that serve to "get the job done."

The data suggest that the New Jersey male superintendent prototype possesses both transformational and transactional leadership characteristics. Viewed from the perspective of the Three-Dimensional Model of Power, participants reported a preference for "mechanisms built on communication process, myths, symbols, and inspiration" (Fowler, 2004), but that connote the view that both implicit and explicit uses of power may, at any time, be warranted in context.

The findings of the qualitative data generally support the findings of the quantitative data, which suggest a multidimensional leadership style with an emphasis on the human resource (family) frame. However, the data give voice
to a suggestion that the political frame perhaps plays a more pervasive role across all four frames than is necessarily reported by the quantitative data. The data suggest that New Jersey male superintendents are comfortable with the use of power. The data also suggest the existence of overlapping characteristics of the four frames, which, at times, mesh the frames as to make them indistinguishable. Figure 1 reports a conditional matrix of the four frames as concluded from the qualitative analysis of the study.

In comparison, the qualitative analysis of the female superintendent study concludes that New Jersey female superintendents, although multidimensional leaders, reported a clear preference for the human resource and structural frames (Edmunds, 2007). Edmunds concluded that female New Jersey superintendents exuded an ambiguity when discussing power and the political frame.
Figure 1. Conditional matrix of the four frames (n = 11)
Section II: Power and the Three-Dimensional Model of Power

Section II analyzes the data in the context of the Three-Dimensional Model of Power (Fowler, 2004) and draws from the data in Section I. Section II is divided into three separate subsections to include the explicit use of power (first dimension of power), the mobilization of bias (second dimension of power), and the shaping of consciousness (third dimension of power). Each subsection is summarized with a table that describes the central category, properties, and dimensions of the power dimension developed by the researcher. Comparison and contrast of the findings with the female superintendent study is limited due to the fact that the Edmunds's 2007 study does not examine the findings in the context of the Three-Dimensional Model of Power.

The Three-Dimensional Model of Power: Research Questions 3 and 4

3. To what extent do the four leadership frames characterize the way New Jersey male superintendents use power in the context of the Three-Dimensional Model of Power?
4. How do the findings compare to the findings of a recent study of New Jersey female superintendents (Edmunds, 2007)?

Explicit Use of Power (First Dimension of Power)

Participants were read a brief overview of the Three-Dimensional Model of Power (Fowler, 2004). The model was described as follows: The Three-Dimensional Model of Power was developed from leading theories of power. The three dimensions include (a) explicit use of power, described as mechanisms of force, economic dominance, authority, and persuasion; (b) the mobilization of bias, described as implicit mechanisms of power, including customs, norms, organized structures, procedures, rules, social usage, and tradition; and (c) the shaping of consciousness described as mechanisms built on communication process, myths, symbols, and inspiration. Participants were asked additional questions that prompted a definition of power and how they perceived the exercise power in their districts.

Central category: Explicit use of power (first dimension of power). The central category derived from the data for the explicit use of power is stated as follows:
Explicit power is an exercise of required authority. Table 27 reports the findings for the explicit use of power.

Table 27

Central Category for the Explicit Use of Power (First Dimension of Power)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Central category</th>
<th>Properties</th>
<th>Dimensions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Explicit power is use of required authority</td>
<td>Limited applicability</td>
<td>Emergencies Lapses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>Accountability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Positional</td>
<td>Survival</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Participants generally defined "power" as the "ability to get the job done." This is consistent with the findings in Section I that suggest a pervasive thread of use of power in the multidimensional style of New Jersey male superintendents. Participants reported use of explicit power as a rare exercise of force or dominance, one to be used sparingly in leadership style. It is most identified with authority. But a deeper reading of Fowler's description of the first dimension of power suggests numerous exercises of explicit use of power are reported in the data across the four frames.

Fowler defined the explicit use of power as "mechanisms of force, economic dominance, authority, and
persuasion" (2004, p.30). Force is described as either physical or psychic (Wrong, 1979, as cited by Fowler, 2004). Economic dominance is characterized as influence over jobs or conditions (Weber, 1986, as cited by Fowler, 2004). Authority is defined by four components to include patriarchal authority (Bendix, 1960, as cited by Fowler), legal authority (Bendix, 1960, as cited by Fowler), competent authority (Wrong, 1979, as cited by Fowler), and charismatic authority (Bendix, 1960, as cited by Fowler). The final type of explicit use of power, persuasion, is defined as an "an overt attempt to affect the behavior of others by convincing them the desired behavior is good" (Wrong, 1979, as cited by Fowler, 2004). Persuasion is characterized by socialization, rational persuasion, or manipulative persuasion.

Thus, many uses of explicit power are identified in the data. Several participants described personnel moves that used physical or psychic force and economic dominance. Urban Superintendent Edward described a principal transfer: "So, what do I do? She thinks she's right. So the next year I transferred her from the high school to an elementary school." Suburban Superintendent Greg eliminated a
problematic district position and described the lingering effects: "That former [position] is just causing lots of problems for the assistant principal and not dealing with any." Urban Superintendent Ken described the effects of a forced transfer of a curriculum supervisor: "He resents it. He hates the fact that his title has been changed. He is actively pursuing positions in other districts."

Participants also reported numerous examples of persuasion to include administrative retreats, book readings, and new employee orientation programs. Participants reported comprehensive interviews of applicants in the hiring process, use of symbols to motivate, and in-servicing staff, all subtle exercises of persuasion. For example, Suburban Superintendent Jack described a new district math initiative: "It's very difficult to have someone teach a traditional math program and move to a standards based inquiry method program. It takes years in order for them to feel comfortable and refine their skills."

Examples of use of authority were often reported in the interviews. Suburban Superintendent Ben stated, "If you have to exercise your power, it's probably not a good
situation." Suburban Superintendent Andrew linked use of authority to the framework of the family frame, stating, "It's rare. That's just not who I am as a leader or what I think is particularly effective, to say, You're going to do it because I'm the father and I make the rules."

Participants reported use of explicit power primarily in the context of board relationships. For example, Suburban Superintendent Andrew described a scenario where explicit use of power cannot be avoided: "But with the board, with four times in seven years, we got into a power struggle, and I said, 'That's not how I am going to be dealing with it.' Those are rare, and I think when overused, they're ineffective in my opinion." Thus, Suburban Superintendent Andrew described use of explicit power as necessary, primarily in the context of struggle.

Suburban Superintendent Ivan described explicit use of power in the context of what he viewed as an ethical dilemma. He described a student organization "costing the school district, for 29 children, $130,000 a year." He described confronting his board: "This is where you learn in your career, there will be certain mountains that you're going to fight and you won't die on, but they're worth
fighting for. I said to the board, 'We just lost 2.3 million dollars in funding. I can’t do this.'" He stressed the "importance of a superintendent who must stand up for those things best for all children, not just a few." He described a theme of power struggle, "and it also taught me the importance of how important the superintendent is for a board. If you’re not a strong superintendent with strong board members, the board will run the district. When there’s a vacuum with no leadership, something will fill it, and there was the board. So, it was a constant struggle to keep the balance between them."

Urban Superintendent Dan described explicit use of power in the context of professional survival. He described political maneuvering to retain support on his board following installation of a new board president, who "wanted to exercise direct control of the schools. So, he and I clashed a lot." Urban Superintendent Dan described engagement in political maneuvering to obtain a contract extension: "And basically that put him in his place. That calmed him down. He realized that he couldn’t get rid of me, and he couldn’t force his will on me either. So that’s about as bold and broad a political play as you could get."
(And that was consciously your motivation?) Absolutely it was. I knew if I had that, then that gave me the base that I could basically, without saying it—I could say, 'Screw you. You can't touch me.'"

Several participants reported a belief that all three dimensions are required in day-to-day governance and that changing circumstances dictate the particular use of one or more of the dimensions. Urban Superintendent Edward said, "My definition of power according to where I'm at—all three of those could be used. I will say to you that according to what I'm trying to accomplish, [that] is what method I'm going to be using." He added later, "If you're asking what do I think power would most of the time work—[it] is when the pain I can cause on the person is greater than the pleasure to get out of what they're doing; then I will make them change. That's a definite."

Subtler were other participants' references that the occasional use of explicit power can be warranted. Suburban Superintendent Hank stated, "I look at power as a very positive thing, and to be always held to the side, not to be thrown out or thrust in front." Suburban Superintendent Jack noted, "I look at power when I think about a decision
that I have to make. I have this thing called the ABCs of decision-making. An 'A' decision is I have to make a decision immediately, because maybe students or staff are at risk. I have the power to be able to say because the responsibility and accountability is mine. It’s not because I can do this; it’s because I have to do this at this time.”

Occasionally, explicit use of power was referenced in terms of addressing the accountability of others. When describing subordinates who did not meet deadlines or goals, Suburban Superintendent Greg added, “Sometimes you have to be authoritative and say you have to get it done.”

Urban Superintendent Dan specifically disagreed with Fowler’s definition of explicit use of power, stating, “I was surprised to see persuasion listed as an explicit use of power, because that’s a softer use and it’s more related to the other two in my view, that persuasion is more like [dimensions] two and three than it is [dimension] one.”

Urban Superintendent Dan went on to state, “Although I know that that doesn’t work all the time, I know that it is necessary some of the time. So, I like to try and set the tone with the union and with others that I will make
decisions they won’t like. Sometimes that’s going to happen; you can count on it.” He acknowledged use of explicit power can be tempered with open discussion and debate, suggesting that blatant exercise of authority when not accompanied with rational discourse and articulation is unwise. Suburban Superintendent Jack echoed the same, stating, “I use my position in terms of having the power of the decision to make that decision, yet I often take the input of those very seriously, and you can see in the decision I make, it really wasn’t my decision.”

Overall, participants generally defined and viewed “power” as the ability to get things done. Although the data reported numerous descriptions of the explicit use of power across the four frames in terms of force, economic dominance, authority, and persuasion in accordance with Fowler’s definition, interview participants associated explicit use of power solely as an exercise of authority, and one to be used sparingly. The data suggest that New Jersey male superintendents reserve the explicit use of power for situations in which immediate risk jeopardizes students or the district, clear authority is required in terms of accountability or liability, others have failed to
perform, or professional survival is on the line. However, study participants described an interpretation of explicit power in a narrower sense than that described by Fowler (2004).

**Mobilization of Bias (Second Dimension of Power)**

*Central category.* Fowler (2004) defined the mobilization of bias as "implicit mechanisms of power to include custom, norms, organizational structures, procedures, rules, social usage, and tradition" (p.31). According to Fowler, the mobilization of bias is best viewed as behaviors that marginalize or eliminate the meaningful participation or communication of constituents (Bachrach & Baratz, 1962; Bachrach & Botwinick, 1992, as cited by Fowler). The data overwhelmingly support the opposite: Study participants associated mobilization of bias with efforts to be inclusive and communicative. Participants interpreted mobilization of bias in terms of insistence on following chain of command protocols. Table 28 reports findings for the mobilization of bias. However, the findings are limited by the self-reporting nature of the study. The central category is defined as structures support inclusion, communication, and compliance.
Table 28

Central Category of the Mobilization of Bias (Second Dimension of Power)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Central category</th>
<th>Properties</th>
<th>Dimensions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Structures support inclusion, communication, and compliance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structures support inclusion and communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chain of command</td>
<td></td>
<td>Procedures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td></td>
<td>Compliance Trust</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Shaping of Consciousness (Third Dimension of Power)

Central category. Fowler (2004) described the shaping of consciousness as "mechanisms built on communication processes, myths, and symbols" (p. 31). Fowler suggested the shaping of consciousness examines the "unusual empowerment" and "unusual disempowerment" of those at opposite ends of the social spectrum, again suggesting the disenfranchisement of constituents. However, participants generally interpreted the shaping of consciousness through the lens of the symbolic frame. Fowler also viewed the shaping of consciousness in terms of "social institutions," of which family is of major importance, and participants overwhelmingly reported the influence of parents and
mentors on their leadership style. Table 29 reports the findings for the shaping of consciousness. The central category is defined as shaping of consciousness evolves from collaboration and communication.

Table 29

Central Category of the Shaping of Consciousness (Third Dimension of Power)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Central category</th>
<th>Properties</th>
<th>Dimensions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shaping of consciousness evolves from collaboration and communication</td>
<td>Model values</td>
<td>Respect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Model goals</td>
<td>Ownership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Create opportunity</td>
<td>Belonging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Family</td>
<td>Kindness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mentors</td>
<td>Deep listening</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Participants overwhelmingly reported a preference for the exercise of the third dimension of power, the shaping of consciousness. At the same time, most participants acknowledged the integration of all three dimensions of power into their leadership style when warranted. Suburban Superintendent Charles stated, “I really try to get people involved, communicate what we’re trying to do, really try to create some type of ownership in the things we’re trying
to accomplish, and then hopefully, more times than not, you’ll get people who are committed to something rather than you forcing or having them comply.” Suburban Superintendent Jack stated, “You have power because people want to do something. They’re motivated by their rewards that come from reaching a goal or being able to be successful at an initiative.” Urban Superintendent Ken stated, “I don’t think power comes in the title. It comes from your ability to influence behavior.”

A clear preference for collaboration was reported. Tied closely to collaboration was the recurring theme of the importance of communication. Participants described common characteristics of communication style to include open, clear, consistent discourse. Suburban Superintendent Andrew stated, “In this district I believe there is a need as a leader to get the message down to something that people, large groups of people, can understand.” He added, “The community needed to see that I had a clear vision of what I wanted to accomplish. They needed to see that I was ready to answer the questions.”

While one-on-one communication was frequently discussed, several participants reported the importance of
written communication and excellent oratory skills. Urban Superintendent Dan stated, "It's a personal style. I write a lot. I speak a lot to groups." Rural Superintendent Frank added, "I think my communication style is—yeah, it is frequent and active and comes from all mediums whether it's electronic or in person." Some participants reiterated the power of the electronic age, which made managing communication constant and frustrating. Suburban Superintendent Hank stated, "But in past days, communication was such that if there was a misstatement or miscommunication, you had time to deal with it. Today it's on the fly. You can say something or something can get miscommunicated—it's on every blog, it's on every website, and you're constantly trying to get information out correctly today." While visibility of the superintendent was also stated as important, several participants reported time was often constrained by other commitments.

Overwhelmingly, participants associated their views of power with the influence of family members—generally parents—and role models. Attributes commonly attributed to both are kindness and gentleness. Role models and family demonstrate a love for children and learning and model
respect for others. They listen and encourage. They let others make mistakes. They are self-reliant. They think outside the box. They are described as supportive, honest, and hardworking. Outside of family, role models are most frequently identified as former supervisors, often males at the K-8 level.

In conclusion, Fowler (2004) raised an important aspect of communication that also surfaces in the data. Fowler reminded that just as a communicator brings to the table a unique set of experiences, so does the listener. Fowler stated, "However, school leaders must understand that many of the people they deal with have been either unusually empowered or unusually disempowered through the shaping of their consciousness" (2004, p.39). Urban Superintendent Edward alluded to the need for administrators and constituents to be able to see the perspective of others and engage in deep listening. He stated, "But whether I’m your supervisor, or you’re my supervisor, we’re going to make a decision based on those pictures that we have in our mind. That means that you’re going to see your pictures, and I’m going to see my pictures. So you’re going to be 100% sure of what you’re
saying, and I'm going to believe 100% of what I'm saying. There's where the problem comes, because neither of us doesn't believe.”

**Summary of the Three-Dimensional Model of Power: Research Questions 3 and 4**

3. To what extent do the four leadership frames characterize the way New Jersey male superintendents use power in the context of the Three-Dimensional Model of Power?

4. How do the findings compare to the findings of a recent study of New Jersey female superintendents (Edmunds, 2007)?

Overall, the data suggest that New Jersey male superintendents construct a slightly different perspective of the Three-Dimensional Model of Power than that envisioned by Fowler (2004). Fowler painted a more negative view of power, using frequent references to disenfranchisement and marginalization, while not surprisingly, in the context of this study, participants linked the framework of the Three-Dimensional Model closely to their interpretation of the four frames. Participants raised resonant themes of accountability, relationships,
connections, communication, motivation, and supporting structures in the context of power. In the context of "power serves to get the job done," the data support the suggestion of a multidimensional leadership style and a permeating, utilitarian presence of power across the four frames.

A comparison to the female superintendent study (Edmunds, 2007) is limited. Although Edmunds raised the issue of the "mobilization of bias disempowering female educational administrators and marginalizing them in our society" (p. 112), the study did not examine its exercise within the leadership style of the participants themselves. However, Edmunds reported some similarities that assisted in the understanding of power. Females reported a similar view of power as "the ability to get things done" (p.111), and Edmunds concluded that females view "power and authority . . . to be synonymous" (p.112). However, the greatest distinction between the two studies is the apparent comfort with power suggested by the male study and the discomfort and ambiguity described in the female study.
Section III: Role of the Contemporary Leader

The Role of the Contemporary New Jersey Male Superintendent: Research Question 7

7. How is the role of the contemporary New Jersey male superintendent understood in the context of the findings of the research study?

The Contemporary New Jersey Male Superintendent Profile

The profile of the New Jersey male superintendent constructed from the qualitative data reflects similarities and differences to that constructed from the literature. Although participants generally met the demographic profile of the national study (Glass & Franceschini, 2007) as reflected in Chapter 4, the data suggest that the leadership style of the New Jersey male superintendent does not entirely conform to a stereotyped image as a dominant, aggressive, transactional leader. The data suggest a leader with tendencies toward the structural and political frames, often associated more with transactional leadership and use of power, but with strong associations with the human resource and symbolic frames, considered more reflective of a transformational leadership style (Bolman & Deal, 2003) and a reliance on motivational strategies.
Pervasive themes of relationships, communication, collaboration, and motivation suggest a leader attuned to the importance of people and community identity. An overriding concern for the best interests of children shines through the data and illuminates a caring, compassionate leader, but one who is prepared to use political maneuvering if warranted. The data report no suggestion that men face the same "double bind" faced by women who risk criticism if perceived as too assertive (Bolman & Deal, 2003). The undeniable presence of accountability and fiscal austerity temper the profile of the superintendent to reflect a leader who must be engaged with the realities of positive instructional outcomes, yet the overriding, and overwhelming, identification of his priorities for learning and children connote an integral role as instructional leader.

In closing, one unexpected theme rises from the data to highlight an overlooked responsibility in contemporary leadership challenges: that of managing crisis. When asked to describe a significant leadership challenge encountered in their superintendencies, 5 of the 11 participants referenced the sudden traumatic loss of children or staff in their districts, 2 of whom described incidents of a
student drowning while on school sponsored trips, another of whom described a child who broke his neck falling from play equipment during off school hours. In these instances, participants described having to use all four frames to manage the event. People want answers (jungle), people want to grieve (theater), policies are scrutinized (factory), but perhaps more importantly, “I had to put my arms around people. I had to use family.” Suburban Superintendent Ivan summarized a perspective of the suddenness of crisis and the unexplained nature of loss: “These are things you don’t equate. They just happen.”

Bomb threats, lockdowns, environmental hazards, and the pervasive presence of liability add to the list of issues that menace school leaders today. Suburban Superintendent Ivan was reflective when he stated, “I never thought that when I was a superintendent of schools that I would have to put in cameras, I’d have to lock doors, have buzzing systems.”

Overall, the data serve to highlight the challenging and continually evolving role of contemporary school leadership in difficult times. The data reflect a leader with multiple dominant roles, those of manager, politician, motivator, and instructional leader (Cuban, 1998).
CHAPTER VII
Findings, Implications, Recommendations, and Conclusion

Introduction

Education is a central focus of contemporary national and state policy. Passage of NCLB and the eroding economic climate have produced a national scenario of increased scrutiny and demand for the accountability of schools (Glass & Franceschini, 2007). School leadership is positioned in a prominent, highly visible role to make a difference in the lives of children.

Numerous studies have chronicled the demographic profile and leadership characteristics of public school superintendents. AASA has conducted 10-year studies over a 90-year span to assess trends that aid in the preparation and practice of school administrators. This study examines New Jersey male leadership trends in the context of the most recent national study (Glass & Franceschini, 2007) and a recent study of female New Jersey superintendents (Edmunds, 2007).
Purpose

The purpose of the research study is to examine leadership style and use of power of New Jersey male superintendents. The theoretical framework centers on the Four Frame Model of Leadership developed by Bolman and Deal (2003, which views leadership from four separate lenses, including the structural (factory), human resource (family), political (jungle), and symbolic (theater) frames, and the Three-Dimensional Model of Power, compiled from leading theories of power (Fowler, 2004). Both models represent a multidimensional approach to the study of leadership and power and the ability to frame and reframe from multiple perspectives.

The study compares the findings with those of a recent female superintendent study in New Jersey (Edmunds, 2007) for the purpose of examining similarities and differences between male and female dominant leadership style and use of power. The data are examined in comparison with recent national data (Glass & Franceschini, 2007) where possible.

Methodology

The study uses mixed methodology. It uses the Leadership Orientations (Self) Survey developed by Bolman and Deal (1990) to measure leadership style across the four
frames. The survey was mailed to all currently employed New Jersey male superintendents identified from the NJDOE Web site. The data are calculated and described for purposes of the study using descriptive statistics and factor analysis.

Semistructured interviews were also conducted with 11 male superintendents solicited from districts statewide using criteria based upon size, configuration, geographic location, and socioeconomic status (DFG). The interview questions were primarily developed and designed around the four frames, the Three-Dimensional Model of Power, and other relevant themes found in the literature. The data are examined using grounded theory in order to give "voice" to the quantitative findings (Patton, 2002). The research study examines the data in order to define a demographic portrait of the New Jersey male superintendent and a contemporary leadership style for the purpose of improving policy, practice, and future research.

Findings for Demographic Profile

District Context

Given the suburban nature of New Jersey, it is not surprising to find that the data suggest the overwhelming majority of male superintendents are employed in suburban districts (66%). They represent 15.7% of urban
superintendents and 17.6% of rural superintendencies. Males are proportionately represented in both K-8 (39.6%) and K-12 (39.6%) districts, and represent 14.2% of regional school districts. The greatest percentage of males is employed in districts between 2,000 and 3,000 students (35.3%). In terms of geographic location, males are more likely to be represented in northern (42.9%) or southern (37%) counties than in the central part of the state (20.1%).

Females are also primarily employed in suburban districts (69%), but the data suggest they are disproportionately underrepresented in urban districts (8.5%) and overrepresented in rural districts (22.5%). On the other hand, females are disproportionately overrepresented in smaller districts under 1,000 (52.1%) when compared to males (32%) and underrepresented in districts between 2,000 and 5,000 students (16.9%). Additionally, the data suggest that they are disproportionately overrepresented in the central counties (36.6%) and underrepresented in the northern (28.2%) and southern (33.8%) geographic areas of New Jersey.
Personal Characteristics

Males reported a proportionately higher percentage (79.9%) of association with role models than did females (19.7%). However, the nature of the role model survey question differed between studies. While the female study participants were specifically asked if they experienced a female role model in their career path, the male study asked if participants identified with any role model during their careers.

Males reported a proportionately higher percentage of representation in the superintendency under age 50 (20.8%) than did females (18.3%), and females reported a proportionately higher percentage (81.7%) than did males (77.9%) over age 50. The data support suggestions that females enter the superintendency at a later point in their careers than males (Dana & Bourisaw, 2006; Grogan & Brunner, 2005; Hummel, 1998). The proportions of males (47.4%) and females (45.1%) holding a doctoral degree are similar, but fall slightly under the national average (50%). In general, the data report that 73% of New Jersey superintendents are male and 22% female; a finding consistent with the most recent national data of 78% and 21.7% respectively (Glass & Franceschini, 2007).
Work Characteristics

The percentage of males who reported being in their first position as superintendent is proportionately lower (61.7%) than that of females (69%). However, 10.4% of male participants reported prior experience as superintendent. The data suggest males have more varied career paths than do females, and predominantly enter the first position as superintendent from either an assistant superintendent (29.2%) or principal (46.7%) position. Females reported a proportionately higher percentage for the position of assistant superintendent (35.2%) and lower percentage for principal (38%). The data support literature that has suggested that females, more so than males, tend to enter the superintendency from central office positions of curriculum and instruction and that males enjoy greater representation in the principalship (Dana & Bourisaw, 2006; Glass & Franceschini, 2007; Grogan & Brunner, 2005). The data are generally consistent with national data (46.7%).

New Jersey males reported 9.8 mean years of classroom experience and 12.85 mean years of administrative experience, and the mean years served in their current position is 6.16 years. New Jersey females reported mean years of classroom experience of 10.56 years, mean years of
administrative experience as 11.98, and mean years in their current position as 4.73. The findings are consistent with literature that has suggested that women spend more time in the classroom than do males (Dana & Bourisaw, 2006; Grogan & Brunner, 2005; Hummel, 1998). However, less disparity exists between male and female superintendents when comparing classroom and administrative experience with the national data.

Summary

Overall, the data generally support the conclusion that male superintendents enjoy more diversity in employment in categories of district context, work experience, and personal characteristics, than do females. However, the differences between mean years of classroom and administrative experience for males and females are lower than is suggested by the national data (Dana & Bourisaw, 2006; Glass & Franceschini, 2007; Grogan & Brunner, 2005). The data suggest that males are more likely to experience the encouragement of mentors in their careers and enter administrative positions at a younger age than females. The proportion of the overall percentages of male (73%) and female (22%) superintendents is consistent with national data (78% and 21.7% respectively). A review of the
NJDOE Web site estimates that approximately 7-9% of superintendent positions are filled by interim candidates in New Jersey.

Findings for Quantitative Survey Instrument: The Four Frames

The Leadership Orientation (Self) Survey is a measurement of leadership orientation style from four perspectives: the structural (factory) frame, with an emphasis on rules, policies, procedures, and goals; the human resource (family) frame, which emphasizes needs, skills, and relationships; the political (jungle) frame, emphasizing power, conflict, competition, and political maneuvering; and the symbolic (theater) frame, which emphasizes organizational culture, meaning, metaphor, ritual, and ceremony (Bolman & Deal, 1990, p. 16). The survey instrument measures responses from 32 behaviors and 24 leadership styles, which align to the four frames in order to assess dominate leadership style preferences.

The current study examines leadership style and use of power of the New Jersey male superintendent in order to develop a leadership profile and draw conclusions regarding similarities and differences between males and females. While the research remains inconclusive regarding
leadership style differences across lines of gender, recent studies have suggested that males and females lead differently (Dana & Bourisaw, 2006; Grogan & Brunner, 2005; Hegelsen, 1990, 1995; Rosener, 1990).

The structural (factory) frame. The data suggest that both males (81.56%) and females (79.6%) frequently engage in behaviors associated with the structural frame, especially those that involve logical thinking and analysis (Table 8). Both males (97.4%) and females (95.8%) identified the highest proportionate response to “think very clearly and logically,” and conversely, both males (63%) and females (62%) identified the lowest proportionate response to “have extraordinary attention to detail.” While males showed a proportionately higher percentage of association with chain of command (83.1%) than did females (73.3%), they reported a proportionately lower percentage (74.6%) for clear, logical policies than did females (81.7%). Although the findings suggest both males and females are structural leaders, males generally reported a higher proportionate response across seven of the eight behaviors than did females (Table 9). This supports the research that has suggested that males have a stronger association with the structural frame than do females and
demonstrate tendencies of transactional leadership (Eagly & Johannesen-Schmidt, 2001). Findings for leadership style are generally consistent with the findings for behaviors (Table 10). Overall, similarities are more predominant than differences among males and females in the structural frame.

The human resource (family) frame. The data suggest that both males and females associate strongly with leadership behaviors associated with the human resource (family) frame (Table 12). Both males (84.28%) and females (91%) reported the human resource frame as the predominant style preference (Table 18). The findings support Young's (2007) suggestion that males also demonstrate the desire to build relationships and nurture children, contradicting traditional notions of masculinity.

While males and females both reported the lowest percentage of association for the behavior "foster high levels of participation and involvement," females reported a higher proportionate response (85.9%) than did males (70.8%). Additionally, females reported a proportionately higher percentage across seven of the eight behaviors (Table 9). Males and females did not share the highest proportionate response in the human resource frame, the
only difference reported between high and low responses across the four frames (Table 19). Males reported the highest proportionate percentage (94.8%) for "show high level of support and concern for others," and females reported the highest proportionate percentage (95.8%) in the frame for "build trust through open and collaborative relationships." While this may suggest males are more likely to be mentors, the researcher declines to draw a conclusion given the narrow context of the finding.

However, overall, the findings support women as caring, collaborative leaders and a conclusion that females, to a greater extent than males, demonstrate tendencies toward transformational leadership in keeping with the literature (Bolman & Deal, 2003; Eagly & Johannesen-Schmidt, 2001; Hegelsen, 1990, 1995). However, the data suggest that New Jersey males also clearly identify a strong association with behaviors of the human resource frame.

Although the data for leadership style (Table 13) is slightly inconsistent, given the limitations of the data noted, the data generally support the findings of the behaviors.

The political (jungle) frame. While males reported the lowest frame percentage among the four frames for behaviors
associated with the political frame (77.98%; Table 18), they clearly associated with the behaviors of the political frame. Females, on the other hand, reported a proportionately lower percentage (61%) when compared to males (77.98%) for the political frame, the lowest percentage of males or females in the two studies across the four frames. Despite the clear differences in association with the political frame, both males (87.6%) and females (90.1%) reported the highest percentage for the behavior "have exceptional ability to mobilize and get things done." Although females reported proportionately lower percentages across six of the eight behaviors, this represents the highest percentage of the political frame. Females also reported a proportionately higher percentage (87.3%) for the behavior "succeed in the face of conflict and opposition" than did males (87%). This suggests women view the political frame similarly to males in the context of "getting the job done," a finding also reported by the Edmunds study (2007). Both males and females reported the lowest percentage (59.1% and 35.2% respectively) for "am very skillful and shrewd negotiator," suggesting a negative connotation for the word "shrewd."
Overall, males reported proportionately higher responses than did females for six of the eight behaviors associated with the political frame and clearly associated with the political frame to a greater extent (78.14%) than did females (61%). The proportionate percentages reflect the greatest disparity among the frames. The findings suggest that males are more comfortable with power than are females (Table 18) and demonstrate tendencies toward a transactional leadership style. However, males report a multidimensional leadership style. The findings for leadership style (Table 15) are generally consistent with the findings of behaviors.

The symbolic (theater) frame. The data suggest that both males (78.14%) and females (81.6%) associate with the behaviors of the symbolic frame and share some similarities. However, although both males (90.2%) and females (94.3%) reported the highest proportionate percentage of association with "generate loyalty and enthusiasm," and the lowest proportionate percentage (63% and 59.1% respectively for "am highly charismatic"; Table 16), females reported proportionately higher percentages of association with five of the eight behaviors across the symbolic frame (Table 9). The data support the literature
that has suggested that women are more likely to be viewed as transformational leaders (Bennis, 1989; Burns, 1978, as cited by Bolman & Deal, 2003; Eagly & Johannesen-Schmidt, 2001), but also support a conclusion that males report strong association with the symbolic frame and transformational leadership style.

The New Jersey male superintendent, in a sense, is an enigma, with a multidimensional leadership style and both transactional and transformational tendencies. While the data support a similar conclusion of multidimensional leadership style for New Jersey females and report more similarities than differences among leadership style for males and females, the data clearly reflect a more dominant role of the political frame for males and to a lesser extent, a more dominant role of the human resource frame for females. The data support Edmunds’s (2007) conclusion that females experience discomfort with the construct of power.

Findings of Factor Analysis

A factor analysis of the data for the 32 leadership behaviors and 24 leadership styles of the male study was also conducted in order to determine if the responses generally clustered across the four frames according to the
expectations of Bolman and Deal (2003). Overall, males reported a consistent pattern of association with behaviors across the four frames: (a) human resource (84.28%), (b) structural (81.56%), (c) symbolic (78.14%), and (d) political (77.98%). The human resource frame, however, was identified as the highest percentage for the male responses and the predominant frame.

Factor analysis identifies that the behaviors associated with the human resource frame cluster according to the expectations of Bolman and Deal (2003). Six behaviors associated with the human resource frame loaded on Factor 1, and the two remaining behaviors of the human resource frame split on some combination that included Factor 1, identifying the human resource frame as the most important. This is consistent with the findings of the study. Additionally, among the remaining frames, (a) three behaviors associated with the structural frame split on Factor 3 and the remaining five on some combination that included Factor 3, (b) three of the behaviors associated with the symbolic frame loaded on Factor 2 and five on various combinations, and (c) three of the behaviors associated with the political frame loaded on Factor 2 and five on various combinations. The findings report overlap
patterns consistent with a suggestion that male superintendents demonstrate multidimensional leadership style and that the behaviors may have multidimensional aspects. The findings also support a suggestion of the subtle, intertwined role of the political frame.

Despite some anomalies, perhaps as a result of the study limitations noted, factor analysis of leadership styles yields a similar conclusion that leadership styles generally cluster according to the expectations of Bolman and Deal (2003) across the four frames. Factor analysis reports the human resource frame as the most important frame with five of the six styles loading on Factor 1, consistent with the findings of the study. Additionally, factor analysis suggests a more predominant role for the political frame than may be first deducted; five of the six Styles loaded on Factor 2. Of the remaining frames, four of the items of the symbolic frame loaded on Factor 3, and four of the items associated with the structural frame loaded on Factor 4. The findings suggest closely related, multidimensional leadership characteristics for New Jersey male superintendents when viewed in the context of the four frames and support a suggestion that the four frames may be interpreted by males to be so closely woven together as to
be indistinguishable. The findings support a suggestion that the political frame plays an integral role in the leadership style of the New Jersey male superintendent.

Findings for Qualitative Interviews: Leadership Orientation and Use of Power

The findings of the qualitative interviews serve to give "voice" to the findings of the quantitative data (Patton, 2002). Using grounded theory, the researcher developed central categories for each of the four frames.

The central category for the structural frame was reported as follows: Structures must support accountability. Participants viewed structures primarily as key personnel, and key personnel were consistently identified as those associated with the delivery of curriculum and instruction. Participants placed a strong emphasis on the importance of accountability and high student achievement. Additionally, participants described use of power and political acumen in the management of structures, usually in the context of personnel management or district reorganization.

When compared to the conclusions of the Edmunds (2007) study, both males and females placed a high degree of importance on the involvement of key personnel in district
leadership. However, males placed greater emphasis on central office staff as key players, while females placed emphasis on board of education and union leadership, suggesting that males and females may view collaboration from different perspectives. Additionally, males focused primarily on the role of curriculum and instruction within the structural context while females did not. The findings support males as instructional leaders, but as leaders who are keenly aware of the crucial role of key staff in the context of supporting district structures. In some ways, the data suggest males, in fact, may view delegation of these responsibilities to a greater extent than do females.

The findings support a suggestion that power plays a subtle role in leadership style within the structural frame, primarily as an ability to effectively communicate with key stakeholders, but also in the hiring and firing of staff. Personnel administration is also viewed as integrally connected to accountability.

The central category for the human resource frame was reported as follows: People and relationships are key. Almost as an extension of the structural frame, similar themes surfaced in the context of the human resource frame. Participants viewed people as the primary capital of the
district, supported the crucial importance of hiring effective staff, acknowledged political necessities of managing board of education and stakeholder involvement, and reported communication as the necessary skill to effectively manage them all. Recurring themes of relationship and connection arose. Prior interscholastic coaching experience, especially within their own districts, was often cited as a vehicle that served to bolster community ties, communication skills, relationships, and connection with students, parents, and staff. Successful coaching experience was usually viewed as an extension of teaching.

Similar to the structural frame, the recurring concerns cited in the human resource context are reported as accountability, achievement, and ensuring the well-being and development of children and staff. In the context of the human resource frame, human capital was often viewed in the context of organizational goals.

The data support a suggestion that male superintendents have assumed a predominant focus as instructional leaders in the post-NCLB era and demonstrate a collaborative leadership style. However, when comparing the findings to the female study (Edmunds, 2007), male
participants reported an emphasis on hiring practices, while females placed more emphasis on the observation and supervision of staff, suggesting that males and females may view instructional leadership differently. Males tacitly acknowledged the necessary role of power in managing human capital in order to "get the job done."

The central category of the political frame was reported as follows: All politics are local. Participants recognize the importance of forming deep ties, developing knowledge of their districts, identifying and managing power bases, and effectively communicating, similar themes reported in the structural and human resource frames. Participants viewed exercise of power as communication, persuasion, and building successful relationships based upon trust and mutual respect. While preference was placed on use of personal power, males suggested no hesitancy to use positional power if warranted. Males also acknowledged the encroaching role of government as a powerful player in the dynamics of school leadership, and recurring themes of accountability and achievement continued to play out as prioritized goals.

The central category of the symbolic frame is reported as follows: Symbols serve for motivational and utilitarian
purposes. Participants viewed symbols as effective
communication tools and a means to motivate and achieve
goals. Once again, overriding themes were reported as the
importance of relationships, feeling connected, and
establishing district identity and values. The use of
symbols as instruments of power was clearly an underlying
assumption in discussion. Power was described in the
context of achieving goals, but a manipulative dimension
behind use of symbols was inherent and tacitly acknowledged
by the participants.

Overall, pervasive themes of accountability,
relationship, communication, and power permeate the four
frames. The findings generally support those of the
quantitative data that suggest New Jersey male
superintendents are multidimensional leaders who view the
frames as nearly indistinguishable. The findings of the
qualitative analysis also support the suggestion that males
view power as an inherent dimension within each frame,
consistent with theories of Bolman and Deal (2003) that a
dimension of power is present in each frame, though
administered from different perspectives. The data also
support the suggestion that male superintendents have
assumed roles as instructional leaders in the contemporary, post-NCLB era.

Implications

Introduction

This study supports the findings of the recent AASA study (Glass & Franceschini, 2007) that described the role of the contemporary superintendent as threefold: "the butcher, the baker, and candlestick maker." Several pervasive themes reported in the research study support the contentions of Glass and Franceschini that superintendents today play an increasingly complex role in a job of multiple roles in terms of accountability, both academic and fiscal; traversing political terrain; and managing the personal relationships necessary in school governance. Glass and Franceschini noted that the superintendency is "increasingly a 'people' type of profession" (2007, p. xvi). The study also recognized the accelerating importance of the role of curriculum and instruction in the leadership model in the post-NCLB era. Glass and Franceschini posed three primary areas of concern in their preface to the report. They identified changing demographics, the importance of managing board relationships, and the work conditions of today's superintendent as "key" questions
driving the study. The current study supports and reinforces their contentions.

**Demographics**

**District context.** The data suggest males are proportionately overrepresented in urban, midsized, and K-12 districts in the northern and southern geographic areas of New Jersey. Females, on the other hand, are overrepresented in small, rural, and K-8 districts and the central counties.

Given the data, several issues surface. One is the possibility of existing bias in hiring practices of boards of education, suggesting that hiring agencies may still view the superintendency, especially those positions out of the K-8 realm, to be the purview of males. Additionally, because females are historically employed in an elementary setting, the role of elementary experience as limiting may be an issue for females who seek choices in leadership positions. Existing cultural or regional differences may be existing factors in terms of regional employment opportunities. The data suggest something unique about the central counties: Are they more affluent? Are they more influenced by institutions of higher education in their areas to accept female educators as leaders? Do districts
prefer to draw from outside candidates? Despite the continuing acceptance of female educators as school district leaders, the data suggest a subtle hint of lingering bias in their employment in some areas, and a need for further study of regional and district configuration differences in hiring practices.

**Personal and work characteristics.** In terms of personal characteristics, the gender makeup of New Jersey superintendents, identified as 73% male and 22% female from the NJDOE Web site, generally mirrors the most recent national data (78% male and 21.7% female). Glass and Franceschini (2007) predicted that by 2010 nearly 25-30% of the nation’s superintendents would be female, a prediction supported by both the male and female New Jersey studies.

Males overwhelmingly reported the presence of mentors in their professional careers. Several interview participants described school professionals early in their careers, often direct supervisors and other males, who encouraged them to obtain advanced degrees and advance their careers from the classroom to the office. The data suggest that females, who often face the realities of child rearing responsibilities to a greater degree than do males (Dana & Bourisaw, 2006; Grogan & Brunner, 2005), may face
family or societal barriers in their ability to obtain advanced degrees or devote the long hours required in filling an administrative position. Thus, males often enter the superintendency at a younger age than do females. As a result they build the requisite experience and skills necessary to advance their degrees and careers.

Again, questions arise. Do school administrators routinely identify and encourage promising staff, male or female, to seek administrative positions? If so, how or whom do they identify? Using what criteria? Do their busy schedules allow time for mentoring staff? Do females enter the profession with different career goals than do males? Do males feel more financial pressure? Do districts provide financial incentives to seek advanced degrees? Do larger, K-12 districts have more resources to promote financial incentives? Do other professional opportunities exist in this area? The data suggest several avenues of further study in this area.

Several other issues surface in the data in regard to personal and work characteristics. Glass and Franceschini (2007) reported a trend towards the importance of experience in the classroom and in the area of curriculum and instruction in the post-NCLB era. They reported a
change in the superintendent demographic in the most recent national study that suggests males and females are entering the superintendency at a later stage in their careers and spending more years in the classroom. The latest study reported the highest mean average in age (54.5) in the history of the AASA studies, suggesting that males and females are spending more time in their classrooms before seeking administrative positions. This may suggest a more predominant interest in classroom practice. However, given the more volatile, political climate of school governance, this also may suggest a reluctance to enter the jungle of school district leadership by both males and females. The New Jersey studies support the national data in the sense that the majority of superintendents are over age 50. However, in age categories under 50, the percentage of males (20.8%) under 50 is proportionately higher than females (18.3%), by a narrow margin.

In terms of mean tenure in their current position, males report a mean percentage of 6.16 years as compared to females who report 4.73 years. In comparison to the national average of 5.5 years, the data suggest that New Jersey males exceed the national average, and females fall below the national average. The meaning of the data is
subject to conjecture in the context of the present study and is need of further study.

The most compelling data of the demographic study demonstrate the importance of the career path in the superintendency. Males reported more diversity in their range of administrative experiences, and overwhelmingly reported a proportionately higher percentage of experience in the position of principal (46.7%) than did females (38%). Females, on the other hand, reported a proportionately higher percentage of employment as assistant superintendent prior to entering the first position as superintendent (35.2%) than did males (29.2%). This may suggest an advantage today in an era that places a great deal of value on the role of curriculum and instruction in the high stakes accountability faced by superintendents.

The Four Frame Model of Leadership

Accountability. The findings of the research study report the dominant role of accountability in the superintendency. The role of accountability is pervasive, but particularly so in the areas of academic achievement and fiscal responsibility. The survey data report a high percentage of association with the structural frame,
perhaps the frame most closely associated with issues of accountability.

However, participants reported the highest percentage of association with the behaviors that associate with clear and logical thinking. A careful examination of the behaviors identifies only two behaviors that suggest accountability: "set specific, measurable goals and hold people accountable for results" and "strongly emphasize careful planning and clear time lines," for which participants reported two of the lower percentages in the frame context. When asked how the research study could be improved, Suburban Superintendent Jack pointed out the absence of questions addressing accountability.

That is a piece that I'm not sure that people either moving into the profession or those people that look or will criticize or evaluate the profession really take stock of. I can't tell you how many times a day I sign my name to documents that are very important documents that are going places that we're spending lots of money, where we're giving permission to be able to do things that you can answer for.

Thus, the findings of the study suggest that accountability presents an area of study not fully addressed in survey instruments, studies of the superintendency, preparation programs, and organizations that provide professional development opportunities.
Relationships. Another pervasive theme of the study is the importance of building and maintaining relationships. The findings of the research study suggest that participants reported a high percentage of association with behaviors associated with the human resource frame, the frame most closely associated with relationships. Closely tied to the concept of relationships is the ability to communicate effectively. The qualitative findings of the study suggest that participants view the importance of relationships and communication as integral characteristics across all four frames, including the political frame, in which building relationships is equated with building and maintaining coalitions.

An examination of the behaviors reveals that only one behavior specifically uses the word "communicate," and it is found in the behaviors of the symbolic frame. Other behaviors that perhaps align with communication skills are encountered across the behaviors of the four frames. They include "develop alliances," "am highly participative," "listen well," "ability to mobilize," "build trust," "unusually persuasive," "able to be an inspiration," "foster participation," "anticipate and deal with"
conflict," "effective in getting support," "generate new opportunities," "give recognition," and "generate loyalty."

Therefore, while the ability to effectively communicate can be supported arguably as embedded in the survey instrument across the four frames, the findings of the study suggest that communication is an important aspect of successful leadership that may be underdeveloped. Preparation programs may not have the ability to devote the necessary amount of instructional time needed in this area, suggesting that continuing education and professional development programs that are available to school administrators need to support this need, especially for new and aspiring professionals who lack the requisite experience. Areas particularly sensitive to the development of effective communication skills are identified as managing crisis, the media, and daily interaction with constituents, to include the board of education.

Power. Sheff Kohn (1995) aptly identified the "power problem of the superintendency." The present study underscores the pervasive, veiled presence of power in the superintendency. Although survey participants reported the lowest percentage of association with the political frame, the frame most closely associated with the exercise of
power, the study clearly identifies and supports its presence in current leadership practice across the four frames.

Bolman and Deal (2003) recognized the chameleon aspects of power. They discussed the exercise of power as it may be viewed from the different lenses of the four frame model and stated, "The question becomes, How does each group articulate preferences and mobilize power to get what it wants?" (p. 192). Bolman and Deal also discussed the tendency to view power in a negative light: "We have to stop describing power always in negative terms: (as in) it excludes, it represses. In fact, power produces; it produces reality" (Foucault, 1975, as cited by Bolman & Deal, 2003).

The findings of the study suggest some reluctance among participants to associate in a positive manner with the use of power, often citing the exercise of positional power as a last resort. An examination of the quantitative findings also identifies some anomalies. For example, the lowest percentage of the study is reported for a behavior associated with the political frame, and the overall mean percentage for the political frame is the lowest percentage of the four frames.
Glass and Franceschini (2007) acknowledged the importance of the school leader to navigate the political climate and avoid missteps. The ability to identify and ameliorate conflict is crucial to professional survival. This requires a proactive approach to leadership.

While most preparation programs provide a sound theoretical base, new and aspiring leaders often lack the necessary hands-on experience crucial for success. The first year of the superintendency is a challenging experience, and it can be especially demanding if encountered in unfamiliar territory in which a leader has established neither a personal nor positional power base. The research study identifies the importance of viewing power as a positive attribute in leadership, inherent in mundane occurrences, such as new teacher orientations and literary selections. Preparation programs and continuing education opportunities of professional organizations are called upon to assess and expand programs and support networks to assist not only new and aspiring leaders, but all leaders who face many new challenges today unanticipated by preparation programs as well. Typically, these challenges continue to evolve, requiring preparation
programs and professional organizations to be not only reactive but proactive as well.

Recommendations for Policy, Practice, and Future Research

The research study reports an in-depth study of the male superintendency in New Jersey. In conjunction with a comparison of the findings with those of the recent female study (Edmunds, 2007), the following recommendations are suggested:

1. The role of curriculum and instruction in current practice is an area of increasing importance. Preparation programs and continuing education programs of professional organizations should review current programs for expansion or inclusion.

2. The development and enhancement of communication skills by preparation programs and continuing education programs should conduct ongoing training in this area as current issues evolve to include personal communication skills, the media, and managing board relations.

3. Managing crisis and sudden traumatic loss may be areas that are underdeveloped and in need of
review by preparation and continuing education programs.

4. Managing data for purposes of improving and strengthening instruction are skills of importance in current practice that may be underdeveloped and in need of review by preparation and continuing education programs.

5. Further study of hiring practices of boards of education and educational consultants is warranted.

6. Further study of the role of administrative mentoring programs is warranted.

7. Further study of factors that lead to the success of superintendent longevity is warranted.

8. Further study of variables of race and ethnicity in the demographic profile of New Jersey superintendents is warranted.

9. Further study of urban and rural district leadership in New Jersey is warranted.

10. Further study of the role of the effect of state and federal aid and mandates on school achievement is warranted.
11. Further study of the New Jersey principalship at both the K-8 and K-12 levels is warranted.

12. Further study of male and female experiences in salary and contract negotiation is warranted.

13. Further study of the role of the position of interim superintendent is warranted.

14. Further study of the practice of out of state superintendent hires is warranted.

15. Further study of leadership practices of small districts under 1,000 students is warranted.

16. Further study of the language of leadership survey instruments for gender bias is warranted.

17. Further study of the New Jersey superintendency using measurements other than self-reporting is warranted.

18. Power is a multidimensional construct and its definition and role in the superintendency is in need of further study.

Conclusion

The role of superintendent is a complex, evolving job. Superintendents in the current era face unique challenges in terms of accountability and maintaining the district relationships necessary to foster achievement, build unity,
bolster motivation, stay solvent, and retain community identity. School districts today are called upon to provide more than academic proficiency. Public schools, perhaps more than any institution in the community, can serve as the common compass for the academic, physical, social, and moral direction of its future citizens. It is an exciting and challenging position for those who want to make a difference in the lives of children and communities.

Glass and Franceschini (2007) as well as many others who have followed the superintendency over the years are clear on one point. Although a demanding, impossible, and often frustrating calling, the majority of today’s superintendents are overwhelmingly happy and satisfied with their career path. In this respect, the profession has benefited from its ongoing scrutiny, a scrutiny that the researcher has benefited from immensely in this current endeavor.
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Appendix A
LEADERSHIP ORIENTATIONS (SELF-REPORTING) FORM

© 1990, Lee G. Bolman and Terrence E. Deal, all rights reserved

This questionnaire asks you to describe your leadership and management style.

I. Behaviors

You are asked to indicate how often each of the items below is true of you. Please use the following scale in answering each item.

1 2 3 4 5

Never Occasionally Sometimes Often Always

So, you would answer "1" for an item that is never true of you, "2" for one that is occasionally true, "3" for one that is 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 all the time from the things that you do seldom or never.

1. _____ Think very clearly and logically.

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

3. _____ Have exceptional ability to mobilize people and resources to get things done.
4. ____ Inspire others to do their best.
5. ____ Strongly emphasize careful planning and clear time lines.
6. ____ Build trust through open and collaborative relationships.
7. ____ Am a very skillful and shrewd negotiator.
8. ____ Am highly charismatic.
9. ____ Approach problems through logical analysis and careful thinking.
10. ____ Show high sensitivity and concern for others' needs and feelings.
11. ____ Am unusually persuasive and influential.
12. ____ Am able to be an inspiration to others.
13. ____ Develop and implement clear, logical policies and procedures.
14. ____ Foster high levels of participation and involvement in decisions.
15. ____ Anticipate and deal adroitly with organizational conflict.
16. ____ Am highly imaginative and creative.
17. ____ Approach problems with facts and logic.
18. ____ Am consistently helpful and responsive to others.
19. ____ Am very effective in getting support from people with influence and power.

20. ____ Communicate a strong and challenging sense of vision and missions.

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

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

23. ____ Am politically very sensitive and skillful.

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

25. ____ Have extraordinary attention to detail.

26. ____ Give personal recognition for work well done.

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

28. ____ Generate loyalty and enthusiasm.

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

30. ____ Am a highly participative manager.

31. ____ Succeed in the face of conflict and opposition.

32. ____ Serve as in influential model of organizational aspirations and values.
II. Leadership Style

This section asks you to describe your leadership style. For each item, give the number "4" to the phrase that best describes you, "3" to the item that is next best, and on down to "1" for the item that is least like you.

1. My strongest skills are
   ___ a. Analytic skills
   ___ b. Interpersonal skills
   ___ c. Political skills
   ___ d. Ability to excite and motivate

2. The best way to describe me is
   ___ a. Technical expert
   ___ b. Good listener
   ___ c. Skilled negotiator
   ___ d. Inspirational leader

3. What has helped me the most to be successful is my ability to
   ___ a. Make good decisions
   ___ b. Coach and develop people
   ___ c. Build strong alliances and a power base
   ___ d. Energize and inspire others
4. What people are most likely to notice about me is my

_____ a. Attention to detail
_____ b. Concern for people
_____ c. Ability to succeed in the face of conflict and opposition
_____ d. Charisma

5. My most important leadership trait is

_____ a. Clear, logical thinking
_____ b. Caring and support for others
_____ c. Toughness and aggressiveness
_____ d. Imagination and creativity

6. I am best described as

_____ a. An analyst
_____ b. A humanist
_____ c. A politician
_____ d. A visionary

III. Overall Rating

Compared to other individuals that you have known with comparable levels of experience and responsibility, how would you rate yourself on
1. Overall effectiveness as a manager

1  2  3  4  5

Bottom 20%  Middle 20%  Top 20%

2. Overall effectiveness as a leader.

1  2  3  4  5

Bottom 20%  Middle 20%  Top 20%

IV. Demographics

1. How many years have you been in your current job?  

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

3. Did you have a female role model who was a superintendent of schools before you took your first position as a superintendent? Yes ___ No ___  

4. How many total years have you been a superintendent in NJ, either in this district or another?  

5. Is this your first superintendency? Yes ___ No ___  

6. If this is not your first superintendency, in how many other school districts were you a superintendent?  

7. Have you had a contract as a superintendent renewed? Yes ___ No ___
8. Did you first become a superintendent in the same district where you were employed? Yes ____ No ____

9. What level of education had you completed prior to achieving your first superintendency? ________________

10. What was the official title of your position prior to this experience? __________

11. If you were a classroom teacher, how many years of experience do you have? ____

12. How many years of administrative experience did you have prior to becoming a superintendent? ________

13. Please describe the context of your current district: Urban ____ Suburban ____ Rural ____

14. Please identify the size of your district:
   a. under 1,000 students ____
   b. 1,000-2,000 students ____
   c. 2,000-5,000 students ____
   d. 5,000-10,000 students ____
   e. over 10,000 students ____

15. Which of the following best describes your district: K-8 ____ K-12 ____ Regional ____

16. What is your district factor grouping? ________

17. In which county is your district located? (see groupings below)
Group A: Atlantic, Burlington, Camden, Cape May, Cumberland, Gloucester, Ocean, Salem

Group B: Hunterdon, Mercer, Middlesex, Monmouth, Somerset

Group C: Bergen, Essex, Hudson, Morris, Passaic, Sussex, Union, Warren

18. Which of the following best describes your age range?
   a. 29 years and under ___
   b. 30-39 ___
   c. 40-49 ___
   d. 50-59 ___
   e. 60+ ___

Thank you for completing the survey.

Please return in the self-addressed, stamped envelope within one week.
Appendix B
INTERVIEW QUESTIONS: IN-DEPTH, SEMISTRUCTURED

Male Superintendents: Examination of Leadership Style and Construct and Use of Power

Demographic Questions

1. How many total years have you been a superintendent in New Jersey, either in this district or another? Do you have any experience as a superintendent outside of New Jersey? If so, how many years?

2. Is this your first position as superintendent?

3. If this is not your first position as superintendent, in how many other districts were you a superintendent?

4. Have you had a contract as superintendent renewed?

5. Did you work in the district in which you became employed as superintendent?

6. What level of education had you completed when you assumed the superintendency?

7. What was your official title immediately prior to becoming superintendent?

8. If you were a classroom teacher, how many years of experience did you have prior to your first administrative position? Prior to becoming superintendent?
9. Did you have coaching experience prior to your first administrative position? If so, how many years of coaching experience did you have? In how many sports?

10. How many years of administrative experience did you have prior to becoming superintendent?

11. Is your current district best described as urban? suburban? rural?

12. What is the DFG grouping of your current district?

13. How big is your district in terms of student population? number of schools? (a) under 1,000, (b) 1,000-2,000, (c) 2,000-5,000, (d) 5,000-10,000, (e) over 10,000


15. What county is your school district located in? Do all students come from that county?

16. What best describes your age? (a) 29 and under, (b) 30-39, (c) 40-49, (d) 50-59, (e) 60+

Description of the Four Frame Model of Leadership

Please listen to my description of the Four Frame Model of Leadership developed by Bolman and Deal.

Bolman and Deal are best-selling authors of a book on organizational theory entitled Reframing Organizations: Artistry, Choice, and Leadership (2003). The Four Frame
Model views organizations through the following metaphors: factories, families, jungles, and theaters or temples.

To help you understand the metaphors a bit better, here are some examples of how the metaphors are being used:

1. "Factories" suggest that the work of schools as an organization is similar to a well-oiled machine that can be adjusted through structures to operate smoothly and efficiently.

2. "Families" suggest that the work of an organization is primarily grounded in people and that the human resource is the most important resource.

3. "Jungles" represent the notion that the work of the leader relies most heavily on a power play or political interplay in which building coalitions and leveraging power with stakeholders is critical.

4. "Theaters" suggest that in order to motivate individuals in an organization, leaders must work through symbolism, metaphor, and tradition.

I will now ask you questions related to your leadership styles categorized by each of the four frames.
Questions About Structure: Factories

17. What kind of administrative structures do you believe most influence your work? For example, an administrative structure in schools might be the line and staff chart.

18. Have you recently reorganized your administrative structure at your district? If so, describe the results either positive or negative that you see from the restructuring.

19. Please identify any other administrative structures that you feel are essential to your work?

Questions About Human Resources: Families

20. Describe your views on human resources in your particular district.

21. How do you develop and sustain relationships with the members of your board?

22. How do you repair relationships that have been stressed in your organization among the following: administrators, faculty members, parents?

Questions About Politics: Jungle

23. Which coalitions in your district are most helpful to you?
24. Which coalitions in your district provide the most resistance to change?

25. How do you control the balance of resources in your system?

Questions About Symbolism: Theaters or Temples

26. What are the most important symbols in your system? Are there any "sacred cows" in your system?

27. How do you use these symbols, traditions, or metaphors to achieve the goals of your system?

28. How do you motivate individuals to put their hearts and their minds into their work?

Key Question

Which of these four frames do you think best reflects your district? Why?

Questions About Power

The Three-Dimensional Model of Power was developed from leading theories of power. The Three Dimensions include (a) explicit uses of power (mechanisms of force, economic dominance, authority, and persuasion), (b) the mobilization of bias (implicit mechanisms of power to include custom, norms, organizational structures, procedures, rules, social usage, tradition), and (c) the
shaping of consciousness (mechanisms built on communication process, myths, symbols, and inspiration).

29. What is your definition of power?

30. Based on your definition of power, how do you view your method of exercising power in your district?

31. How would you describe your communication style?

32. How would you describe the influence of your family on your communication or leadership style?

Other Questions Related to the Purposes of This Research

33. Were there any role models that helped you or mentored you throughout (during) your career as an administrator? Describe one briefly and how this individual may have affected your career.

34. Describe a defining moment when you knew you had established yourself as the chief executive officer of your district?

35. Describe any resistance or challenges that you may have faced in your work that you believe can be attributed to your gender?

36. Which combination of factors do you believe led directly to your rise as superintendent?

37. How would you describe the work experience of male superintendents in New Jersey?
38. Describe a scenario in which you were called upon to test the limits of your leadership skills and you were successful. How did you choose what to do in that particular situation? What frame do you think this situation was in?

39. How do you think New Jersey superintendents are meeting the leadership challenge in the 21st century?

40. In your best judgment, how do you believe the superintendency in New Jersey has changed? How would you describe your current, past, and future role as superintendent?

41. Do you believe that the communication style of women superintendents differs from that of male superintendents?

42. How do you recognize employee achievements?

43. What led to your decision to become a superintendent?

44. Did your doctorate (if applicable) contribute to your success?

45. What do you describe as the most necessary characteristics of a superintendent?

46. What community or professional organizations do you belong to?
47. Did you experience any personal or professional barriers in your decision to become superintendent?

48. How do you believe teaching experience influenced your success as superintendent? How do you believe coaching experience influenced your success as superintendent? How do you believe your administrative experience influenced your success as superintendent? Which factors were most influential?

49. Do you have any advice for those who wish to become superintendent?

50. Is there any question that I should have asked you that I did not?

Thank you for your participation in this interview process.
Appendix C
VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY

Structural Frame (Section 1)

Internal Consistency Data

Coefficient alpha all items .920

Human Resource Frame (Section 1)

Internal Consistency Data

Coefficient alpha all items .931

Political Frame (Section 1)

Internal Consistency Data

Coefficient alpha all items .913

Symbolic Frame (Section 1)

Internal Consistency Data

Coefficient alpha all items .931

Structural Frame (Section 2-Forced Choice)

Internal Consistency Data

Coefficient alpha all items .841

Human Resource Frame (Section 2-Forced Choice)

Internal Consistency Data

Coefficient alpha all items .843

Political Frame (Section 2-Forced Choice)

Internal Consistency Data

Coefficient alpha all items .799
Symbolic Frame (Section 2—Forced Choice)

Internal Consistency Data

Coefficient alpha all items .842