

VITA

Jennifer G. McCormick

EDUCATION

- 2011 Indiana State University, Terre Haute, Indiana
Ph.D. in Educational Administration
- 2008 Indiana State University, Terre Haute, Indiana
Ed.S. in Educational Administration
- 2004 Ball State University, Muncie, Indiana
Licensure in School Administration
- 1999 Ball State University, Muncie, Indiana
M.A. in Special Education
- 1993 Purdue University, West Lafayette, Indiana
B.A. in Elementary Education

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

- 2010 - Yorktown Community Schools, Yorktown, Indiana
Superintendent
- 2007 - 2010 Yorktown Community Schools, Yorktown, Indiana
Assistant Superintendent
- 2004 - 2007 Yorktown Community Schools, Yorktown, Indiana
Principal
- 1994 - 2004 Yorktown Community Schools, Yorktown, Indiana
Teacher

THE PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS AND PROFESSIONAL SKILLS DEFINING
SUPERINTENDENT EFFECTIVENESS

A Dissertation

Presented to

The College of Graduate and Professional Studies

Department of Educational Leadership

Indiana State University

Terre Haute, Indiana

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Philosophy

by

Jennifer G. McCormick

December 2011

© Jennifer G. McCormick 2011

Keywords: Personal characteristics, professional skills, superintendent effectiveness

COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Committee Chair: Robert Boyd, Ed.D.

Associate Professor, Educational Leadership

Indiana State University, Terre Haute, Indiana

Committee Member: Terry McDaniel, Ph.D.

Assistant Professor, Educational Leadership

Indiana State University, Terre Haute, Indiana

Committee Member: William Roberson, Ed.D.

President, Roberson Consulting Services, LLC

Camby, Indiana

ABSTRACT

The intent of this study was to determine if there were differences among Indiana public high school principals, Indiana public school superintendents, and Indiana public school board presidents about the personal characteristics and professional skills that define effective superintendents. In order to effectively determine such characteristics and skills, research and literature were reviewed; input from practicing Indiana public high school principals, Indiana public school superintendents, and Indiana public school board presidents was sought; and a survey was conducted. A generalization was made from the sample to the population regarding how each of these groups defined superintendent effectiveness. Current research and literature was reviewed in order to develop a survey instrument intended to obtain the desired input from the sample. The components of the survey were divided into two categories: personal characteristics and professional skills. The content or specific items for the survey were created for the survey from the complete list of items which were identified through the current literature in three or more sources. Based on the set criteria, the current literature facilitated the production of a survey with 14 personal characteristics and 22 professional skills. Two research questions were formulated for the study. Question one and question two were analyzed statistically through Null Hypothesis One and Null Hypothesis Two. For each null hypothesis, a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to determine significance. The level of significance established for this study was .05. Descriptive data were also utilized to answer both research questions. Study findings showed public high school principals valued

the personal characteristic of *charismatic* significantly higher than public school board presidents. In addition, it was concluded public high school principals valued the professional skill of *serves as a child advocate* significantly higher than public school board presidents, and high school principals also valued *empowers/develops others* significantly higher than public school board presidents. However, school board presidents valued *able to meet major mandates* significantly higher than high school principals in defining effective superintendents.

It was also concluded that superintendents valued the professional skill of *develops positive relations with board members* significantly higher than public school board presidents. Yet, public school board presidents valued the professional skill of *able to meet major mandates* significantly higher than public school superintendents. The emerging views of leadership, along with the current unique societal, political, and economic climate demand that careful attention be placed on the personal characteristics and professional skills that define an effective superintendent. Using such information from the study for recruiting, selecting, training, and retaining effective superintendents will be important. Bringing focus to such difficult tasks as those described in the study could be very helpful in multiple ways.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I understand and respect the power of high quality mentors in one's life. I wish to express my appreciation to the following people for their contributions to my professional growth and completion of the Ph.D. program. I hold the utmost respect for these quality individuals.

Appreciation is due to Dr. Robert Boyd for directing the study and to Dr. Terry McDaniel and Dr. William Roberson for serving on the study committee. Each member of my committee exemplifies the quality mentor that I hope to become. A special thanks to Dr. Boyd who challenged me to become a better thinker throughout my Ed.S. and Ph.D. programs. In addition, I also wish to thank Dr. William Roberson for his continued support, guidance, and encouragement.

Appreciation is also due to those educators who have been supportive or influential throughout my professional career. Thanks to Dr. Vince Bertram, Mrs. Kelly Wittman, Mr. Pat LaVelle, Mrs. Bev LaVelle, and Mrs. Terry Montgomery. Although their significance has different meaning individually, each has played a valuable role in my life.

Special recognition is reserved for my family. My husband, Trent, has provided encouragement and support throughout my academic endeavors. My son, Cael, was inspirational in my commitment to better myself through further education and doctorate attainment. In addition, my parents and sister were also very encouraging throughout this process.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

COMMITTEE MEMBERS	ii
ABSTRACT.....	iii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	v
LIST OF TABLES.....	ix
INTRODUCTION	1
Statement of Problem.....	1
Purpose of the Study	4
Research Questions	5
Null Hypotheses.....	5
Significance of the Study.....	5
Definition of Terms.....	6
LITERATURE REVIEW	7
Historical Shifts	8
Personal Characteristics and Professional Skills	11
METHODOLOGY	46
Research Questions	46
Null Hypotheses.....	47
Participants.....	47
Survey Design.....	48

Procedure	49
Data Analysis	50
Personal Characteristics, Professional Skills, and Current Sources	51
PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA	52
Research Questions	53
Null Hypotheses	53
Presentation of Study Sample	54
Comprehensive Survey Results	55
Superintendent Survey Results	63
High School Principal Survey Results	69
School Board President Survey Results	75
Reliability of Survey Results	81
Null Hypothesis One	81
Null Hypothesis Two	87
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	95
Personal Characteristics Defining Superintendent Effectiveness	95
Professional Skills Defining Superintendent Effectiveness	96
Conclusions	99
Recommendations for Further Research	101
Summary	102
REFERENCES	104
APPENDIX A: Personal Characteristics, Professional Skills, and Supporting Research	108
APPENDIX B: Supporting Research Sources	111

APPENDIX C: Survey Instrument	113
APPENDIX D: Final Survey	115

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1 <i>Respondents' Rating of Personal Characteristics</i>	56
Table 2 <i>Respondents' Rating of Professional Skills</i>	59
Table 3 <i>Superintendents' Rating of Personal Characteristics</i>	63
Table 4 <i>Superintendents' Rating of Professional Skills</i>	66
Table 5 <i>High School Principals' Rating of Personal Characteristics</i>	69
Table 6 <i>High School Principals' Rating of Professional Skills</i>	72
Table 7 <i>School Board President's Rating of Personal Characteristics</i>	75
Table 8 <i>School Board Presidents' Rating of Professional Skills</i>	78
Table 9 <i>Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient</i>	81
Table 10 <i>Assumption of Normality – ANOVA1 (Personal Characteristics)</i>	83
Table 11 <i>Test of Homogeneity of Variance for Personal Characteristics</i>	84
Table 12 <i>Model Summary Significance for Personal Characteristics</i>	86
Table 13 <i>Assumption of Normality – ANOVA2 – Professional Skills</i>	88
Table 14 <i>Test of Homogeneity of Variance for Professional Skills</i>	89
Table 15 <i>Model Summary Significance for Professional Skills</i>	91

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Statement of Problem

A 2009 study indicated that district leadership has a measurable impact on student achievement (Marzano & Waters, 2009). The debate over the focus of such findings has been the subject of much controversy over time (Leithwood, Day, Sammons, Harris, & Hopkins, 2006). Yet, these recent research results have refocused attention onto district level leadership. Obviously, the question, does district leadership really matter, has been already affirmatively answered by Marzano and Waters (2009). Although this link between student achievement and the superintendent has been made, the struggle to determine what defines an effective superintendent still remains.

The 21st century is an exciting yet challenging time in education. In addition to the bureaucracy at the federal, state, and local levels, educational leaders are experiencing paradigm shifts in leadership approaches as a result of leaving the Industrial Era and entering the Knowledge Era. Additionally, there are new demands being placed on leaders today, also deemed the Age of Accountability, that challenges the historical duties associated with the superintendency (Lashway, 2002). As the complexity of the superintendency increases, the requirements demanded of effective superintendents are nothing short of precedent setting.

The demands placed on educational leaders are complex, yet the expectations are extremely high. Over the past two decades, research on effective school leadership has focused considerable attention on three areas. One such area was the fluid transfer of focus throughout the decades on determining which level of school leadership should be the level of focus. Yet, the heightened interest placed back on school district leadership has never been at a higher level than it is today (Education Writers Association, 2003). Another area was the examination of the change in the role of superintendent due to such factors as the leaders' ever-changing situational context and societal impact associated with the role. Today, leaders are faced with limited resources, diverse community needs which demand superintendent transparency, federal and state heightened legislative pressures, demands for research-based curriculum and instruction delivered by highly qualified teachers, and a growing number of at-risk students (Education Writers Association, 2003). Lastly, the study of the historical shifts over 155 years in district-level leadership professional standards and licensing requirements were also a focus. Clearly, this was still a focal point for many, as licensing requirements are currently being scrutinized. Unquestionably, the decision to deregulate the profession of school district superintendent should not be unilaterally made by politicians (Bjork & Kowalski, 2005). As a matter of fact, an understanding of the depth and complexity of such a position should drive professional standards and licensing requirements (Bjork & Kowalski, 2005). Interestingly, found in all three focused areas of study concerning school superintendents was an underlying theme of a quest for desired qualities that define superintendent effectiveness.

With new research supporting district leadership impacting student achievement combined with the 21st century complex and demanding expectations placed on the superintendent's role, there was a desire to establish the personal characteristics and

professional skills that defined effective superintendents. This type of trait-based perspective on leadership was not a novel idea. In fact, the idea of conducting a trait-based approach to establish leadership effectiveness spans over time (Zaccaro, 2007). The first such study dates as far back to Galton's 1869 study, *Hereditary Genius* (as cited in Zaccaro, 2007). Recently, in a quest to define the basis of effective leaders, there has been resurgence in the interest of such trait-based studies (Zaccaro, 2007). Identifying the personal characteristics and professional skills that lead to leadership effectiveness has been the topic of many studies, theories, and perspectives. As previously mentioned, one such perspective was the trait-based perspective (Zaccaro, 2007). Although the trait-based perspective has a controversial history, much research has been conducted with a focus on attention to individual differences that should predict leadership emergence and effectiveness (Zaccaro, 2007). More recently, several studies have linked specific personal characteristics to leadership effectiveness providing an argument that trait-based studies do matter and deserve further study (Zaccaro, 2007). However, it was cautioned that in addition to the trait-based studies, professional skills need to be explored in combination with personal characteristics in order to fully examine what determines leadership effectiveness (Zaccaro, 2007). Furthermore, studies have indicated that leaders' personal characteristics or traits and attributes are important predictors for both their current level of effectiveness and for future acquisition of skills that will further predict future effectiveness (Zaccaro, 2007).

Unquestionably, there was research that claimed that effective leadership practice does not depend on personal characteristics or personal skills but on context alone (Leithwood et al., 2006). It would be negligent to ignore these claims. It is important to note that effective leaders are impacted by situational context; however, in different situations effective leaders are

sensitive to their application of personal characteristics and professional skills and adapt appropriately (Leithwood et al., 2006). Their personal characteristics and professional skills are not completely different and do not change drastically in differing context; their application of such is just different (Leithwood et al., 2006). In fact, recently, there has been the argument made that effective leaders exhibit personal characteristics and professional skills that are exhibited over multiple settings (Zaccaro, 2007). For example, given a change in the environment, effective leaders adapt their own behavior in that particular situation based on developed skills and intellectual capacity (Zaccaro, 2007). Although situational context was an important consideration when measuring effectiveness regarding a change in the leader's behaviors, personal characteristics, and professional skills still defined what measures the effectiveness regarding the leader's role (Zaccaro, 2007). Given the degree of complexity surrounding the task of defining what skills and characteristics define effective superintendent leadership, there is the need for an instrument to measure this effectiveness.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to determine if there is a difference among Indiana public high school principals, Indiana public school superintendents, and Indiana public school board presidents about what were the personal characteristics and professional skills that define effective superintendents. In order to effectively determine such characteristics and skills, research and literature were reviewed; input from practicing Indiana public high school principals, Indiana public school superintendents, and Indiana public school board presidents was sought; and a survey was conducted.

Research Questions

In order to effectively fulfill the purpose of this study, answers to the following two research questions were obtained. Those questions were:

1. Is there a difference among Indiana public high school principals, Indiana public school superintendents, and Indiana public board presidents about what are the personal characteristics that define effective superintendents?
2. Is there a difference among Indiana public high school principals, Indiana public school superintendents, and Indiana public board presidents about what are the professional skills that define effective superintendents?

Null Hypotheses

From these questions, the following null hypotheses were formulated.

H₀ 1: There is no significant difference among Indiana public high school principals, Indiana public school superintendents, and Indiana public school board presidents about what are the personal characteristics that define effective superintendents.

H₀ 2: There is no significant difference among Indiana public high school principals, Indiana public school superintendents, and Indiana public school board presidents about what are the professional skills that define effective superintendents.

Significance of the Study

Identifying the personal characteristics and professional skills that define an effective superintendent is important to the educational field. Through the use of research, review of current literature, by gathering practitioner feedback, and conducting a survey, this study sought to accomplish the following:

1. Identify the personal characteristics and professional skills that define effective superintendents based on the current role of superintendent;
2. Determine if there is a significant difference among Indiana public high school principals, Indiana public school superintendents, and Indiana public school board presidents about what are the personal characteristics that define effective superintendents; and
3. Determine if there is a significant difference among Indiana public high school principals, Indiana public school superintendents, and Indiana public school board presidents about what are the professional skills that define effective superintendents.

Definition of Terms

In order to establish clarification in the understanding of this study, the following terms are defined:

Effective (when referring to educational leadership) is suggesting exceptionalism that is “hard to find, worth trying to learn about and emulate, and carries with it a high degree of respect and value” (Leithwood, 1995, p. 7); “ability to convert creativity, mental ability, and knowledge into results; thus, the ability to achieve” (Drucker, 2001, p. 192).

Personal characteristics are those intrinsic factors that are unique to a particular person and directly affect that person's regular capacity (Human Characteristics and Skills Development Canada, 2010, ¶ 1).

Professional skills are the major transferable skills that are often possessed by professionals and management level personnel (Cabal Group, n.d., ¶ 1).

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

The 21st century is an exciting yet challenging time in education. In this Knowledge Era, new competitive situations are defined by deregulation, globalization, advancement in technology, and powerful politics (Halal & Taylor, 1999). These descriptors coupled with other unprecedented issues facing education place demands on educational leaders that are complex and evoke expectations that are extremely high. In these times, school superintendents must be masters at leading as well as managing. However, Drucker (2001) reminded us that leaders do not manage people; the charge is to lead them. In addition to leading people, superintendents are being faced with a great deal of change and issues that demand transformation in our schools. Such issues include, but are not limited to, the following: (a) major mandates, (b) more assertive special interest groups, (c) more demanding request from stakeholders to be included in the decision-making process, (d) an increased number of alternative education choices, and (e) standards-based accountability (Lashway, 2002). These responsibilities are monumental for school leaders and demand strong leadership skills and unique personal characteristics. Consequently, it is imperative school superintendents have personal characteristics and professional skills that define and result in effectiveness.

The notion of superintendent effectiveness is not an easy one to define. In fact, effective leadership is a subject much easier to just talk about than to either define or

accomplish (Scherer, 2009). The much-needed research revealing those specific qualities of individuals who have successfully lead school districts is minimal (Mendez-Morse, 1992). Drucker (2001) also stated, “Effectiveness can no longer be taken for granted; nor can it be neglected. The motivation of the knowledge worker depends on his being effective, on being able to achieve” (p. 193). Thus, effectiveness is no longer optional for leaders; it is required (Covey, 2004). In the arena of leadership, there is an increased desire to know what it does take to effectively manage a school district (Thomas, 2001). The term *effective*, when referring to educational leadership, suggests exceptionality that is “hard to find, worth trying to learn about and emulate, and carries with it a high degree of respect and value” (Leithwood, 1995, p. 7). In addition, effectiveness converts creativity, mental ability, and knowledge into results; thus, it is the ability to achieve (Drucker, 2001). In fact, an increase in effectiveness is the sole factor in raising a professional’s level of success (Drucker, 2001). Yet, truly defining an effective school district leader is challenging and can evoke an enormous quest for specific skills and characteristics (Leithwood, 1995).

Historical Shifts

Although the demand for effective school leadership spans throughout history, the responsibilities associated with the superintendent role, the corresponding expectations, and the amount of focus placed on the office of the superintendent have drastically changed. At the end of World War II, school leaders were challenged to focus more on curriculum and the determination of who was fit to teach (Thomas, 2001). Then, during the 1960s educational equity movement, the educational focus was shifted away from the superintendent and toward the building level principal (Thomas, 2001). Eventually, the 1980s claimed two significant educational events that brought focus back to the superintendency. The first was the release of

A Nation at Risk (U.S. Department of Education, 1983). This national report was the start of a 10-year renewal in the interest of the position of superintendent, thus bringing back more focus to central office (as cited in Thomas, 2001). Along with this renewed focus came heavy criticism (Thomas, 2001). Surprisingly, the heaviest of all criticism came in the form of a comment made during the 1987 state of education address given by the Secretary of Education, William Bennett (as cited in Marzano & Waters, 2009). During his address, Bennett negatively referred to administrators and the administrative system of public schools as *the blob* (Marzano & Waters, 2009). The *blob* analogy referred to the central office and, in his opinion, the manner in which resources were being handled and reform was being approached (Marzano & Waters, 2009). However, by the mid-1990s, the focus once again shifted away from district leadership and toward public school reform as a whole (Thomas, 2001). This was due in part from an emphasis placed on charter schools, vouchers, and the restructuring of power (Thomas, 2001). The notion of restructuring power also brought the spotlight back to the building-level leadership (Thomas, 2001). Today, a shift has once again happened.

A heightened interest has once again been brought back to district-level leadership (Education Writers Association, 2003). Some of this is due to the increase in the recent evidence expanding on the idea that district leadership plays a critical role in overall school improvement, including student achievement (Lashway, 2002). Unfortunately, there still remains a large void in recent research and literature with focus on effective leadership at the district level (Thomas, 2001). The knowledge base that is available regarding what makes an effective superintendent is starting to expand, but the demands placed on the superintendent have never been greater (Education Writers Association, 2003). In fact, some would say the role of the superintendent is in a *state of crisis* (Education Writers Association, 2003).

However, Lashway (2002) added that if it is indeed in a *state of crisis*, the situation has arguably energized those in the position rather than holding them back. Furthermore, there seems to be an overall new sense of promise and a resurgence of respect for district leadership, both resulting from recent links between effective superintendents and effective schools (Marzano & Waters, 2009). Thus, these recent links gave reason for a developed sense of urgency to assess the effectiveness of school superintendents. This is especially true as superintendents face ever-changing priorities (Institute for Educational Leadership, 2001).

Superintendent priorities are not only ever-changing, they are more complex and greater in number (Institute for Educational Leadership, 2001). Over time, district leaders' priorities have moved from the four Bs (i.e., bonds, budget, buses, and buildings) to the four Rs (i.e., race, resources, relationships, and rules; Institute for Educational Leadership, 2001). Current priorities have again shifted from the Rs to the four As and five Cs (Institute for Educational Leadership, 2001). Superintendents are expected to be aware of, passionate about, and able to execute in the areas of academic standards, accountability, autonomy, ambiguity, collaboration, communication, connection, child advocacy, and community building (Institute for Educational Leadership, 2001). Given this reality, the question remains, "What personal characteristics and professional skills must superintendents possess in order to effectively fulfill these responsibilities?"

Interestingly, since 1996, school leaders have been judged based on six performance standards as defined by the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) (Wilmore, 2008). In fact, many superintendent preparation programs strive to meet these standards; yet, many have argued the standards were better suited for building-level administrators not district-level (Bjork, Collier, Glass, & Hoyle, 2005). These standards were

identified using three categories: knowledge, dispositions, and performance. Although these standards were scrutinized and later revised, for many years there remained limited research linking mastery of such standards to actual superintendent effectiveness (Bjork et al., 2005). Furthermore, as a response to the No Child Left Behind Act of 2002, the question still remained: What constitutes a highly effective administrator? (Wilmore, 2008). In an attempt to answer this question, the Interstate Consortium on School Leadership (ICSL) was given the task of defining a highly effective administrator (as cited in Wilmore, 2008). In 2006, the ICSL reviewed and eventually updated the ISLLC standards along with the Educational Leadership Constituent Council's (ELCC) school administrator standards (Wilmore, 2008). The end result produced seven standards, which were intended to simply be partial guidelines and benchmarks leading to superintendent effectiveness (Wilmore, 2008). These standards incorporated both personal characteristics and professional skills, with the last standard being intended for university superintendent preparedness programs (Wilmore, 2008).

In addition to the ISLCC-ELCC standards, ELCC has also joined with the American Association of School Administrators (AASA) to write eight superintendent standards (Bjork et al., 2005). These standards were intended to be used to develop and establish effective superintendents. The standards addressed superintendent candidate identification and preparedness, along with superintendent selection and performance (Bjork et al., 2005). Each of the eight standards was supported by several specific indicators.

Personal Characteristics and Professional Skills

Effective leaders, including superintendents, frequently exemplify common characteristics and skills. With the current link of research supporting district leadership and its impact as related to student achievement combined with the current and unprecedented

expectations placed on the superintendent, there is an established need to identify the personal characteristics and professional skills that define effective superintendents; a trait-based perspective on leadership does just that. Although, this perspective is not a novel one, it is one definitely being identified as worthy of revisiting. In fact, the idea of conducting a trait-based approach to establish leadership effectiveness spans over time with the first such study dating back to Galton's 1869 study, *Hereditary Genius* (as cited in Zaccaro, 2007). The revisiting of such a perspective is a result of an effort to define the basis of effective leaders; thus, the resurgence in its interest and its related studies (Zaccaro, 2007). Superintendent effectiveness examined by identifying the personal characteristics and professional skills that were exhibited by school leaders has been the focus of a plethora of studies, theories, and perspectives. As previously mentioned, one such perspective was the trait-based perspective (Zaccaro, 2007). Although a controversial history is associated with the trait-based perspective, noted research has been conducted reflecting much given attention to individual differences that in theory should assist in predicting leadership emergence and effectiveness (Zaccaro, 2007). More recently, numerous studies have also supported the link between specific personal characteristics and leadership effectiveness; thus, an argument that trait-based studies do matter and deserve further study has been established (Zaccaro, 2007). However, it is cautioned that when examining such studies and perspectives, in addition to the trait-based studies the professional skills must also be considered in an attempt to fully examine and reflect upon what determines leadership effectiveness (Zaccaro, 2007). Furthermore, it was also mentioned that personal characteristics and professional skills must be explored while still considering the differing situations and critical experiences that developed and molded such great leaders (Bennis & Thomas, 2002). Lastly, current levels of effectiveness and future attainment of such

personal characteristics or traits and attributes can serve as vital predictors of future effectiveness according to what studies have indicated (Zaccaro, 2007).

Covey. When effective people display such characteristics and skills, these traits can also be defined as habits (Covey, 1989). A review of Covey's (1989) work revealed seven habits that defined highly effective people. The seven habits included: being proactive, beginning with the end in mind, putting first things first, thinking win-win, seeking first to understand—then being understood, having synergy or putting the organization first, and being committed to self renewal (Covey, 1989). The seven habits are further refined to target more specified skills and characteristics that are embedded in each one. Later, an eighth habit of highly effective people was introduced: finding your own voice and inspiring others to find their own voice as well (Covey, 2004). Effective leaders do not display these habits in isolation (Covey, 2004). They understand the natural relationships that exist among the habits and embrace them as they grow as leaders (Covey, 2004). Worth noting, listening was mentioned as a communication skill that demanded attention when defining effectiveness. However, effective listening skills can only happen when there is a high level of mutual trust and cooperation (Covey, 1989).

Drucker. In addition, effective leaders are competent leaders who continue to learn (Drucker, 2001). Furthermore, effective leaders maintain a focus on the overall organization and the awesome responsibilities that are associated with it (Drucker, 2001). To do so, the leader turns his or her attention away from himself or herself and toward the whole (Drucker, 2001). This practice leads to the powerful development of others who make up all levels of the organization (Drucker, 2001). In addition, effective people have a refined, specialized knowledge base that is continually enhanced and shared with others in a strategic manner

(Drucker, 2001). Human relations are another area where effective people excel (Drucker, 2001). The personal characteristics and professional skills surrounding this area are communications, teamwork, self-development, and development of others (Drucker, 2001). The key to determining what sets aside effective leaders is the productivity gained by using the aforementioned four areas (Drucker, 2001). Although a productive human relation is a vital component of effective leadership, the characteristic of charisma seem to be discounted. In addition, effective people focus on their own strengths by identifying, improving, and evaluating them (Drucker, 2001). However, effective people also do not ignore their weaknesses (Drucker, 2001). Moreover, effective people know themselves and understand the importance of somewhat paralleled value systems between themselves and the organization (Drucker, 2001). Because effective people are driven by goals and productivity, they are very aware and respectful of time (Drucker, 2001). During that time, effective people make difficult decisions. The decisions effective people make compared to those decisions ineffective people make are very calculated, taking into consideration the purpose for the decision and ensuring the decision can be carried out in a simplistic form (Drucker, 2001). In addition, these great leaders understand that the decision-making process must start with doing what is right versus doing what is easy or popular (Drucker, 2001). The effective leader then goes on to end the decision-making process using a planned method of gathering information in a quest to self-determine the level of success that resulted from his or her decision (Drucker, 2001). Lastly, functioning communication skills is also an area present in effective leaders (Drucker, 2001).

Once one builds such an environment, the effective leader then listens, understands the complexity of perceptions and expectations related to communication, focuses on a desired outcome of communication rather than the exact output, and accepts the notion that

organizational communication comes from a member of the whole to the whole (Drucker, 2001). Ineffective people tend to communicate to the organization using a top down, me to them, manner, thus not operating as part of the organization (Drucker, 2001).

Marzano and Waters. In affirming the answer to the question, “Does leadership matter?” five actions were identified that effective superintendents engage in to ensure student achievement (Marzano & Waters, 2009). The five actions are as follows:

1. Ensure collaborative goal setting including all relevant stakeholders with an emphasis on principals.
2. Establish and communicate nonnegotiable goals for achievement and instruction and create and implement an action plan in order to achieve such goals.
3. Ensure Board support and focus regarding district goals by effective communication and elimination of distractions.
4. Monitor goals using building-level benchmarks and impose an expectation of corrective action if goals are not met or followed.
5. Allocate resources in order to achieve goals; this may mean reallocation of time, money, personnel, and other supporting resources. (Marzano & Waters, 2009, p. 6)

ISLLC/ELCC district level standards. In 2006, ICSL determined that a review of the ISLLC standards along with the Educational Leadership Constituent Council’s (ELCC) school administrator standards were necessary (Wilmore, 2008). The review ultimately lead to an updated list of combined standards, which was reflected in the outcome of a total of seven newly formulated standards (Wilmore, 2008). At such time, these seven standards were intended to simply be partial guidelines and serve as benchmark with the purpose of developing and producing effective superintendents (Wilmore, 2008). These newly updated seven

standards incorporated both personal characteristics and professional skills determined to be essential for successful superintendents, while the last standard was intended to serve as a guideline for universities to follow in their quest to deliver superintendent preparedness programs (Wilmore, 2008). These standards are as follows:

Standard 1: A school district leader who has the knowledge and ability to promote the success of all students by facilitating the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a school or district vision of learning that is supported by the school community;

Standard 2: A school district leader who has the knowledge and ability to promote the success of all students by promoting a positive school culture, providing an effective instructional program, applying best practices to student learning, and designing comprehensive professional growth plans for staff;

Standard 3: A school district leader who has the knowledge and ability to promote the success of all students by managing the organization, operations, and resources in a way that promotes a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment;

Standard 4: A school district leader who has the knowledge and ability to promote the success of all students by collaborating with families and other community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizing community resources;

Standard 5: A school district leader who has the knowledge and ability to promote the success of all students by acting with integrity and fairness and in an ethical manner;

Standard 6: A school district leader who has the knowledge and ability to promote the success of all students by understanding, responding to, and influencing the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context; and

Standard 7: The internship provides significant opportunities for candidates to synthesize and apply the knowledge and practice and develop the skills identified in Standards 1-6 through substantial, sustained, standards-based work in real settings, planned and guided cooperatively by the institution and school district personnel for graduate credit. (Wilmore, 2008, pp. 7-8)

ISLCC/AASA district level standards. The joint work on standards and each standard's indicators by ISLCC and AASA produced the following:

Standard 1: Strategic Leadership and District Culture

- formulating a vision statement
- demonstrating awareness of the larger influences on education
- promoting academic rigor
- empowering others
- solving programs using problem-solving skills and decision-making skills
- assessing district climate
- motivating others
- exhibiting multiculturalism (Bjork et al., 2005, p. 20)

Standard 2: Policy and Governance

- understanding public school governance
- understanding the relationship with the Board of Education
- formulating district policy

- relating local policy to state and federal regulations
- avoiding civil and criminal liabilities (Bjork et al., 2005, p. 40)

Standard 3: Communication and Community Relations

- articulating the district's vision
- demonstrating political understanding and skill
- understanding and connecting with cultural groups
- using good judgment
- gauging external perception of a district
- communicating the district's positions and educational issues
- writing and speaking clearly
- listening using formal and informal skills
- working with groups
- identifying political forces in a community
- identifying the political context
- passing referenda
- promoting children's welfare
- mediating conflicts
- building consensus
- promoting community relations
- identifying, tracking, and dealing with issues
- making and implementing communication plans (Bjork et al., 2005, pp. 65-66)

Standard 4: Leadership and Organizational Management and School Finance

- making and implementing operational plans

- applying a system perspective
- defining roles and functions, delegating, determining accountability
- monitoring and assessing progress
- understanding school finance (Bjork et al., 2005, pp. 81-82)

Standard 5: Planning and Developing Curriculum

- developing curriculum design and delivery for diverse schools
- creating developmentally appropriate curriculum and instruction
- assessing students' present and future learning needs
- creating research-based curriculum based on standards, policies, and mandates
- promoting curricular alignment
- designing curricular, co-curricular, and extracurricular programs
- using technology, communications, and information systems (Bjork et al., 2005, p. 112)

Standard 6: Instructional Management

- developing, implementing, and monitoring change process to improve students and adults
- demonstrating and understanding of motivation in instruction
- describing classroom management theories and techniques
- understanding development of the total student
- formulating a plan to assess teachers
- analyzing instructional resources, and align them in a cost-effective and equitable manner
- describing instructional strategies that are multiculturally sensitive

- applying computer technology to instruction
- describing alternative methods or monitoring student progress based on objectives
- describing how to interpret data to improve instruction
- demonstrating knowledge on instructional strategies research
- describing student achievement, progress monitoring and reporting (Bjork et al., 2005, pp. 131-132)

Standard 7: Staff Evaluation and Personnel Management

- recruiting, selecting, developing, and promoting personnel
- evaluating personnel using effective practice and models
- avoiding legal problems involving personnel
- evaluating the effective use of human resources (Bjork et al., 2005, pp. 160-161)

Standard 8: Values and Ethics of Leadership

- exhibiting multiculturalism
- understanding the role of schooling in a democratic society
- demonstrating integrity
- modeling moral and ethical standards
- promoting democracy and civic responsibility
- promoting moral and ethical values in each classroom and school
- safeguarding diversity of religion and ethnicity
- coordinating community agencies to support child welfare (Bjork et al., 2005, p. 188)

Leithwood and Riehl. In addition to such standards, Leithwood and Riehl (2003) summarized several research-based findings regarding effective superintendents. They reported a common core set of skills and characteristics that defined effective school leaders (Leithwood & Riehl, 2003). In accordance with their findings, effective superintendents should lead by setting direction using an identified, shared, and articulated vision and set of goals; creating high expectations and monitoring performance; using clear and effective communication; developing the intellect in people; serving as a role model for people and providing support; developing and modifying the organizational structure; managing the school environment in a proactive and focused manner; strengthening school culture through articulated shared norms; and building the collaborative process. (Leithwood & Riehl, 2003, p. 2)

Interestingly, the report makes it clear that these skills do not ensure success in every context; yet, failure to possess and effectively use such skills will likely result in failed leadership (Leithwood & Riehl, 2003, p. 6). Many of these characteristics were reinforced by other studies.

Harris. One such study by Harris (2009) examined 22 award-winning superintendents from across 16 states. The study revealed three key overlapping skills or characteristics that defined each of the 22 effective leaders (Harris, 2009). First, each superintendent set direction for the district, emphasizing student learning and results (Harris, 2009). Next, the superintendents redesigned the organization putting people before programs (Harris, 2009). Finally, each decorated superintendent focused on developing people, placing an emphasis on *we* before themselves (Harris, 2009). In addition to these three key superintendent commonalities, the work also revealed effective superintendents understood the changing times

and worked to change programming and curriculum to fit student needs (Harris, 2009). Creative thinking and a displayed strong commitment were also skills that described these leaders (Harris, 2009).

Kellerman. When addressing personal characteristics and professional skills needed for the future success of effective leaders, followership must also be considered as there is no leadership without followership (Kellerman, 2008). For leaders to succeed in the area of followership, they must first understand that followers are important and grasp the magnitude of follower impact (Kellerman, 2008). Secondly, effective leaders provide followership development (Kellerman, 2008). Commitment to such professional development for all is a must. In addition, effective leaders understand and utilize followers as change agents within the organization (Kellerman, 2008). Also, leaders understand that followers are more important to leaders than the concept of the reverse (Kellerman, 2008). This understanding is reflected in actions that support such notions as providing quality professional development and utilization of followers for the sake of change (Kellerman, 2008). Because of the power associated with followers, effective leaders neither overestimate nor underestimate the power of their followers (Kellerman, 2008). Therefore, these leaders listen to their followers, set follower-friendly policies, and intentionally work to improve the followers' working environments (Kellerman, 2008).

Uhl-Bien, Marion, and McKelvey. In the post-industrial leadership world, effective leaders must rely more on corporate intelligence, learning capacity, creativity, and adaptability (Uhl-Bien, Marion, & McKelvey, 2007). This concept is what defines the Complexity Leadership Theory (Uhl-Bien et al., 2007). This demands that leaders develop an environment in which knowledge is captured and disseminated while using all resources efficiently and

effectively (Uhl-Bien et al., 2007). The effective leader's outcome goals would be to then develop, embrace, and implement change with new and innovative knowledge (Uhl-Bien et al., 2007). In order to capitalize on new knowledge, these leaders understand the degree of importance and the scale of the network of connectedness that must be utilized to gather information in order to develop learning capacity within the organization (Uhl-Bien et al., 2007). To successfully develop such an environment, successful leaders lead by modeling adaptability, making intellectually sound decisions, and displaying a commitment to learn (Uhl-Bien et al., 2007). In addition to the personal characteristics and professional skills aforementioned that define effective leaders as described by the Complexity Leadership Theory, leaders must also lead organizations at a complexity level that is equal to that of the environment; thus, leaders must successfully search and find solutions to challenges and remain innovative (Uhl-Bien et al., 2007). As a result of establishing this complexity equilibrium, the leader creates an organization that optimizes its ability to learn, create, and adapt (Uhl-Bien et al., 2007).

Our new era, the Knowledge Era, also requires effective leaders to shift their thinking from individual control and power toward leading in a systemic, complex organizational unit as a whole (Uhl-Bien et al., 2007). To accomplish this shift in thinking, leaders will empower other leaders and followers (Uhl-Bien et al., 2007). While the Knowledge Era demands a change in thinking in practice from the leaders, many leadership theories and practice continue to reflect those practices and same thinking of the Industrial Era (Uhl-Bien et al., 2007). Therefore, it is important to establish those characteristics and skills that define those effective leaders who are making the shift.

Leithwood, Day, Sammons, Harris, and Hopkins. Not all claims regarding school leadership effectiveness are all the same or have the same supporting evidence (Leithwood et al., 2006). Yet, overall, the evidence supported claims that alluded to the idea that successful leaders exhibit shared practices that contain four key considerations (Leithwood et al., 2006). These four considerations involve common personal characteristics and professional skills. The four key considerations, along with each consideration's leadership descriptors, include the following (Leithwood et al., 2006):

1. Leaders build vision and set directions.
 - Leaders motivate followers.
 - Leaders and followers are driven by a shared purpose.
 - Leaders foster group goal development and objective implementation.
 - Leaders demonstrate high expectations.
 - Leaders clarify roles.
 - Leaders inspire followers.
 - Leaders facilitate planning and organization.
2. Leaders understand and develop people.
 - Leaders build their own knowledge and skills.
 - Leaders build followers.
 - Leaders are supportive and considerate.
 - Leaders foster intellectual stimulation.
 - Leaders model appropriate behaviors and values.

3. Leaders redesign organizations.
 - Leaders establish work environments which embrace motivation, commitment, and capacities.
 - Leaders build collaborative cultures.
 - Leaders restructure organizations.
 - Leaders build productive relationships with staff, students, community, and board members.
 - Leaders connect their organization to the wider community.
 - Leaders team build.
 - Leaders delegate effectively.
 - Leaders consult wisely.
 - Leaders network appropriately and effectively.
4. Leaders manage and/or oversee the teaching and learning programs.
 - Leaders create productive work conditions that are supportive.
 - Leaders staff appropriately and efficiently.
 - Leaders provide teacher support.
 - Leaders monitor school activities.
 - Leaders buffer staff against distractions.

Bjork. Experts in the educational arena understand and support the findings that superintendents have a direct and indirect impact on curriculum, instruction, and student achievement (Bjork, 2009). The Instructionally Effective School Districts' research has identified five essential areas that require a combination of personal characteristics and professional skills that define an effective superintendent (Bjork, 2009). These five areas are

staff selection and recruitment, principal supervision and evaluation, establishing clear instructional and curricular goals, monitoring learning and curricular improvement activities, and financial planning for instruction.

These five areas are further dissected to assist in determining how effective district leaders differentiate themselves from average superintendents. For example, when determining staff selection, effective superintendents are very involved in the process (Bjork, 2009). In addition, they are extremely focused and aggressive with regards to their recruitment process (Bjork, 2009). The hiring and recruitment processes carried out by effective superintendents are purposeful with the organizational goals as the driving force (Bjork, 2009).

Next, effective superintendents are strategic in their supervisory and evaluator role (Bjork, 2009). After making it clear what is expected instructionally at the building level and keeping that focus present, effective superintendents directly link the evaluation process to such instructional goal attainment (Bjork, 2009). In order to evaluate in such a manner, superintendents are involved in such activities as visiting classrooms, reviewing student discipline, and evaluating building-level professional development activities (Bjork, 2009).

As previously mentioned in regards to the evaluation process, the superintendent is directly involved in setting instructional and curricular goals. Effective superintendents are committed to setting specific student achievement goals and making sure the staff is aware of the goals and supporting objectives (Bjork, 2009). This communication to the staff is essential as the shared goals are key to effective superintendents' vision for their own district (Bjork, 2009).

Once goals are set and shared, effective superintendents must maintain and monitor the goals (Bjork, 2009). In order to maintain and monitor goals, the superintendent is highly

visible in the schools (Bjork, 2009). In addition, the topic of student achievement is consistently and purposefully revisited by the superintendent with principals and other leaders both within and outside of the organization (Bjork, 2009).

In an effort to accomplish instructional and curricular goals, strategic budgetary decisions must be made with commitment and intention (Bjork, 2009). This means that the superintendent must be skillful at generating internal and external support for goal attainment (Bjork, 2009). Effective superintendents are quite convincing at such practices (Bjork, 2009).

Bjork and Kowalski. As the complexity related to the role of the superintendent is examined, so too are the knowledge and skills that are deemed necessary for effective practice in the position (Bjork & Kowalski, 2005). Five broad roles are determined and defined to help frame the demands of such a challenging role (Bjork & Kowalski, 2005). When reviewing the five roles that have been determined as lasting proven essential roles which determine superintendent effectiveness, it is important to consider their future relevancy and organizational context (Bjork & Kowalski, 2005). The five roles are teacher-scholar, manager, democratic leader, applied social scientist, and communicator.

As far back as 1910, the role of teacher-scholar as it relates to district superintendents has meant differing responsibilities (Bjork & Kowalski, 2005). However, today, it is important the superintendents have a genuine interest in curriculum and instruction and demonstrate this interest by articulating it as their primary focus (Bjork & Kowalski, 2005). At a time when state and national reform and redesign efforts are calling for rigorous accountability standards and the deregulation of superintendent licensing, this role is essential for superintendent effectiveness (Bjork & Kowalski, 2005). In addition, superintendents are expected to develop

and recommend educational policies that increase student achievement (Bjork & Kowalski, 2005).

Around 1920, the Industrial Revolution generated a managerial focus onto the role of the superintendent (Bjork & Kowalski, 2005). This focus brought about and maintained a concentration on efficiency and productivity regarding the budget, facilities, and personnel issues (Bjork & Kowalski, 2005). This also means being skillful at delegating and balancing the superintendent requirements associated with leadership and management (Bjork & Kowalski, 2005).

The role of democratic leader, too, has changed throughout history. However, given the current economic times and changing public values, there is definitely a resurgence of emphasis placed on this role (Bjork & Kowalski, 2005). To successfully fulfill this role, superintendents must communicate with the public and have a keen sense of public wishes and needs (Bjork & Kowalski, 2005). Due to the vast varying differences among school and community patrons, the effective superintendent benefits from polished conflict management and facilitation skills (Bjork & Kowalski, 2005). Lastly, the effective superintendent is also one who is a wise political strategist (Bjork & Kowalski, 2005).

Interestingly, applied social scientist was a role formulated as a result of the merging of educational and societal forces (Bjork & Kowalski, 2005). This role required superintendents to have levels of awareness and expertise related to societal issues such as racism, poverty, and gender discrimination (Bjork & Kowalski, 2005). Effective superintendents seek out research and experts to sensitively and successfully educate their followers on such issues, as these societal topics continue to impact student achievement (Bjork & Kowalski, 2005).

Last is the role of communicator. Whether examining the Knowledge Era or Information Age, communication is a key component. Effective superintendents understand that communication is a two-way, balanced interaction between the superintendent and all stakeholders (Bjork & Kowalski, 2005). Thus, effective superintendents understand the importance of collaboration and do so appropriately and skillfully (Bjork & Kowalski, 2005). Furthermore, communication must include open political dialogue, facilitating and creating goals and visions, building a positive image for the organization, gaining stakeholder support for change, establishing and monitoring a framework for information gathering and dissemination, developing quality marketing programs for the district, deliberately informing the public regarding education-related information, and embracing community diversity (Bjork & Kowalski, 2005).

Southwest Educational Development Laboratory (SEDL). This study supports the idea that effective school leaders are skillful at addressing the responsibilities associated with a district while at the same time addressing the human aspects of the organization (SEDL, 2009). Those school leaders who were deemed effective had six characteristics linked to them that positively assisted them in their school improvement and educational change efforts (SEDL, 2009). Those six characteristics were being a visionary, believing that schools are for learning, valuing human resources, communicating and listening effectively, being proactive, and taking risk (SEDL, 2009).

Being an effective visionary requires superintendents to start with a personal vision and then create a shared vision (SEDL, 2009). This can only be done if the leader has the ability to see the big picture of what needs to be accomplished along with the capacity to get it done (SEDL, 2009). Next, the effective leader shares this vision with all stakeholders and empowers

all to act (SEDL, 2009). Hence, the effective leader has the ability to develop, communicate, and implement a vision for educational change, thus leading measurable student achievement (SEDL, 2009). In addition, the successful superintendent understands and embraces the differing primary focus related to the shared vision that may result depending upon the stakeholder's individual role (SEDL, 2009).

The second shared characteristic of effective superintendents is the common belief that the primary purpose of school is to meet the instructional needs of students (SEDL, 2009). Effective superintendents stay loyal to their communities by respecting and continually examining the instructional needs and desires of the community (SEDL, 2009). However, these elite superintendents have an unwavering commitment to the notion that student learning comes before all else (SEDL, 2009).

Effective superintendents clearly understand that people are their greatest resource (SEDL, 2009). They purposefully exhibit characteristics and skills that support this idea by doing three things. First, leaders truly value the professional input of all staff members (SEDL, 2009). Secondly, the leader has the ability to relate with staff (SEDL, 2009). Lastly, the leader leads in an environment that embraces collaboration and encourages innovative idea sharing (SEDL, 2009). These three areas can be further narrowed down to more specific skills and characteristics of the leader. For example, effective leaders support their staff by providing them with essential resources and sharing genuine verbal and nonverbal moral support (SEDL, 2009). In addition, these leaders are relentless in protecting instructional time while promoting a district-wide climate that expects collaboration (SEDL, 2009). Furthermore, the skill of being personable and friendly is evident in such leaders as well (SEDL, 2009).

Leaders of change use their communication skills in all areas. As a change agent, the effective superintendent understands that communication is no doubt the key to the successful shared characteristics identified in the study (SEDL, 2009). An example of such is the way they communicate through their actions. Being proactive is the way effective superintendents do business (SEDL, 2009). This is essential because this type of leader is always challenging the status quo in the district (SEDL, 2009). Also, these leaders are masterful at identifying changes in the outside forces as well as attending to the changes related to the inside forces (SEDL, 2009). Once identified, effective leaders skillfully craft organizational responses (SEDL, 2009). In addition, they have an innate ability to scan their schools, community, and other impacting forces noticing where the change is needed within their organization (SEDL, 2009). Again, being proactive, the leader sets a course of action based on anticipated student and staff needs (SEDL, 2009). As a result of their proactive demeanor, these leaders are also comfortable with confronting issues and people and spend their energies on anticipation of issues rather than reaction (SEDL, 2009). Finally, in order to realize the organization's vision, effective superintendents work diligently on proactively establishing policies and procedures that either eliminate barriers or create opportunities (SEDL, 2009).

Last is the concept of risk-taking. Leaders who are successful at change are masterful at creating environments that establish the needed purpose for such change (SEDL, 2009). To do so, these leaders encourage staff to try new instructional methods and practices, examine new organizational structures, and report their findings (SEDL, 2009). Although these superintendents are comfortable with risk taking, they do not approach this idea recklessly (SEDL, 2009).

Waters and Marzano. To determine the impact district-level administrators had on student achievement and the characteristics of effective superintendents, a study was conducted by Mid-Continent Research for Education and Learning (Waters & Marzano, 2006). The findings of the research provide one key area that defines effective superintendents (Waters & Marzano, 2006). This one area states that effective superintendents focus their attention on creating goal-oriented districts (Waters & Marzano, 2006).

Obviously, this responsibility calls for specific leadership skills and characteristics. One such supporting professional skill is that of collaborative goal-setter, which demands the comprehensive gathering of input from all stakeholders (Waters & Marzano, 2006). Furthermore, effective leaders are unwavering in their expectation of goals that are focused on student achievement and instruction (Waters & Marzano, 2006). In order to meet this demand and achieve such goals, effective superintendents understand and embrace the necessity for research-based instruction (Waters & Marzano, 2006). Also, the effective superintendent ensures that the local board of education understands these goals and is committed to prioritizing the goals above all else (Waters & Marzano, 2006). Thus, the superintendent must keep the board's primary focus on the set goals and buffer possible distractions (Waters & Marzano, 2006). In addition, the skillful task of monitoring student achievement and ensuring quality instruction remains in the forefront of priorities for effective superintendents (Waters & Marzano, 2006). Lastly, these proven superintendents ensure that necessary resources are given to stakeholders in order to reach goal attainment (Waters & Marzano, 2006). Too often, this means difficult budgetary decision-making on behalf of the district leadership. Effective superintendents must display courage as they make budgetary recommendations on cutting

expenses that do not align with student achievement and instructional goals (Waters & Marzano, 2006).

The Wallace Foundation. In a quest to identify common characteristics and skills exemplified in the principals and superintendents who can transform struggling schools, Public Agenda completed research on five focus groups in high-needs districts (The Wallace Foundation, 2008). Based on the research, 12 issues were examined (The Wallace Foundation, 2008). This examination revealed some commonalities among those effective leaders (The Wallace Foundation, 2008). Those commonalities included the following:

- Is a visionary
- Creates a culture that believed each student can learn
- Instructional leadership is their top priority
- Is highly visible
- Uses data to set goals, analyze problems, and allocate resources
- Has a consensus-building approach rather than continual shake-up
- Recruits staff with purpose
- Is courageous
- Has strong personal core beliefs
- Embraces mentorship to develop leadership
- Eliminates distractions
- Is passionate about education (The Wallace Foundation, 2008, pp. 3-14)

Harms and Crede. The topic of emotional intelligence has a somewhat short yet checkered history (Harms & Crede, 2010). Some studies show that emotional intelligence skills account for 90% of what distinguishes effective leaders from ineffective leaders, but other

studies find this to be a gross overestimate (Harms & Crede, 2010). Regardless, studies do demonstrate emotional intelligence contributes to effective leadership at some level (Harms & Crede, 2010). Therefore, it is important that personal characteristics and professional skills associated with emotional intelligence be considered in the quest to determine superintendent effectiveness. Emotional intelligence leadership skills include such skills as self-confidence, empathy, and self-awareness (Harms & Crede, 2010). High levels of emotional intelligence have also been linked to the Transformational Leadership Theory (Harms & Crede, 2010). This link would be made by the sharing of such high levels of common emotional intelligence skills such as leaders serving as mentors for the sake of encouraging learning and individual development, providing meaning for others, acting as role models, providing challenges, evoking emotions, and fostering a climate of trust (Harms & Crede, 2010). In addition, transformational leadership skills found in effective leaders include social charisma of the leader; followers' perceptions of the leader as confident and committed; leadership actions built on values and beliefs; leadership attention to follower needs; leadership social-emotional support for followers by frequent contacts; leadership inspiration and appeal to followers; leadership establishment of challenging goals; leadership optimism regarding goal attainment; leadership that causes followers to challenge assumptions; and leadership creativity, intellectual capacity, and willingness to take risk (Harms & Crede, 2010).

Judge, Piccolo, and Kosalka. This study examines the positive—the bright side traits—and the negative—the dark side traits—associated with leadership effectiveness (Judge, Piccolo, & Kosalka, 2009). This study also discussed the power of follower perception. For instance, if the followers expect the leader to be charismatic and self-confident, the level to which he or she displays these skills and characteristics will in part determine the leader's level

of effectiveness according to the followers (Judge et al., 2009). Yet, 12 leadership skills and characteristics are identified that ultimately lead to leadership effectiveness (Judge et al., 2009). The identified positive and negative traits are extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, emotional stability, openness, core self-evaluations, intelligence, charisma, narcissism, hubris, dominance, and Machiavellianism.

Bright side traits. Effective leaders are defined as extraverts through their display of assertiveness, high activity and energy levels, upbeat demeanor, and optimistic outlook (Judge et al., 2009). Extraverts usually display a high satisfaction for their work and own well-being (Judge et al., 2009). Effective leaders are also agreeable, which means they are trusting and trustworthy (Judge et al., 2009). Typically, these leaders also have bright social-behaviors and relationships (Judge et al., 2009). In addition, effective leaders will be cooperative, gentle, and kind to team members (Judge et al., 2009). Also, agreeable leaders have an encouraging and pleasant genuine concern for others, which is reflected in the work environment that they create (Judge et al., 2009).

Emotional stability is also exhibited by effective leaders (Judge et al., 2009). This means that leaders are calm, relaxed, and consistent with their emotions (Judge et al., 2009). Openness is the next trait describing effective leaders (Judge et al., 2009). Specifically, this openness involves reactions to intellectual experiences (Judge et al., 2009). These leaders are creative, imaginative, resourceful, and full of insight (Judge et al., 2009). Because of this, they are able and eager to challenge the status quo (Judge et al., 2009).

Core self-evaluation is a very broad categorical trait comprising self-esteem, locus of control, self-efficacy, and emotion stability (Judge et al., 2009). Those leaders with high levels of the above-mentioned traits are more likely to have high job performance levels (Judge et al.,

2009). In addition, they reveal faster and simpler strategic decision-making, involvement in a great deal of large initiatives, and have more endurance in pursuit of initiative goals (Judge et al., 2009). Yet, of all characteristics the most sought after in leaders is that of intelligence (Judge et al., 2009). Intelligence is linked to such effective leadership skills and characteristics as critical decision-making, social affluence, educational achievement, job performance stability, self-sufficiency, legitimacy, lawful behavior, and creative problem-solving of complex issues (Judge et al., 2009).

The positive trait is that of charisma. Although there is mixed research regarding this trait as well, it is still one that gets attention. Charisma is the personal charm, attractiveness, and persuasive communication displayed by effective leaders (Judge et al., 2009). There are hundreds of studies that support the idea that charismatic leaders are able to inspire followers to high levels of achievement and performance and get high levels of commitment from their followers as well (Judge et al., 2009).

Dark side traits. The negative traits associated with effective leadership are narcissism, hubris, social dominance, and Machiavellianism (Judge et al., 2009). Although these are negative in nature, these are exhibited as personal characteristics and linked to professional skills of those who are considered great in their fields (Judge et al., 2009). Whereas these dark traits might arguably compromise the overall leader as an individual, there is research suggesting that these traits when exhibited by leaders may actually enhance the productivity of the followers (Judge et al., 2009). Given the definition of effectiveness, examining these traits is worthy of mention.

Narcissism is defined by a leader who is arrogant, self-absorbed, and slightly hostile (Judge et al., 2009). These leaders view others as inferior and may struggle with the idea of

shared leadership (Judge et al., 2009). Decisions are made by such leaders with a self-serving approach as they are concerned a great deal for their own reputation (Judge et al., 2009).

Similar to the same qualities of narcissism, hubris exists in leaders who have an inflated sense of self (Judge et al., 2009). These leaders tend to exaggerate their own accomplishments and do not appreciate critical feedback (Judge et al., 2009). In addition, these leaders feel they can accomplish what other leaders in similar positions cannot (Judge et al., 2009).

Socially-dominant leaders are ones who control conversations and motivate followers by fear (Judge et al., 2009). These leaders may get results from followers; however, followers prefer a shared and considerate leadership style over this dominating and manipulative approach (Judge et al., 2009).

Lastly, effective leaders have been known to display Machiavellianism. This trait is named after a 16th century author who wrote about a character who was ruthless and manipulative (Judge et al., 2009). These leaders use both political and social power to strive toward a purpose (Judge et al., 2009). Power is quite frequently abused by such a leader as the followers are controlled and convinced into practices that personally benefit the leader (Judge et al., 2009). Although these leaders do strive to maximize opportunities, these opportunities are usually self-serving (Judge et al., 2009).

Conscientious leaders fall into both the dark trait and bright trait categories (Judge et al., 2009). Interestingly, leaders with such skills are diligent in their work and pay much attention to detail; however, some are also impersonal and slightly rude (Judge et al., 2009). In addition, these leaders are aware of follower needs, yet are rarely seen as appealing or inspirational by the followers (Judge et al., 2009).

Lashway. This work brings to light the role of the superintendent and the valid question of what it takes to actually do the job (Lashway, 2002). Furthermore, it focuses on the skills and characteristics necessary to lead in the Age of Accountability (Lashway, 2002). As the complexity of the superintendency increases, the requirements of effective superintendents are as follows:

- Understands the role of instructional leader
- Understands the role of managerial leader
- Understands the role of political leader
- Develops relations with the school board
- Sets expectations and support as instructional leader
- Displays an in-depth understanding of instructional strategies and coaching
- Understands data to guide decision making
- Holds principals and teachers accountable for effective instructional practices
- Requires a clear instructional vision
- Obtains staff commitment
- Is highly visible
- Empowers staff by embracing collaboration and risk taking
- Brings focus to professional development
- Constructs evaluations based on student achievement
- Creates powerful learning communities within the organization
- Declaries instructional goals and aligns the organization for goal attainment

(Lashway, 2002, pp. 1-4)

Education Writers Association. As educational leaders seek to redesign and reform education, the question becomes, “What is effective leadership?” (Education Writers Association, 2003). This question also comes at a time with a heightened interest in the superintendency (Education Writers Association, 2003). The superintendent is expected to do more with less with a primary focus on boosting student achievement (Education Writers Association, 2003). Considering school funding concerns and the demands placed on the position of superintendent, an urgent need to define superintendent effectiveness has been established (Education Writers Association, 2003). Based on the results of the studies that are examined, the personal characteristics and professional skills defining effective district leadership are as follows:

- Understands and has a vision for quality instruction
- Has the knowledge and capacity to execute instructional and curricular programs
- Articulates a vision for student learning and links that vision into the mission
- Organizes support for the vision through personnel and shared decision making
- Encourages board member involvement
- Uses key instructional strategies to realize the vision
- Effectively evaluates and assesses personnel and programs
- Remains highly visible; reports observations to principals
- Keeps focus on district goals
- Has high demands for professional development linked to goals
- Develops an organizational structure; has latitude to hire and fire, fiscal stability
- Develops a board that gives the superintendent latitude to make decisions
- Is extremely flexible and collaborative

- Has broad-based leadership; shared decision making and leadership development
- Is masterful at connecting with stakeholders; community builder
- Is effective communicator
- Is whole child advocate
- Has strong curriculum knowledge
- Understands and is skillful at the politics surrounding education
- Designs own leadership for specific context politics
- Recommends solid student related policies
- Develops and administers the budget effectively
- Effectively manages business; bids, contract, facilities, transportation, etc.
- Develops and supports administration
- Develops and supports teachers
- Develops and supports non-certified staff members (Education Writers Association, 2003, pp. 2-11)

Fullan. In order for substantive systemic change to take place, leadership development must thrive (Fullan, 2009). Organization-embedded learning, job-embedded learning, and system-embedded learning are three systems of leadership development that are tied to successful districts (Fullan, 2009). Since district level-leaders are responsible for supporting, developing, and nurturing such initiatives, examining such systems also gives insight into successful and effective district-level leaders' skills and characteristics (Fullan, 2009).

Organization-embedded learning requires that district-level leaders establish a culture of continuous learning and problem solving (Fullan, 2009). Furthermore, the main focus of this

system is placed on improving the organization and its culture while developing the leaders within the organization (Fullan, 2009).

Job-embedded learning requires that district leadership embrace the idea of leadership development in such a way that they recruit with the purpose of bettering instruction and organizational reform (Fullan, 2009). In addition, these leaders support and provide the resources and opportunities for leadership professional development both within the organization and outside of the organization (Fullan, 2009). Such leadership development programs call for the skillful identification and creation of leadership cohorts (Fullan, 2009). Also, the role modeling and mentoring that is given to leaders is based on solid practices which are researched and implemented by successful leaders (Fullan, 2009).

Lastly, system-embedded learning also requires specific leadership skills and characteristics. When looking at the school district system as a whole, collective efficacy must be reviewed (Fullan, 2009). Collective efficacy results from district leaders displaying confidence in themselves and their teams to accomplish set goals (Fullan, 2009). This confidence is gained by quality interaction and developed commitment (Fullan, 2009). Successful leaders focus on student achievement goals and then work on maximizing individuals and teams (Fullan, 2009). Additionally, these effective leaders align curriculum, instruction, assessment, and interventions as well as leadership development (Fullan, 2009).

Bennis and Thomas. Successful leadership that transcends context, era, and culture was defined categorically into four areas, each containing descriptive personal characteristics and professional skills (Bennis & Thomas, 2002). Those four areas included adaptive capacity, engaging others by creating, voice, and integrity (Bennis & Thomas, 2002). Of the four, adaptive capacity was noted to be the biggest determiner of effective leadership (Bennis &

Thomas, 2002). Leaders with this quality demonstrated the ability to not limit their success to an IQ measure, used critical skills to understand context and recognize opportunity, seized opportune moments, and used challenges and setbacks as learning opportunities toward the development of a higher level of competency (Bennis & Thomas, 2002). In addition, these leaders focused reflective practices on self awareness and growth (Bennis & Thomas, 2002). The other areas, including engaging others by creating, voice, and integrity, considered emotional IQ, purpose, communication, competence, ambition, and enthusiasm for life (Bennis & Thomas, 2002). Leaders with such skills had a shared vision and empowered others to achieve it (Bennis & Thomas, 2002). They also had a focus on a cause over self and created a trusting environment where enthusiasm was modeled (Bennis & Thomas, 2002). Lastly, effective leaders falling into the four distinct categories were highly competent and had a clear understanding of good versus evil (Bennis & Thomas, 2002).

Gardner. As the 21st century leadership era was approaching, the principle findings underscoring leadership effectiveness was presented as a result of studying past and current leaders who represented different vocational arenas, culture backgrounds, and genders (Gardner, 1995). This study revealed six truths of effective leadership (Gardner, 1995). The first truth was the emphasis placed on the leader's individual message, or story, being clear, relevant, and question-answering (Gardner, 1995).

In addition, this message must be heard by an accepting audience (Gardner, 1995). Thus, effective leaders consider the audience's needs and deliver their core message remaining nimble and displaying regard for concerns (Gardner, 1995). Additionally, the audience must be able to make sense of the leader's message (Gardner, 1995).

Next, effective leaders put the organization above all else (Gardner, 1995). Effective leaders use power and position only to better the organization and work toward the attainment of its goals (Gardner, 1995). They use their power and position to develop critical relationships that enhanced their experiences and ultimately led to the betterment of the organization (Gardner, 1995).

In addition, effective leaders embody their message (Gardner, 1995). Therefore, these leaders look convincing and truthful (Gardner, 1995). Successful leaders are aware of their own charismatic capacity, which helps lead to such a convincing look that instills trust (Gardner, 1995).

Effective leaders must also consider their method of delivery. Regardless of whether the delivery is direct or indirect, effective leaders must reflect and focus on the big picture (Gardner, 1995). The effective leader understands that the method used may place restriction on both demands. To transition between methods takes skill, and the effective leader must understand his or her audience in order to do so successfully (Gardner, 1995).

Lastly is the truth related to expertise (Gardner, 1995). Effective leaders must be ambitious with high expectations (Gardner, 1995). However, it is cautioned that an unbalance of too much demand and too little attention to those in need can be distressing to an organization (Gardner, 1995). Typically, effective leaders are also highly competitive, willing to question, and welcome risks (Gardner, 1995). Finally, without question, the effective leader's work must be of high quality and be perceived as such (Gardner, 1995).

Wilmore. Studies focused on 21st century superintendents emphasized a need for superintendents to align all facets of a district while fully understanding the relationships among these facets (Wilmore, 2008). To do so, today's superintendents must be systems

thinkers who possess a firm understanding of change and the process it entails (Wilmore, 2008). In addition, effective superintendents must understand and respect the impact they have on the district (Wilmore, 2008). In order to examine 21st century district leadership effectiveness, specific personal characteristics and professional skills that successful leaders possess must be studied (Wilmore, 2008). To do so, Wilmore (2008) organized these traits into knowledge, skills, and dispositions. These identified traits are as follows:

Knowledge

- Understanding differentiation among the role of teacher, principal, other administrators, board members, and the superintendent
- Understanding and applying curriculum and instructional theories that are developmentally appropriate for an increasingly diversified student population
- Being a strong business and academic leader
- Being fiscally prudent with both district and personal funds
- Being a system thinker and problem solver

Skills

- Being both consensus and team builder
- Having experience in prior positions of educational responsibility
- Needing and soliciting active community support
- Being responsible, because being a superintendent is an honorable responsibility
- Having the skills to work effectively with people from diverse communities
- Managing people well
- Exhibiting self-control in words and actions

- Being a good communicator; able to motivate and teach in order to facilitate the district achievement of its vision
- Supporting and encouraging change for district improvement and enhanced productivity and accountability
- Being able to handle work-related stress and pressure in a healthy and balanced manner

Dispositions

- Being committed to values and truth of well-rounded academic, co-curricular, and extracurricular education for all students
- Meriting the respect of others; good reputation, have integrity and character, live wisely, and be faithful to things
- Displaying a healthy balance of confidence and humility when dealing with educational issues
- Having passion, wisdom, and the ability to facilitate the development, implementation, and evaluation of a district vision of learning (Willmore, 2008, pp. 3-4)

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this study was to determine the personal characteristics and professional skills that defined effective superintendents according to a random sampling of practicing Indiana public high school principals, Indiana public non-charter school superintendents, and Indiana public non-charter school board presidents. A generalization was made from the sample of the population regarding how these groups defined superintendent effectiveness. Current research and literature was reviewed in order to develop a survey instrument that would obtain the desired input from the sample. The survey investigation was designed to determine if there is a difference in how Indiana public high school principals, Indiana public non-charter school superintendents, and Indiana public non-charter school board presidents defined effective superintendents based on personal characteristics and professional skills. The components of the survey were divided into two categories: personal characteristics and professional skills

Research Questions

In order to effectively fulfill the purpose of this study, answers to the following two research questions were obtained. Those questions were:

1. Is there a difference among Indiana public high school principals, Indiana public non-charter school superintendents, and Indiana public non-charter school board

presidents about what are the personal characteristics that define effective superintendents?

2. Is there a difference among Indiana public high school principals, Indiana public non-charter school superintendents, and Indiana public non-charter school board presidents about what are the professional skills that define effective superintendents?

Null Hypotheses

From the two research questions, the following null hypotheses were formulated.

H₀ 1: There is no significant difference among Indiana public high school principals, Indiana public non-charter school superintendents, and Indiana public non-charter school board presidents about what are the personal characteristics that define effective superintendents.

H₀ 2: There is no significant difference among Indiana public high school principals, Indiana public non-charter school superintendents, and Indiana public non-charter school board presidents about what are the professional skills that define effective superintendents.

This chapter includes a description of the sample participants, an overview of the survey design, a description of the instrument, and instrument analysis.

Participants

For this study, a random sample was selected from a population of Indiana's public high school principals, Indiana public non-charter school superintendents, and Indiana public non-charter school board presidents. Fifty percent of the comprehensive population of individuals from each aforementioned group was randomly selected. A list of practicing high school principals and public non-charter superintendents was obtained through the Indiana Department of Education's website. A list of Indiana public non-charter school board presidents was

obtained through the Indiana School Board Association. From available obtained lists of selected superintendents, participants were randomly chosen based on an alphabetized system in which every 15th individual listed by last name was selected from each list. High school principals and school board presidents were randomly chosen based on an alphabetized list in which every 15th individual listed by high school or school district was selected from the list. In order to reach each population's desired sampling number which represented 50%, the list was used in a circular manner taking out those names once they were selected until the desired number was reached. Randomly selecting based on either last name, high school or district resulted in a more diverse sampling population. Fifty percent of public high school principals totaled 172. Fifty percent of public non-charter school superintendents totaled 146, and 50% of public non-charter school board presidents totaled 145. One public non-charter school board president was excluded from the original pool due to serving on this dissertation committee.

Survey Design

The survey consisted of 36 items. In order to maintain content validity, the content, or specific items, was created from the complete list of items as identified through the literature. Commonalities were identified from the list and survey items were determined from those items which were identified through the current literature in three or more sources (Appendix A). A complete list of sources with corresponding numbers to those cited by each specific survey item can be found in Appendix B. The specific items were categorized into two sections: personal characteristics and professional skills. The instrument's items were designed to be answered on a nine-point Likert scale. The Likert scale that was used reflected *one* being *not important* and *nine* being *extremely important* as it related to the degree to which the sample respondents felt

the specific items were personal characteristics and professional skills that defined an effective superintendent.

During the winter of 2011, the initial instrument (Appendix C) was sent to five practicing field experts made up of two public high school principals, two public non-charter school superintendents, and one public non-charter school board president for the purpose of receiving input from them regarding the clarity of survey expectations, content, wording, and length. This was also another attempt at maintaining instrument content validity. These five individuals were later intentionally excluded from the random sample list. In addition to the initial five experts, the executive directors of the Indiana Association of School Principals, Indiana School Board Association, and the Indiana Association of Public School Superintendents were also considered to review the instrument for the same purpose. Suggested changes were reviewed and implemented, when deemed appropriate. If deemed appropriate and changes were made or only considered, the instrument was in its final draft for the survey (Appendix D). As reflected in the final draft of the survey, the nine-point Likert scale was changed to a five-point Likert scale at the suggestion of the two reviewing superintendents. They both expressed their thoughts that a five-point Likert would provide for a more focused understanding on the actual perception regarding the surveyed person's level of importance placed on each item.

Procedure

During the spring of 2011, an email or mailing with the attached or enclosed final draft survey was sent to those 172 principals, 146 superintendents, and 145 school board presidents who were randomly selected to participate. The executive directors of the Indiana Association of School Principals, Indiana School Board Association, and the Indiana Association of Public

School Superintendents were also contacted for needed participants' email and mailing address information. The Indiana Department of Education's website was also utilized to gather the needed contact information. The spring email or mailing was intended to inform the randomly selected participants of the purpose of the survey and encourage participation regarding an attached or enclosed anonymous survey, which was at that time in a final draft form and conducted through SurveyMonkey.

Two weeks following the initial email/ mailing, a follow-up email and/or mailing was made. Telephone calls were also made in order to encourage participation. Not needed were additional surveys to be randomly sent out to those specific groups lacking in the targeted participation. Again, the targeted sample population for each of the superintendent and school board groups was 30. The targeted sample population for the high school principal group was 34.

Data Analysis

For this study, the instrument's content validity was maintained by using five practicing field experts made up of two public high school principals, two public non-charter school superintendents, and one public non-charter school board president for the purpose of receiving input from them regarding the clarity of survey expectations, content, wording, and length.

These five individuals were later intentionally excluded from the random sample list.

Reliability for this study was checked using the Cronbach Alpha test once the survey results were obtained and internal consistency could be measured.

In addition, descriptive and inferential statistical methods were used to analyze the data. The independent variable was the different groups of participants in this study. They included Indiana's public high school principals, Indiana public non-charter school superintendents, and

Indiana public non-charter school board presidents. The dependent variables for this study included the two groupings of personal characteristics and professional skills. In addition, each of the 36 items making up the two groupings was split into individual dependent variables. Descriptive statistics were used to explain the difference in the means. An ANOVA was used to determine the interaction between the levels of the independent variable by comparing the difference in the means of the dependent variables.

Personal Characteristics, Professional Skills, and Current Sources

The personal characteristics and professional skills that defined effective superintendents and leaders that were obtained through review of the literature are contained in Appendix A. The numbers following each specific item reflected the numbers that corresponded with individual resources. The content, or specific items, was created for the survey from the complete list of items, which were identified through the current literature in three or more sources (Appendix A). A complete list of sources with corresponding numbers to those cited by each specific survey item can be found in Appendix B.

CHAPTER 4

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

The purpose of this study was to determine the personal characteristics and professional skills that defined effective superintendents according to a random sampling of practicing Indiana public high school principals, Indiana public non-charter school superintendents, and Indiana public non-charter school board presidents. A generalization was made from the sample to the population regarding how these groups defined superintendent effectiveness. Current research and literature was reviewed in order to develop a survey instrument intended to obtain the desired input from the sample.

The survey investigation was designed to determine if there was a difference in how Indiana public high school principals, Indiana public non-charter school superintendents, and Indiana public non-charter school board presidents defined effective superintendents based on personal characteristics and professional skills. The components of the survey were divided into two categories: personal characteristics and professional skills. The degree to which the surveyed groups ranked the personal characteristics and professional skills was a reflection of what each group deemed as defining characteristics or skills an effective superintendent possessed. The results of the three surveyed groups—superintendents, high school principals, and school board presidents—were then compared to determine if a significant difference existed. This chapter includes a restatement of the research questions and null hypotheses,

presentation of the study sample, and data and data analysis of the comprehensive group and both null hypotheses.

Research Questions

In order to effectively fulfill the purpose of this study, answers to the following two research questions must have been obtained. Those questions were:

1. Is there a difference among Indiana public high school principals, Indiana public non-charter school superintendents, and Indiana public non-charter school board presidents about what are the personal characteristics that define effective superintendents?
2. Is there a difference among Indiana public high school principals, Indiana public non-charter school superintendents, and Indiana public non-charter school board presidents about what are the professional skills that define effective superintendents?

Null Hypotheses

From the two research questions, the following null hypotheses were formulated.

H₀ 1: There is no significant difference among Indiana public high school principals, Indiana public non-charter school superintendents, and Indiana public non-charter school board presidents about what are the personal characteristics that define effective superintendents.

H₀ 2: There is no significant difference among Indiana public high school principals, Indiana public non-charter school superintendents, and Indiana public non-charter school board presidents about what are the professional skills that define effective superintendents.

Presentation of Study Sample

On May 10, 2011, the final draft of the research survey (Appendix D) was sent electronically via SurveyMonkey to 146 Indiana public school superintendents and 172 Indiana public high school principals. In addition, 145 paper surveys were mailed to Indiana public school board presidents. The total number of surveys mailed to randomly selected individuals of each aforementioned group reflected 50% of the comprehensive group population as mentioned in Chapter 3. A list of practicing high school principals and public non-charter superintendents was obtained through the Indiana Department of Education's website and Indiana Public School Superintendent Association. A list of Indiana public non-charter school board presidents was obtained through the Indiana School Board Association. From available obtained lists of selected superintendents, participants were randomly chosen based on an alphabetized system in which every 15th individual listed by last name was selected from each list. High school principals and school board presidents were randomly chosen based on an alphabetized list in which every 15th individual listed by high school or school district were selected from the list. By randomly selecting based on the differing criteria of either last name, high school name or district name, the resulting sampling population was more diverse.

A review of the submitted and returned surveys revealed the following results. Of the 146 electronically sent superintendent surveys, 53 (36%) were completed and submitted. Of the 172 electronically sent high school principal surveys, 54 (31%) were completed and submitted. Lastly, of the 145 surveys mailed to school board presidents, 65 (45%) were completed and returned. After the survey deadline and after analysis had begun, five (3%) more school board presidents completed and returned their surveys; therefore, these five were

excluded from the data analysis. For comprehensive and independent variable specific data analysis, 172 (37%) total surveys of all three populations were used.

All three levels of the independent variable including public school superintendents, public high school principals, and public school board presidents, were asked to rate the importance of each item on the survey according to their perception of the level of importance of each item to defining a highly effective superintendent. Each of the dependent variable items on the survey represented either a personal characteristic or a professional skill.

There were 36 total items on the survey. Each item was rated on the final draft of the survey using a five-point Likert scale ranging from 1 representing *not important* (NI) to 5 representing *extremely important* (EI). A 3 on the Likert scale represented *moderately important* (MI). A rating of 2 represented a perception level between 1 (NI) and 3 (MI). A rating of 4 represented a perception level of between 3 (MI) and 5 (EI). In addition, the 36 items were divided into personal characteristics and professional skills. Personal characteristics made up the first 14 items on the survey. The remaining 22 items on the survey made up professional skills.

Comprehensive Survey Results

A detailed examination of the personal characteristics data was gathered. The total results of the frequency distribution for the personal characteristics considering all three levels of the independent variables ($n = 172$) are provided in Table 1.

Table 1

Respondents' Rating of Personal Characteristics

Personal Characteristic	<i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)	Extremely Important (5)	(4)	Moderately Important (3)	(2)	Not Important (1)
Creative	3.58 (1.03)	33.0 (19.2)	64.0 (37.2)	51.0 (29.7)	18.0 (10.5)	6.0 (3.5)
Displays a Specialized Knowledge Base/Intelligence	4.03 (0.86)	54.0 (31.4)	77.0 (44.8)	34.0 (19.8)	3.0 (1.7)	3.0 (1.7)
Passionate about Education	4.70 (0.58)	128.0 (74.4)	38.0 (22.1)	5.0 (2.9)	0.0 (0.0)	1.0 (0.6)
Proactive	4.34 (0.78)	84.0 (48.8)	66.0 (38.4)	18.0 (10.5)	1.0 (0.6)	2.0 (1.2)
Systemic Thinker	3.98 (0.84)	52.0 (30.2)	70.0 (40.7)	44.0 (25.6)	4.0 (2.3)	1.0 (0.6)
Innovative/ Seizes Opportunity	4.22 (0.73)	67.0 (39.0)	75.0 (43.6)	28.0 (16.3)	1.0 (0.6)	0.0 (0.0)
Strong Human Relation Skills	4.48 (0.81)	111.0 (64.5)	38.0 (22.1)	19.0 (11.0)	3.0 (1.7)	1.0 (0.6)
Committed to Self-Renewal/ Self-Aware	3.88 (0.90)	45.0 (26.2)	74.0 (43.0)	38.0 (22.1)	12.0 (7.0)	1.0 (0.6)
Charismatic	3.23 (1.01)	19.0 (11.0)	52.0 (30.2)	54.0 (31.4)	44.0 (25.6)	3.0 (1.7)
Driven by Set Personal Goals	3.51 (0.96)	26.0 (15.1)	65.0 (37.8)	54.0 (31.4)	25.0 (14.5)	2.0 (1.2)
Calculated Decision Maker	4.00 (0.80)	52.0 (30.2)	71.0 (41.3)	46.0 (26.7)	3.0 (1.7)	0.0 (0.0)

Table 1 (continued)

Personal Characteristic	<i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)	Extremely Important (5)	(4)	Moderately Important (3)	(2)	Not Important (1)
Displays Integrity/ Fairness	4.71 (0.58)	130.0 (75.6)	35.0 (20.3)	5.0 (2.9)	0.0 (0.0)	1.0 (0.6)
Maintains and Models High Expectations	4.67 (0.59)	124.0 (72.1)	42.0 (24.4)	5.0 (2.9)	0.0 (0.0)	1.0 (0.6)
Effective Communicator	4.70 (0.56)	127.0 (73.3)	41.0 (23.8)	3.0 (1.7)	0.0 (0.0)	1.0 (0.6)

According to the results of frequency distribution relating to personal characteristics, six personal characteristics had a most frequently responded rating of EI as it pertains to defining an effective superintendent. Those six included the following: *passionate about education* ($n = 128, 74.4\%$), *proactive* ($n = 84, 48.8\%$), *strong human relation skills* ($n = 111, 64.5\%$), *displays integrity and fairness* ($n = 130, 75.6\%$), *maintains and models high expectations* ($n = 124, 72.1\%$), and *effective communicator* ($n = 127, 73.8\%$). The personal characteristic with the lowest number response rating of EI was *charismatic*. However, overall, *charismatic* rated as MI ($n = 54, 31.4\%$).

The personal characteristic that received the greatest number of responses by a combination of the three levels of the independent variable groups in the EI rating was *displays integrity/fairness* ($n = 130, 75.6\%$). Thus, this indicated that, of all personal characteristics that were rated, *displays integrity/fairness* rated as the highest personal characteristic that defined

effective superintendents. *Charismatic* received the highest total number of responses under the two lowest ratings ($n = 47, 27.3\%$).

All other personal characteristics had a most frequently responded rating of a 4, which fell between EI and MI. Those remaining personal characteristics were as follows: *creative* ($n = 64, 37.2\%$), *displays a specialized knowledge base/intelligence* ($n = 77, 44.8\%$), *systemic thinking* ($n = 70, 40.7\%$), *innovative/seizes opportunity* ($n = 75, 43.6\%$), *committed to self-renewal/self-aware* ($n = 74, 43.0\%$), *driven by set personal goals* ($n = 65, 37.8\%$), and *calculated decision maker* ($n = 71, 41.3\%$).

The data results for the personal characteristics' rank order of the means for the three levels of the independent variables are also previously provided in Table 1. According to the rank order results, the highest ranked personal characteristic mean was *displays integrity and fairness* ($M = 4.71, SD = .58$). In addition, the lowest ranked personal characteristic mean was *charismatic* ($M = 3.23, SD = 1.01$).

Personal characteristics with the rankings of second through 13th were in order as follows: *effective communicator* ($M = 4.70, SD = .56$), *passionate about education* ($M = 4.69, SD = .58$), *maintain and models high expectations* ($M = 4.67, SD = .59$), *strong human relation skills* ($M = 4.48, SD = .81$), *proactive* ($M = 4.34, SD = .78$), *innovative and seizes opportunities* ($M = 4.22, SD = .73$), *displays specialized knowledge base/intelligent* ($M = 4.03, SD = .86$), *calculated decision maker* ($M = 4.00, SD = .80$), *systemic thinker* ($M = 3.98, SD = .84$), *committed to self-renewal/self-aware* ($M = 3.88, SD = .90$), *creative* ($M = 3.58, SD = 1.03$), and *driven by set personal goals* ($M = 3.51, SD = 1.01$).

A detailed examination of the professional skills data was also gathered. The total results of the frequency distribution for the professional skills are provided in Table 2.

Table 2

Respondents' Rating of Professional Skills

Professional Skills	<i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)	Extremely Important (5)	(4)	Moderately Important (3)	(2)	Not Important (1)
Able to Meet Major Mandates	4.41 (0.69)	90.0 (52.3)	62.0 (36.0)	20.0 (11.6)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)
Aware of Political Impact on Education	4.06 (0.81)	54.0 (31.4)	81.0 (47.1)	33.0 (19.2)	2.0 (1.2)	2.0 (1.2)
Collaborative/ Includes Stakeholders	4.21 (0.71)	65.0 (37.8)	78.0 (45.3)	29.0 (16.9)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)
Serves as Child Advocate	4.28 (0.74)	74.0 (43.0)	76.0 (44.2)	18.0 (10.5)	4.0 (2.3)	0.0 (0.0)
Connects and Builds Community Partnerships	4.17 (0.74)	63.0 (36.6)	76.0 (44.2)	32.0 (18.6)	1.0 (0.6)	0.0 (0.0)
Recruits, Selects, & Retains Productive Staff	4.33 (0.87)	96.0 (55.8)	42.0 (24.4)	28.0 (16.3)	6.0 (3.5)	0.0 (0.0)
Understands School Finance	4.37 (0.74)	89.0 (51.7)	60.0 (34.9)	21.0 (12.2)	2.0 (1.2)	0.0 (0.0)
Empowers/ Develops Others	4.38 (0.68)	84.0 (48.8)	68.0 (39.5)	19.0 (11.0)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)
Understands the Complexity of Perception	3.99 (0.85)	55.0 (32.0)	65.0 (37.8)	46.0 (26.7)	6.0 (3.5)	2.0 (1.2)
Establishes Clear Academic Goals	4.17 (0.80)	68.0 (39.5)	68.0 (39.5)	31.0 (18.0)	4.0 (2.3)	0.0 (0.0)

Table 2 (continued)

Professional Skills	<i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)	Extremely Important (5)	(4)	Moderately Important (3)	(2)	Not Important (1)
Eliminates Distractions	3.55 (0.95)	28.0 (16.3)	64.0 (37.2)	54.0 (31.4)	24.0 (14.0)	1.0 (0.6)
Monitors/Assesses Academic Goals	4.07 (0.74)	50.0 (29.1)	87.0 (50.6)	32.0 (18.6)	3.0 (1.7)	0.0 (0.0)
Allocates Resources to Support Academic Goals	4.27 (0.77)	78.0 (45.3)	62.0 (36.0)	30.0 (17.4)	1.0 (0.6)	0.0 (0.0)
Develop, Articulates and Implements a Vision	4.38 (0.76)	92.0 (53.5)	55.0 (32.0)	23.0 (13.4)	2.0 (1.2)	0.0 (0.0)
Display Curricular & Instructional Leadership Skills	4.16 (0.79)	67.0 (39.0)	64.0 (37.2)	38.0 (22.1)	1.0 (0.6)	0.0 (0.0)
Operates a Safe & Effective Environment	4.41 (0.66)	87.0 (50.6)	69.0 (40.1)	16.0 (9.3)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)
Responds to Legal, Societal & Economic Contexts	4.05 (0.78)	54.0 (31.4)	72.0 (41.8)	42.0 (24.4)	2.0 (1.2)	0.0 (0.0)
Demonstrates Cultural Competency	3.92 (0.84)	36.0 (20.9)	76.0 (44.2)	50.0 (29.1)	5.0 (2.9)	2.0 (1.2)
Develops Positive Relations w/Board	4.32 (0.70)	78.0 (45.3)	71.0 (41.3)	23.0 (13.4)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)

Table 2 (continued)

Professional Skills	<i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)	Extremely Important (5)	(4)	Moderately Important (3)	(2)	Not Important (1)
Formulates Student Focused District Policies	4.15 (0.79)	66.0 (38.4)	66.0 (38.4)	36.0 (20.9)	2.0 (1.2)	2.0 (1.2)
Mediates Conflict Effectively	4.17 (0.81)	70.0 (40.7)	66.0 (38.4)	32.0 (18.6)	4.0 (2.3)	0.0 (0.0)
Visible	4.29 (0.75)	79.0 (45.9)	64.0 (37.2)	28.0 (16.3)	1.0 (0.6)	0.0 (0.0)

According to the comprehensive results of frequency distribution relating to professional skills, 11 professional skills had a most frequently responded rating of EI as it pertains to defining an effective superintendent. Those 11 included the following: *develops, articulates, and implements a vision* ($n = 92, 53.5\%$), *able to meet major mandates* ($n = 90, 52.3\%$), *recruits, selects, and retains productive staff* ($n = 96, 55.8\%$), *understands school finance* ($n = 89, 51.7\%$), *empowers/develops others* ($n = 84, 48.8\%$), *allocates resources to support academic goals* ($n = 78, 45.3\%$), *displays curricular and instruction leadership skills* ($n = 67, 39.0\%$), *operates a safe and effective environment* ($n = 87, 50.6\%$), *develops positive relations with board members* ($n = 78, 45.3\%$), *mediates conflict effectively* ($n = 70, 40.7\%$), and *visible* ($n = 79, 45.9\%$).

The professional skill with the highest number of responses under the rating of EI was *recruits, selects, and retains productive staff* ($n = 96, 55.8\%$). The professional skill with the lowest number of responses under the rating of EI was *eliminates distractions* ($n = 28, 16.3\%$).

Eight of the professional skills were most frequently resulted to with an overall rating of a four; a *four* rating fell between EI and MI. These eight included the following: *aware of political impact of education* ($n = 81, 47.1\%$), *collaborates with stakeholders* ($n = 78, 45.3\%$), *serves as child advocate* ($n = 76, 44.2\%$), *connects and builds community partnerships* ($n = 76, 44.2\%$), *understands the complexity of perception* ($n = 65, 37.8\%$), *monitors/assesses the academic goals* ($n = 87, 50.6\%$), *demonstrates cultural competency* ($n = 76, 44.2\%$), and *responds to legal, societal, and economic contexts* ($n = 72, 41.8\%$).

Two professional skills resulted in overall ratings that tied between the number of EI responses and the number of responses rated as a 4; 4 was the rating between EI and MI. These two professional skills were as follows: *establishes clear academic goals* ($n = 68, 39.5$) and *formulates student focused district policies* ($n = 66, 38.4\%$). *Eliminates distractions* received the highest total number of responses shared between the two lowest ratings ($n = 47, 27.3\%$).

The rank order of the means of professional skills for all levels of the three independent variables is provided in Table 2. According to the rank order results, the highest ranked professional skills means were *operates a safe and effective environment* ($M = 4.41, SD = .66$) and *able to meet major mandates* ($M = 4.41, SD = .69$). In addition, the lowest ranked professional skill mean was *eliminates distraction* ($M = 3.55, SD = .97$).

Professional skills with the rankings of second through 21st in order were as follows: *able to meet major mandates* ($M = 4.41, SD = .69$), *empowers and develops others* ($M = 4.38, SD = .68$), *develops, articulates, and implements a vision* ($M = 4.38, SD = .76$), *understands school finance* ($M = 4.37, SD = .74$), *recruits, selects and retains productive staff* ($M = 4.33, SD = .87$), *develops positive relations with board members* ($M = 4.32, SD = .70$), *visible* ($M = 4.28, SD = .75$), *serves as child advocate* ($M = 4.28, SD = .74$), *allocates resources to support*

academic goals ($M = 4.27, SD = .76$), *collaborative/includes stakeholders* ($M = 4.21, SD = .71$), *mediates conflict effectively* ($M = 4.17, SD = .81$), *establishes clear academic goals* ($M = 4.17, SD = .80$), *connects and builds community partnerships* ($M = 4.17, SD = .74$), *displays curricular and instructional leadership skills* ($M = 4.16, SD = .79$), *formulates student focused district policies* ($M = 4.15, SD = .79$), *monitor/assesses academic goals* ($M = 4.07, SD = .74$), *aware of political impact on education* ($M = 4.06, SD = .81$), *responds to legal, societal, and economic contexts* ($M = 4.05, SD = .79$), *demonstrates cultural competency* ($M = 3.92, SD = .84$), *understands the complexity of perception* ($M = 3.99, SD = .85$), and *eliminates distractions* ($M = 3.55, SD = .95$).

Superintendent Survey Results

A detailed examination of the personal characteristics data for the superintendent responses ($n = 53$) was gathered. The frequency distribution for the personal characteristics for superintendents is provided in Table 3.

Table 3

Superintendents' Rating of Personal Characteristics

Personal Characteristic	M (SD)	Extremely Important (5)	(4)	Moderately Important (3)	(2)	Not Important (1)
Creative	3.58 (1.08)	13.0 (24.5)	15.0 (28.3)	16.0 (30.2)	8.0 (15.1)	1.0 (1.9)
Displays a Specialized Knowledge Base/ Intelligence	4.02 (0.75)	15.0 (28.3)	24.0 (45.3)	14.0 (26.4)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)
Passionate About Education	4.83 (0.38)	44.0 (83.0)	9.0 (17.0)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)

Table 3 (continued)

Personal Characteristic	<i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)	Extremely Important (5)	(4)	Moderately Important (3)	(2)	Not Important (1)
Proactive	4.40 (0.75)	29.0 (54.7)	15.0 (28.3)	8.0 (15.1)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)
Systemic Thinker	4.09 (0.81)	20.0 (37.7)	18.0 (34.0)	15.0 (28.3)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)
Innovative/Seizes Opportunity	4.34 (0.68)	24.0 (45.3)	22.0 (41.5)	6.0 (11.3)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)
Strong Human Relation Skills	4.58 (0.63)	35.0 (66.0)	14.0 (26.4)	4.0 (7.5)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)
Committed to Self-Renewal/ Self-Aware	3.94 (0.99)	19.0 (35.8)	17.0 (32.1)	12.0 (22.6)	5.0 (9.4)	0.0 (0.0)
Charismatic	3.34 (1.09)	7.0 (13.2)	20.0 (37.7)	12.0 (22.6)	12.0 (22.6)	2.0 (3.8)
Driven By Set Personal Goals	3.60 (1.00)	11.0 (20.8)	19.0 (35.8)	14.0 (26.4)	9.0 (17.0)	0.0 (0.0)
Calculated Decision-Maker	3.98 (0.82)	16.0 (30.2)	21.0 (39.6)	15.0 (28.3)	1.0 (1.9)	0.0 (0.0)
Displays Integrity/ Fairness	4.77 (0.47)	41.0 (77.4)	10.0 (18.9)	1.0 (1.9)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)
Maintains and Models High Expectations	4.68 (0.51)	37.0 (69.8)	15.0 (28.3)	1.0 (1.9)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)
Effective Communicator	4.74 (0.45)	39.0 (73.6)	14.0 (26.4)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)

Note. *n* = 53

According to the superintendent level of the independent variable results of frequency distribution relating to personal characteristics, nine personal characteristics had a most frequently responded rating of EI as it pertained to defining an effective superintendent. Those nine included the *displays integrity/fairness* ($n = 41, 77.4\%$), *maintains and models high expectations* ($n = 37, 69.8\%$), *effective communicator* ($n = 39, 73.6\%$), *passionate about education* ($n = 44, 83.0\%$), *proactive* ($n = 29, 54.7\%$), *innovative/seizes opportunities* ($n = 24, 45.3\%$), *systemic thinker* ($n = 20, 37.7\%$), *committed to self-renewal/self-aware* ($n = 41, 77.4\%$), and *strong human relationship skills* ($n = 35, 66.0\%$).

The personal characteristic with the highest number of responses under the rating of EI was *passionate about education* ($n = 44, 83.0\%$). The personal characteristic with the lowest number of responses under the rating of EI was *charismatic* ($n = 7, 13.2\%$).

Four of the personal characteristics were most frequently responded to with a rating of 4; a 4 was the rating between EI and MI. These four included the following: *displays a specialized knowledge base/intelligence* ($n = 24, 45.3\%$), *charismatic* ($n = 20, 37.7\%$), *driven by set personal goals* ($n = 19, 35.8\%$), and *calculated decision maker* ($n = 21, 39.6\%$).

Only one personal characteristic resulted in overall ratings of a three representing MI. This personal characteristic was *creative* ($n = 16, 30.2\%$). This was the lowest overall ranking of all personal characteristics for the superintendent independent variable.

A detailed examination of the professional skills data for the superintendent responses ($n = 53$) was also gathered. The total results of the frequency distribution for the professional skills considering superintendents as the independent variable are provided in Table 4.

Table 4

Superintendents' Rating of Professional Skills

Professional Skills	<i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)	Extremely Important (5)	(4)	Moderately Important (3)	(2)	Not Important (1)
Able to Meet Major Mandates	4.28 (0.74)	24.0 (45.3)	20.0 (37.7)	9.0 (17.0)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)
Aware of Political Impact on Education	4.13 (0.71)	17.0 (32.1)	26.0 (49.1)	10.0 (18.9)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)
Collaborative/ Includes Stakeholders	4.26 (0.71)	22.0 (41.5)	23.0 (43.4)	8.0 (15.1)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)
Serves as Child Advocate	4.28 (0.74)	25.0 (47.2)	23.0 (43.4)	4.0 (7.5)	1.0 (1.9)	0.0 (0.0)
Connects and Builds Community Partnerships	4.36 (0.71)	15.0 (28.3)	30.0 (56.6)	8.0 (15.1)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)
Recruits, Selects, & Retains Productive Staff	4.13 (0.65)	30.0 (56.6)	5.0 (15.1)	13.0 (24.5)	2.0 (3.8)	0.0 (0.0)
Understands School Finance	4.23 (0.82)	24.0 (45.3)	18.0 (34.0)	10.0 (18.9)	1.0 (1.9)	0.0 (0.0)
Empowers/Develops Others	4.43 (0.57)	25.0 (47.2)	26.0 (49.1)	2.0 (3.8)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)
Understands the Complexity of Perception	4.17 (0.89)	24.0 (45.3)	16.0 (30.2)	11.0 (20.8)	2.0 (3.8)	0.0 (0.0)
Establishes Clear Academic Goals	4.26 (0.81)	25.0 (47.2)	18.0 (34.0)	9.0 (17.0)	1.0 (1.9)	0.0 (0.0)
Eliminates Distractions	3.48 (0.98)	18.0 (25.3)	21.0 (37.2)	11.0 (18.8)	2.0 (1.9)	1.0 (0.6)

Table 4 (continued)

Professional Skills	<i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)	Extremely Important (5)	(4)	Moderately Important (3)	(2)	Not Important (1)
Monitors/Assesses Academic Goals	4.06 (0.74)	15.0 (28.3)	27.0 (50.9)	10.0 (18.9)	2.0 (1.9)	0.0 (0.0)
Allocates Resources to Support Academic Goals	4.40 (0.79)	31.0 (58.5)	12.0 (22.6)	10.0 (18.9)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)
Develops, Articulates, and Implements a Vision	4.40 (0.77)	30.0 (56.6)	14.0 (26.4)	9.0 (17.0)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)
Display Curricular & Instructional Leadership Skills	4.15 (0.78)	20.0 (37.7)	20.0 (37.7)	12.0 (22.6)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)
Operates a Safe & Effective Environment	4.57 (0.67)	35.0 (66.0)	13.0 (24.5)	5.0 (9.4)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)
Responds to Legal, Societal, & Economic Contexts	3.98 (0.82)	17.0 (32.1)	18.0 (34.0)	18.0 (34.0)	2.0 (1.2)	0.0 (0.0)
Demonstrates Cultural Competency	3.90 (0.78)	13.0 (24.5)	20.0 (37.7)	18.0 (34.0)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)
Develops Positive Relations w/Board	4.53 (0.61)	31.0 (58.5)	19.0 (35.8)	3.0 (5.7)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)
Formulates Student Focused District Policies	4.27 (0.82)	25.0 (47.2)	17.0 (32.1)	9.0 (17.0)	1.0 (1.9)	0.0 (0.0)
Mediates Conflict Effectively	4.17 (0.85)	23.0 (43.4)	17.0 (32.1)	12.0 (22.6)	1.0 (1.9)	0.0 (0.0)

Table 4 (continued)

Professional Skills	<i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)	Extremely Important (5)	(4)	Moderately Important (3)	(2)	Not Important (1)
Visible	4.45 (0.64)	28.0 (52.8)	21.0 (39.6)	4.0 (7.5)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)

Note. *n* = 53

According to the superintendent level of the independent variable, results of frequency distribution relating to professional skills, 13 professional skills had a most frequently responded to rating of EI as it pertains to defining an effective superintendent. Those 13 included the following: *able to meet major mandates* (*n* = 24, 45.3%), *serves as child advocate* (*n* = 25, 47.2%), *recruits, selects, and retains productive staff* (*n* = 30, 56.6%), *understands school finance* (*n* = 24, 45.3%), *understands the complexity of perception* (*n* = 24, 45.3%), *establishes clear academic goals* (*n* = 25, 47.2%), *allocates resources to support academic goals* (*n* = 31, 58.5%), *develops, articulates, and implements a vision* (*n* = 30, 56.6%), *operates a safe and effective environment* (*n* = 35, 66.0%), *develops positive relations with board members* (*n* = 31, 58.5%), *formulates student focused district policies* (*n* = 25, 47.2%), *mediates conflict effectively* (*n* = 23, 43.4%), and *visible* (*n* = 28, 52.8%).

The professional skill with the highest number of responses under the rating of EI was *operates a safe and effective environment* (*n* = 35, 66.0%). The professional skill with the lowest number of responses under the rating of EI was *demonstrates cultural competency* (*n* = 13, 24.5%).

Seven of professional skill had a most frequently responded rating of 4; a 4 was the rating between EI and MI. The seven included the following: *aware of political impact on*

education ($n = 26, 45.1\%$), *collaborative/includes stakeholders* ($n = 23, 43.4\%$), *connects and builds community partnerships* ($n = 30, 56.6\%$), *demonstrates cultural competency* ($n = 20, 37.7\%$) *empowers/develops others* ($n = 26, 49.1\%$), *eliminates distractions* ($n = 19, 35.8\%$), and *monitors/accesses academic goals* ($n = 27, 50.9\%$).

Only one professional skill had a tie of the most frequently responded rating of 3 and 4. This professional skill was *responds to legal, societal, and economic contexts* ($n = 18, 34.0\%$). This was also the lowest overall ranking of all professional skills for the superintendent level of the independent variable.

High School Principal Survey Results

A detailed examination of the personal characteristics data for the high school principal group ($n = 54$) was also gathered and examined. The total results of the frequency distribution for the personal characteristics considering high school principals as the level of the independent variable are provided in Table 5.

Table 5

High School Principals' Rating of Personal Characteristics

Personal Characteristic	<i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)	Extremely Important (5)	(4)	Moderately Important (3)	(2)	Not Important (1)
Creative	3.58 (1.09)	9.0 (16.7)	18.0 (33.3)	15.0 (27.8)	10.0 (18.5)	2.0 (3.7)
Displays a Specialized Knowledge Base/ Intelligence	4.08 (0.78)	17.0 (31.5)	24.0 (44.4)	11.0 (20.4)	1.0 (1.9)	0.0 (0.0)
Passionate About Education	4.57 (0.74)	36.0 (66.7)	15.0 (27.8)	2.0 (3.7)	0.0 (0.0)	1.0 (1.9)

Table 5 (continued)

Personal Characteristic	<i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)	Extremely Important (5)	(4)	Moderately Important (3)	(2)	Not Important (1)
Proactive	4.20 (1.00)	26.0 (48.1)	18.0 (33.3)	7.0 (13.0)	1.0 (1.9)	2.0 (3.7)
Systemic Thinker	4.02 (0.97)	19.0 (35.2)	21.0 (38.9)	9.0 (16.7)	3.0 (5.6)	1.0 (1.9)
Innovative/Seizes Opportunity	4.22 (0.72)	20.0 (37.0)	27.0 (50.0)	6.0 (11.1)	1.0 (1.9)	0.0 (0.0)
Strong Human Relation Skills	4.41 (0.94)	35.0 (64.8)	9.0 (16.7)	8.0 (14.8)	1.0 (1.9)	1.0 (1.9)
Committed to Self- Renewal/Self- Aware	4.02 (0.85)	15.0 (27.8)	27.0 (50.0)	6.0 (11.1)	4.0 (7.4)	0.0 (0.0)
Charismatic	3.43 (1.02)	8.0 (14.8)	20.0 (37.0)	13.0 (24.1)	13.0 (24.1)	0.0 (0.0)
Driven By Set Personal Goals	3.51 (0.79)	4.0 (7.4)	26.0 (48.1)	18.0 (33.3)	6.0 (11.1)	0.0 (0.0)
Calculated Decision Maker	4.07 (0.84)	19.0 (35.2)	22.0 (40.7)	11.0 (20.4)	2.0 (3.7)	0.0 (0.0)
Displays Integrity/ Fairness	4.63 (0.76)	40.0 (74.1)	10.0 (18.5)	3.0 (5.6)	0.0 (0.0)	1.0 (1.9)
Maintains and Models High Expectations	4.64 (0.70)	39.0 (72.2)	13.0 (24.1)	1.0 (1.9)	0.0 (0.0)	1.0 (1.9)
Effective Communicator	4.59 (0.71)	36.0 (66.7)	16.0 (29.6)	1.0 (1.9)	0.0 (0.0)	1.0 (1.9)

Note. $n = 54$

According to the high school principal level of the independent variable results of frequency distribution relating to personal characteristics, six professional skills had a most frequently responded rating of EI as it pertains to defining an effective superintendent. Those six included *displays integrity/fairness* ($n = 40, 74.1\%$), *maintains and models high expectations* ($n = 39, 72.2\%$), *effective communicator* ($n = 36, 66.7\%$), *passionate about education* ($n = 36, 66.7\%$), *proactive* ($n = 26, 48.1\%$), and *strong human relationship skills* ($n = 35, 64.8\%$).

The personal characteristic with the highest number of responses under the rating of EI was *displays integrity/fairness* ($n = 40, 74.1\%$). The personal characteristic with the lowest number of responses under the rating of EI was *driven by set personal goals* ($n = 4, 7.4\%$).

Eight of personal characteristics had a most frequently responded rating of 4; 4 was the rating between EI and MI. These eight included the following: *displays a specialized knowledge base/intelligence* ($n = 24, 44.4\%$), *creative* ($n = 18, 33.3\%$), *driven by set personal goals* ($n = 26, 48.1\%$), *calculated decision maker* ($n = 22, 40.7\%$), *charismatic* ($n = 20, 37.0\%$), *committed to self-renewal* ($n = 26, 48.1\%$), *systemic thinker* ($n = 21, 28.9\%$), and *innovative/seizes opportunity* ($n = 27, 50.0\%$).

A detailed examination of the professional skills data for the high principal responses ($n = 54$) was also gathered and examined. The total results of the frequency distribution for the professional skills considering principals as a level of the independent variable are provided in Table 6.

Table 6

High School Principals' Rating of Professional Skills

Professional Skills	<i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)	Extremely Important (5)	(4)	Moderately Important (3)	(2)	Not Important (1)
Able to Meet Major Mandates	4.30 (0.72)	24.0 (44.4)	22.0 (40.7)	8.0 (14.8)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)
Aware of Political Impact on Education	4.09 (0.71)	16.0 (29.6)	27.0 (50.0)	11.0 (20.4)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)
Collaborative/ Includes Stakeholder	4.13 (0.70)	17.0 (31.5)	27.0 (50.0)	10.0 (18.5)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)
Serves As Child Advocate	4.43 (0.63)	27.0 (50.0)	23.0 (42.6)	4.0 (7.4)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)
Connects and Builds Community Partnerships	4.26 (0.68)	21.0 (38.9)	26.0 (48.1)	7.0 (13.0)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)
Recruits, Selects, & Retains Productive Staff	4.41 (0.88)	34.0 (63.0)	10.0 (18.5)	8.0 (14.8)	2.0 (3.7)	0.0 (0.0)
Understands School Finance	4.37 (0.68)	26.0 (48.1)	22.0 (40.7)	6.0 (11.1)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)
Empowers/Develops Others	4.57 (0.60)	33.0 (61.1)	17.0 (31.5)	3.0 (5.6)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)
Understands the Complexity of Perception	3.98 (0.74)	14.0 (25.9)	25.0 (46.3)	15.0 (27.8)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)
Establishes Clear Academic Goals	4.22 (0.66)	19.0 (35.2)	28.0 (51.9)	7.0 (13.0)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)
Eliminates Distractions	3.69 (1.02)	12.0 (22.2)	22.0 (40.7)	12.0 (22.2)	7.0 (13.0)	1.0 (1.9)

Table 6 (continued)

Professional Skills	<i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)	Extremely Important (5)	(4)	Moderately Important (3)	(2)	Not Important (1)
Monitors/Assesses Academic Goals	4.04 (0.67)	13.0 (24.1)	30.0 (55.6)	11.0 (20.4)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)
Allocates Resources to Support Academic Goals	4.23 (0.70)	20.0 (30.0)	25.0 (46.3)	8.0 (14.8)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)
Develops, Articulates, and Implements a Vision	4.33 (0.75)	26.0 (48.1)	21.0 (38.9)	6.0 (11.0)	1.0 (1.9)	0.0 (0.0)
Display Curricular & Instructional Leadership Skills	4.19 (0.71)	19.0 (35.2)	25.0 (46.3)	9.0 (16.7)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)
Operates Safe & Effective Environment	4.39 (0.63)	25.0 (46.3)	25.0 (46.3)	4.0 (7.4)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)
Responds to Legal, Societal, & Economic Contexts	3.15 (0.66)	16.0 (29.6)	29.0 (53.7)	8.0 (14.8)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)
Demonstrates Cultural Competency	3.77 (0.77)	9.0 (16.7)	26.0 (48.1)	17.0 (31.5)	2.0 (3.7)	0.0 (0.0)
Develops Positive Relationships w/ Board	4.26 (0.71)	22.0 (40.7)	24.0 (44.4)	8.0 (14.8)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)
Formulates Student Focused District Policies	4.20 (0.76)	22.0 (40.7)	21.0 (38.9)	11.0 (20.4)	1.0 (1.9)	0.0 (0.0)
Mediates Conflict Effectively	4.26 (0.68)	21.0 (38.9)	26.0 (48.1)	7.0 (13.0)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)

Table 6 (continued)

Professional Skills	<i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)	Extremely Important (5)	(4)	Moderately Important (3)	(2)	Not Important (1)
Visible	4.15 (0.81)	21.0 (38.9)	21.0 (38.9)	11.0 (20.4)	1.0 (1.9)	0.0 (0.0)

Note. *n* = 54

According to the high school principal level of the independent variable results of the frequency distribution relating to professional skills, seven professional skills had a most frequently responded rating of EI as it pertains to defining an effective superintendent. Those seven included the following: *able to meet major mandates* (*n* = 24, 44.4%), *serves as child advocate* (*n* = 27, 50.0%), *recruits, selects, and retains productive staff* (*n* = 34, 63.0%), *understands school finance* (*n* = 26, 48.1%), *empowers/develops others* (*n* = 33, 61.1%), *develops, articulates, and implements a vision* (*n* = 26, 48.1%), and *formulates student focused district policies* (*n* = 22, 40.7%).

The professional skill with the highest number of responses under the rating of EI was *recruits, retains, and retains productive staff* (*n* = 34, 63.0%). The professional skill with the lowest number of responses under the rating of EI was *demonstrates cultural competency* (*n* = 9, 16.7%).

Thirteen of professional skill had a most frequently responded rating of 4; 4 was the rating between EI and MI. The 13 included the following: *aware of political impact on education* (*n* = 27, 50.0%), *collaborative/includes stakeholders* (*n* = 27, 50.0%), *connects and builds community partnerships* (*n* = 26, 48.0%), *understands the complexity of perception* (*n* = 25, 46.3%), *establishes clear academic goals* (*n* = 28, 51.9%), *eliminates distractions* (*n* = 22,

40.7%), *demonstrates cultural competency* ($n = 26, 48.1\%$) *displays curricular and instructional leadership skills* ($n = 25, 46.3\%$), *allocates resources to support academic goals* ($n = 25, 46.3\%$), *responds to legal, societal, and economic contexts* ($n = 29, 53.7\%$), *develops positive relations with board members* ($n = 24, 44.4\%$), *mediates conflict effectively* ($n = 26, 48.1\%$), and *monitors/accesses academic goals* ($n = 30, 55.6\%$).

Two professional skills resulted in an overall rating of a tie between the number who most frequently responded with either 4 or EI. These professional skills were *operates a safe and effective environment* ($n = 25, 46.3\%$) and *visible* ($n = 21, 31.8\%$). The lowest overall ranking of all professional skills for the high school principal level of the independent variables was 4.

School Board President Survey Results

A detailed examination of the personal characteristics data for the school board president level ($n = 65$) was also gathered and examined. The total results of the frequency distribution for the personal characteristics considering board presidents as the level of the independent variable are provided in Table 7.

Table 7

School Board President's Rating of Personal Characteristics

Personal Characteristic	<i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)	Extremely Important (5)	(4)	Moderately Important (3)	(2)	Not Important (1)
Creative	3.72 (0.91)	11.0 (16.9)	31.0 (47.7)	20.0 (30.8)	3.0 (4.6)	0.0 (0.0)
Displays a Specialized Knowledge Base/ Intelligence	4.00 (1.02)	22.0 (33.8)	29.0 (44.6)	9.0 (13.8)	2.0 (3.1)	3.0 (4.6)

Table 7 (continued)

Personal Characteristic	<i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)	Extremely Important (5)	(4)	Moderately Important (3)	(2)	Not Important (1)
Passionate About Education	4.69 (0.57)	48.0 (73.8)	14.0 (21.5)	3.0 (4.6)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)
Proactive	4.40 (0.58)	29.0 (44.6)	33.0 (50.8)	3.0 (4.6)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)
Systemic Thinker	3.86 (0.75)	13.0 (20.0)	31.0 (47.7)	20.0 (30.8)	1.0 (1.5)	0.0 (0.0)
Innovative/Seizes Opportunity	4.10 (0.77)	23.0 (35.4)	26.0 (40.0)	16.0 (24.6)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)
Strong Human Relation Skills	4.46 (0.81)	41.0 (63.1)	15.0 (23.1)	7.0 (10.8)	2.0 (3.1)	0.0 (0.0)
Committed to Self- Renewal/Self- Aware	3.72 (0.86)	11.0 (16.9)	30.0 (46.2)	20.0 (30.8)	3.0 (4.6)	1.0 (1.5)
Charismatic	2.98 (0.89)	4.0 (6.2)	12.0 (18.5)	29.0 (44.6)	19.0 (29.2)	1.0 (1.5)
Driven By Set Personal Goals	3.43 (1.04)	11.0 (16.9)	20.0 (30.8)	22.0 (33.8)	10.0 (15.4)	2.0 (3.1)
Calculated Decision Maker	3.95 (0.76)	17.0 (26.2)	28.0 (43.1)	20.0 (30.8)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)
Displays Integrity/ Fairness	4.74 (0.48)	49.0 (75.4)	15.0 (23.1)	1.0 (1.5)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)
Maintains and Models High Expectations	4.70 (0.57)	48.0 (73.8)	14.0 (21.5)	3.0 (4.6)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)
Effective Communicator	4.77 (0.49)	52.0 (80.0)	11.0 (16.9)	2.0 (3.1)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)

Note. $n = 65$

According to the school board president level of the independent variable results of frequency distribution, relating to personal characteristics, five personal characteristics had a most frequently responded rating of an EI as it pertains to defining an effective superintendent. Those five included *displays integrity/fairness* ($n = 49, 75.4\%$), *maintains and models high expectations* ($n = 48, 73.8\%$), *effective communicator* ($n = 52, 80.0\%$), *passionate about education* ($n = 48, 73.8\%$), and *strong human relationship skills* ($n = 41, 63.1\%$).

The personal characteristic with the highest number of responses under the rating of EI was effective communicator ($n = 52, 80.0\%$). The personal characteristics tied for the lowest number of responses under the rating of EI were *driven by set personal goals* ($n = 11, 16.9\%$), *creative* ($n = 11, 16.9\%$), and *committed to self-renewal* ($n = 11, 16.9\%$).

Seven of personal characteristics had a most frequently responded rating of 4; 4 was the rating between EI and MI. These seven included the following: *displays a specialized knowledge base/intelligence* ($n = 29, 44.6\%$), *creative* ($n = 31, 47.7\%$), *calculated decision maker* ($n = 28, 43.1\%$), *committed to self-renewal* ($n = 30, 46.2\%$), *systemic thinker* ($n = 31, 47.7\%$), *proactive* ($n = 33, 50.8\%$), and *innovative/seizes opportunity* ($n = 26, 40.0\%$).

Two of the personal characteristics had a most frequently responded rating of 3. A 3 rating represented MI. These two personal characteristics included *charismatic* ($n = 29, 44.6\%$) and *driven by set personal goals* ($n = 22, 33.8\%$).

A detailed examination of the professional skills data for the school board presidents level ($n = 65$) was also gathered and examined. The total results of the frequency distribution for the professional skills considering school board presidents as the level of the independent variable are provided in Table 8.

Table 8

School Board Presidents' Rating of Professional Skills

Professional Skills	<i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)	Extremely Important (5)	(4)	Moderately Important (3)	(2)	Not Important (1)
Able to Meet Major Mandates	4.60 (0.58)	42.0 (64.6)	20.0 (30.8)	3.0 (4.6)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)
Aware of Political Impact on Education	3.98 (0.96)	21.0 (32.3)	28.0 (43.1)	12.0 (18.5)	2.0 (3.1)	2.0 (3.1)
Collaborative/ Includes Stakeholders	4.23 (0.72)	26.0 (40.0)	28.0 (43.1)	11.0 (16.9)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)
Serves as Child Advocate	4.09 (0.82)	22.0 (33.8)	30.0 (46.2)	10.0 (15.4)	3.0 (4.6)	0.0 (0.0)
Connects and Builds Community Partnerships	4.12 (0.86)	27.0 (41.5)	20.0 (30.8)	17.0 (26.2)	1.0 (1.5)	0.0 (0.0)
Recruits, Selects, & Retains Productive Staff	4.32 (0.79)	32.0 (49.2)	24.0 (36.9)	7.0 (10.8)	2.0 (3.1)	0.0 (0.0)
Understands School Finance	4.49 (0.71)	39.0 (60.0)	20.0 (30.8)	5.0 (7.7)	1.0 (1.5)	0.0 (0.0)
Empowers/Develops Others	4.18 (0.77)	26.0 (40.0)	25.0 (38.5)	14.0 (21.5)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)
Understands the Complexity of Perception	3.83 (0.89)	17.0 (26.2)	24.0 (36.9)	20.0 (30.8)	4.0 (6.2)	0.0 (0.0)
Establishes Clear Academic Goals	4.05 (0.90)	24.0 (36.9)	22.0 (33.8)	15.0 (23.1)	3.0 (4.6)	0.0 (0.0)
Eliminates Distractions	3.49 (0.85)	8.0 (12.3)	23.0 (35.4)	27.0 (41.5)	7.0 (10.8)	0.0 (0.0)

Table 8 (continued)

Professional Skills	<i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)	Extremely Important (5)	(4)	Moderately Important (3)	(2)	Not Important (1)
Monitors/Assesses Academic Goals	4.11 (0.79)	22.0 (33.8)	30.0 (46.2)	11.0 (16.9)	2.0 (3.1)	0.0 (0.0)
Allocates Resources to Support Academic Goals	4.20 (0.79)	27.0 (41.5)	25.0 (38.5)	12.0 (18.5)	1.0 (1.5)	0.0 (0.0)
Develops, Articulates, and Implements a Vision	4.40 (0.77)	36.0 (55.4)	20.0 (30.8)	8.0 (12.3)	1.0 (1.5)	0.0 (0.0)
Display Curricular & Instructional Leadership Skills	4.14 (0.86)	28.0 (43.1)	19.0 (29.2)	17.0 (26.2)	1.0 (1.5)	0.0 (0.0)
Operates a Safe & Effective Environment	4.31 (0.66)	27.0 (41.5)	31.0 (47.7)	7.0 (10.8)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)
Responds to Legal, Societal, & Economic Contexts	4.02 (0.85)	21.0 (32.3)	25.0 (28.6)	16.0 (24.6)	2.0 (3.1)	0.0 (0.0)
Demonstrates Cultural Competency	3.80 (0.95)	14.0 (21.5)	30.0 (46.2)	15.0 (23.1)	3.0 (4.6)	2.0 (3.1)
Develops Positive Relations w/Board	4.20 (0.73)	25.0 (38.5)	28.0 (43.1)	12.0 (18.5)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)
Formulates Student Focused District Policies	4.02 (0.79)	19.0 (29.2)	28.0 (43.1)	16.0 (24.6)	1.0 (1.5)	0.0 (0.0)
Mediates Conflict Effectively	4.11 (0.89)	26.0 (40.0)	23.0 (35.4)	13.0 (20.0)	3.0 (4.6)	0.0 (0.0)

Table 8 (continued)

Professional Skills	<i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)	Extremely Important (5)	(4)	Moderately Important (3)	(2)	Not Important (1)
Visible	4.26 (0.78)	30.0 (46.2)	22.0 (33.8)	13.0 (20.0)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)

Note. $n = 65$

According to the school board president level of the independent variable results of frequency distribution relating to professional skills, 12 professional skills had a most frequently responded rating of an EI as it pertains to defining an effective superintendent. Those 12 included the following: *able to meet major mandates* ($n = 42, 64.6\%$), *establishes clear academic goals* ($n = 24, 36.9\%$), *recruits, selects, and retains productive staff* ($n = 32, 49.2\%$), *understands school finance* ($n = 39, 60.0\%$), *empowers/develops others* ($n = 26, 40.0\%$), *develops, articulates, and implements a vision* ($n = 36, 55.4\%$), *connects and builds community relations* ($n = 27, 41.5\%$), *mediates conflict effectively* ($n = 26, 40.0\%$), *allocates resources to support academic goals* ($n = 27, 41.5\%$), *visible* ($n = 30, 46.2\%$), *displays curricular and instructional leadership skills* ($n = 28, 43.1\%$), and *responds to legal, societal, and economic contexts* ($n = 21, 32.3\%$).

The professional skill with the highest number of responses under the rating of EI was able to meet major mandates ($n = 42, 64.6\%$). The professional skill with the lowest number of responses under the rating of EI was eliminates distractions ($n = 8, 12.3\%$).

Nine of professional skill had a most frequently responded rating of 4; 4 was the rating between EI and MI. The nine included the following: *aware of political impact on education* ($n = 28, 43.1\%$), *serves as a child advocate* ($n = 30, 46.2\%$), *understands the complexity of*

perception (n = 24, 36.9%), operates a safe and effective environment (n = 31, 47.7%), monitors/assesses academic goals (n = 30, 46.2%) demonstrates cultural competency (n = 30, 46.2%), develops positive relations with board members (n = 28, 43.1%), collaborative/includes stakeholders (n = 28, 43.1%) and formulates student focused district policies (n = 28, 43.1%).

Reliability of Survey Results

In order to examine internal consistency for the superintendent effectiveness survey, Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient test was completed for both the personal characteristics and professional skills. With all results .70 or higher, it was concluded that both areas on the survey fell within an acceptable range for reliability. The results of the Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient are provided in Table 9.

Table 9

Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient

Survey Items	Number of Items	Cronbach's Alpha
Personal Characteristics	14	.863
Professional Skills	22	.926

Null Hypothesis One

Null Hypothesis One was formulated as follows: There is no significant difference among Indiana public high school principals, Indiana public non-charter school superintendents, and Indiana public non-charter school board presidents about what are the personal characteristics that define effective superintendents.

Each of the personal characteristics of H₀1 was tested using a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) with the position of those who were randomly sampled including the following: superintendent, high school principal, and school board president serving as the three levels of the independent variables. The 14 personal characteristics, which were rated on the Likert scale, were the dependent variables.

The assumption of independence regarding H₀1 was not violated. The sample population's responses were assumed independent of one another because each population that was surveyed was randomly selected within each independent variable group as explained in detail in Chapter 3. In addition, the groups were not intermixed; thus, it can be concluded that they were independent of each other. The results used to determine the assumption of normality for the dependent variables for personal characteristics is in Table 10.

Of all 14 dependent variables, this assumption was violated for seven variables due to skewness values and/or kurtosis values greater than 1.0 or less than -1.0. Those seven variables were as follows: *displays a specialized knowledge base/intelligence* (skew = -.888, kurtosis = 1.210), *passionate about education* (skew = -2.510, kurtosis = 9.386), *proactive* (skew = -1.347, kurtosis = 2.664), *strong human relation skills* (skew = -1.573, kurtosis = 2.167), *displays integrity/fairness* (skew = -2.460, kurtosis = 10.148), *maintains and models high expectations* (skew = -2.339, kurtosis = 8.433), and *effective communicator* (skew = -2.562, kurtosis = 10.638). Although the assumption of normality was violated, utilizing the one-way ANOVA can be justified because of relatively similar sample sizes among the three levels making up the independent variable regarding superintendent ($n = 53$), high school principal ($n = 54$), and school board president ($n = 65$). The results used to determine the homogeneity of variances for the dependent variables for personal characteristics are presented in Table 11.

Table 10

Assumption of Normality – ANOVA1 (Personal Characteristics)

Personal Characteristic	Skewness	Kurtosis
Creative	.469	-.204
Displays a Specialized Knowledge Base/Intelligence	-.888	1.210*
Passionate About Education	-2.510*	9.386*
Proactive	-1.347*	2.664*
Systemic Thinker	-.443	-.193
Innovative/Seizes Opportunity	-.453	0.696
Strong Human Relation Skills	-1.573*	2.167*
Committed to Self-Renewal/Self-Aware	-.547	-.162
Charismatic	.068	-.850
Driven by Set Personal Goals	-.215	-.573
Calculated Decision Maker	-.206	-.916
Displays Integrity/Fairness	-2.640*	10.148*
Maintains and Models High Expectations	-2.339*	8.433*
Effective Communicator	-2.562*	10.638*

Note. *falls outside the acceptable range of normality +1/-1

Table 11

Test of Homogeneity of Variance for Personal Characteristics

Personal Characteristic	F-Value (Levene's)	Significance
Creative	3.424	.035*
Displays a Specialized Knowledge Base/Intelligence	.628	.535
Passionate About Education	8.734	.000*
Proactive	4.559	.012*
Systemic Thinker	.849	.430
Innovative/Seizes Opportunity	.287	.751
Strong Human Relation Skills	3.431	.035*
Committed to Self-Renewal/ Self-Aware	2.113	.124
Charismatic	5.120	.007*
Driven by Set Personal Goals	2.793	.064
Calculated Decision Maker	.255	.776
Displays Integrity/Fairness	3.880	.023*
Maintains and Models High Expectations	.469	.626
Effective Communicator	4.304	.015*

Note. *significance of an alpha level of .05

Although the assumption of homogeneity of variance was violated according to the dependent variable results, running of the ANOVA can be justified as this test is robust to a violation of this assumption due to relatively similar sample sizes among the three independent

variable levels, superintendent ($n = 53$), high school principal ($n = 54$), and school board president ($n = 65$). If the dependent variables resulted in a significance level equal or less than .05, then a violation in the assumption of homogeneity of variance occurred. This was determined by examining the Levene's statistical significance value in the test of homogeneity of variances.

There were seven personal characteristics which violated the assumption of homogeneity of variances. These seven were made up of the following: creative ($F = 3.424$, $p = .035$), *passionate about education* ($F = 8.734$, $p = .000$), *proactive* ($F = 4.559$, $p = .012$), *strong human relation skills* ($F = 3.431$, $p = .035$), *charismatic* ($F = 5.120$, $p = .007$), *displays integrity and fairness* ($F = 3.880$, $p = .023$), and *effective communicator* ($F = 4.304$, $p = .015$). The results used to determine the model summary significance levels for the dependent variables for personal characteristics are in Table 12.

Regarding the model summary, the only dependent variable *charismatic* ($F = 3.330$, $p = .038$) is significantly different somewhere among the three levels of the independent variable. There was no significant difference among the other 13 dependent variables among their levels of the independent variable.

Due to the dependent variable *charismatic* ($F = 3.330$, $p = .038$) being significant and violating the assumption of homogeneity of variance, one cannot assume variance is equal for this dependent variable. As a result, a post hoc test that does not assume equal variances was utilized to determine where significance lies. This test was the Dunnett T3. According to the Dunnett T3 results, significance difference lies between how school board presidents and high school principals value the personal characteristic of *charismatic* in defining an effective superintendent. Public high school principals ($M = 3.43$, $SD = 1.02$) valued the personal

characteristic of *charismatic* significantly higher than public school board presidents ($M = 2.98$, $SD = .89$).

Table 12

Model Summary Significance for Personal Characteristics

Personal Characteristic	<i>F</i>	Significance
Creative	1.404	.248
Displays a Specialized Knowledge Base/Intelligence	.116	.891
Passionate About Education	2.627	.075
Proactive	1.183	.309
Systemic Thinker	1.186	.308
Innovative/Seizes Opportunity	1.547	.216
Strong Human Relation Skills	.682	.507
Committed to Self-Renewal/Self-Aware	1.747	.177
Charismatic	3.330	.038*
Driven by Set Personal Goals	.475	.623
Calculated Decision Maker	.350	.705
Displays Integrity/Fairness	.867	.422
Maintains and Models High Expectations	.084	.920
Effective Communicator	1.599	.205

Note. *significance of an alpha level of .05

In summary of H_{01} considering all three sampled groups including the following: public school superintendents, public school high school principals, and public school board

presidents, and working with an alpha of .05, the only personal characteristic that had a significant difference was *charismatic* ($F = 3.330, p = .038$). Public high school principals ($M = 3.43, SD = 1.02$) valued the personal characteristic of *charismatic* significantly higher than public school board presidents ($M = 2.98, SD = .89$) as determined through a Dunnett T3 post-hoc test.

Null Hypothesis Two

Null Hypothesis Two was formulated as follows: There is no significant difference among Indiana public high school principals, Indiana public non-charter school superintendents, and Indiana public non-charter school board presidents about what are the professional skills that define effective superintendents.

Each of the professional skills of the H₀ 2 was tested using a one-way ANOVA with positions of those who were randomly sampled included the following: superintendent, high school principal, and school board president. These three different positions served as levels of the independent variables. The 22 professional skills, which were rated on the Likert scale, were the dependent variables.

The assumption of independence regarding H₀ 2 was not violated. The sample population's responses were assumed independent of one another because each population that was surveyed was randomly selected within each independent variable group. In addition, the groups were not intermixed; thus, it was concluded that they were independent of each other. The results to determine the assumption of normality for the dependent variables for professional skills is in Table 13.

Table 13

Assumption of Normality – ANOVA2 – Professional Skills

Professional Skills	Skewness	Kurtosis
Able to Meet Major Mandates	-.739	-.622
Aware of Political Impact on Education	-.785	-1.108*
Collaborative/Includes Stakeholders	-.327	-.979
Serves as Child Advocate	-.847	.440
Connects and Builds Community Partnerships	-.368	-.815
Recruits, Selects, & Retains Productive Staff	-1.009*	-.084
Understands School Finance	-.897	-.004
Empowers/Develops Others	-.641	-.676
Understands the Complexity of Perception	-.308	-.847
Establishes Clear Academic Goals	-.592	-.452
Eliminates Distractions	-.166	-.685
Monitors/Assesses Academic Goals	-.376	-.311
Allocates Resources to Support Academic Goals	-.580	-.802
Develop, Articulates, and Implements a Vision	-.920	-.097
Display Curricular & Instruction Leadership Skills	-.363	-1.076*
Operates a Safe & Effective Environment	-.677	-.572
Responds to Legal, Societal, & Economic Contexts	-.233	-.932
Demonstrates Cultural Competency	-.455	.336
Develops Positive Relations w/Boards	-.532	-.833
Formulates Student Focused District Policies	-.425	-.864

Table 13 (continued)

Professional Skills	Skewness	Kurtosis
Mediates Conflict Effectively	-.596	-.506
Visible	-.608	-.709

Note. *falls outside the acceptable range of normality +1/-1

Of all 22 dependent variables, this assumption of normality was violated for three variables due to skewness and/or kurtosis values greater than 1.0 or less than -1.0. Those three variables were as follows: *aware of political impact on education* (skew = -.785, kurtosis = 1.108), *recruits, selects, and retains productive staff* (skew = -1.009, kurtosis = .084), and *displays curricular and instructional leadership skills* (skew = -.363, kurtosis = -1.076). Although the assumption of normality was violated, utilizing the one-way ANOVA can be justified because of relatively similar sample sizes among the three levels making up the three levels of the independent variable, superintendent ($n = 53$), high school principal ($n = 54$), and school board president ($n = 65$). The results used to determine the homogeneity of variances for the dependent variables for professional skills are contained in Table 14.

Table 14

Test of Homogeneity of Variance for Professional Skills

Personal Characteristic	F-Value (Levene's)	Significance
Able to Meet Major Mandates	3.030	.051
Aware of Political Impact on Education	1.028	.360
Collaborative/Includes Stakeholders	.530	.590
Serves as Child Advocate	.148	.862

Table 14 (continued)

Personal Characteristic	<i>F</i> -Value (Levene's)	Significance
Connects and Builds Community Partnerships	5.148	.007*
Recruits, Selects, & Retains Productive Staff	2.773	.065
Understands School Finance	1.204	.303
Empowers/Develops Others	2.885	.059
Understands the Complexity of Perception	3.064	.049*
Establishes Clear Academic Goals	2.309	.102
Eliminates Distractions	1.071	.345
Monitors/Assesses Academic Goals	1.157	.317
Allocates Resources to Support Academic Goals	1.379	.255
Develop, Articulates, and Implements a Vision	.174	.841
Display Curricular & Instructional Leadership Skills	2.216	.112
Operates a Safe & Effective Environment	.015	.985
Responds to Legal, Societal, & Economic Contexts	1.632	.199
Demonstrates Cultural Competency	.595	.553
Develops Positive Relations w/Board	.555	.575
Formulates Student Focused District Policies	1.005	.368
Mediates Conflict Effectively	1.852	.160
Visible	1.258	.287

Note. *significance of an alpha level of .05

Although the assumption of homogeneity of variance was violated according to the dependent variable results, running the ANOVA can be justified as this test is robust to a violation of this assumption due to relatively similar sample sizes among the three variable levels, superintendent ($n = 53$), high school principal ($n = 54$), and school board president ($n = 65$). If the dependent variables resulted in a significance level equal or less than .05, then a violation in the assumption of homogeneity of variance occurred. This was determined by examining the Levene's statistic significance value in the test of homogeneity of variance. There were two professional skills which violated the assumption of homogeneity of variance. These two included the following: *connects and builds community partnerships* ($F = 5.148, p = .007$) and *understands the complexity of perception* ($F = 3.064, p = .049$). The results used to determine the model summary significance levels for the dependent variables for professional skills are in Table 15.

Table 15

Model Summary Significance for Professional Skills

Professional Skills	<i>F</i>	Significance
Able to Meet Major Mandates	4.243	.016*
Aware of Political Impact on Education	.530	.590
Collaborative/Includes Stakeholders	.523	.594
Serves as Child Advocate	3.503	.032*
Connects and Builds Community Partnerships	.587	.557
Recruits, Selects, & Retains Productive Staff	.461	.632
Understands School Finance	1.893	.154
Empowers/Develops Others	5.086	.007*

Table 15 (continued)

Professional Skills	<i>F</i>	Significance
Understands the Complexity of Perception	2.332	.100
Establishes Clear Academic Goals	1.229	.295
Eliminates Distractions	.809	.447
Monitors/Assesses Academic Goals	.146	.864
Allocates Resources to Support Academic Goals	1.079	.342
Develops, Articulates, and Implements a Vision	.135	.874
Display Curricular & Instructional Leadership Skills	.060	.942
Operates a Safe & Effective Environment	2.349	.099
Responds to Legal, Societal, & Economic Contexts	.703	.496
Demonstrates Cultural Competency	.331	.718
Develops Positive Relations w/Board	3.629	.029*
Formulates Student Focused District Policies	1.646	.196
Mediates Conflict Effectively	.512	.600
Visible	2.271	.016

*significance of an alpha level of .05

Regarding the model summary, the professional skills dependent variables with a significant difference are somewhere among the three levels of the independent variable groups were the following: *able to meet major mandates* ($F = 4.243, p = .016$), *serves as child advocate* ($F = 3.503, p = .032$), *empowers/develops others* ($F = 5.086, p = .007$), and *develops positive relations with board members* ($F = 3.629, p = .029$). There were no significant

differences among the other 18 dependent variables, among their levels of the independent variable.

There were no violations in the assumption of homogeneity of variance for dependent variables identified with significant difference; therefore, equal variance can be assumed. As a result, a Tukey HSD post hoc test was utilized to determine where significance lies.

According to the Tukey HSD results, significance lies between how school board presidents and high school principals value the professional skills of *serves as a child advocate*, *empowers/develops others*, and *able to meet major mandates* in defining an effective superintendent. Public high school principals ($M = 4.43$, $SD = .632$) valued the professional skill of *serves as a child advocate* significantly higher than public school board presidents ($M = 4.09$, $SD = .824$). High school principals ($M = 4.57$, $SD = .605$) also valued *empowers/develops others* significantly higher than public school board presidents ($M = 4.18$, $SD = .768$). However, school board presidents ($M = 4.60$, $SD = .580$) valued the professional skill of *able to meet major mandates* significantly higher than high school principals ($M = 4.30$, $SD = .717$).

In addition, the Tukey HSD revealed significant differences between how school board presidents and public school superintendents value the professional skills of *develops positive relations with board members* and *able to meet major mandates*. Superintendents ($M = 4.53$, $SD = .608$) valued the professional skill of *develops positive relations with board members* significantly higher than public school board presidents ($M = 4.20$, $SD = .733$). Yet, public school board presidents ($M = 4.60$, $SD = .581$) valued the professional skill of *able to meet major mandates* significantly higher than public school superintendents ($M = 4.28$, $SD = .744$).

In summary of H_02 considering all three sampled groups including public school superintendents, public school high school principals, and public school board presidents, four

professional skills had significant difference found among the groups surveyed. Those four included the following: *develops positive relations with board members* ($F = 3.629, p = .029$), *able to meet major mandates* ($F = 4.243, p = .016$), *serves as child advocate* ($F = 3.503, p = .032$), and *empowers/develops others* ($F = 5.086, p = .007$). Through the use of a Tukey HSD post hoc test, it was concluded significance lies between how school board presidents and high school principals value the professional skills of *serves as a child advocate*, *empowers/develops others*, and *able to meet major mandates* in defining an effective superintendent. Public high school principals ($M = 4.43, SD = .632$) valued the professional skill of *serves as a child advocate* significantly higher than public school board presidents ($M = 4.09, SD = .824$). High school principals ($M = 4.57, SD = .605$) also valued *empowers/develops others* significantly higher than public school board presidents ($M = 4.18, SD = .768$). However, school board presidents ($M = 4.60, SD = .580$) valued *able to meet major mandates* significantly higher than high school principals ($M = 4.30, SD = .717$).

In addition, post hoc tests revealed significant differences lying between how school board presidents and public school superintendents value the professional skills of *develops positive relations with board members* and *able to meet major mandates*. Superintendents ($M = 4.53, SD = .608$) valued the professional skill of *develops positive relations with board members* significantly higher than public school board presidents ($M = 4.20, SD = .733$). Yet, public school board presidents ($M = 4.60, SD = .581$) valued the professional skill of *able to meet major mandates* significantly higher than public school superintendents ($M = 4.28, SD = .744$).

CHAPTER 5

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS**Personal Characteristics Defining Superintendent Effectiveness**

Null Hypothesis One stated there was no significant difference among Indiana public high school principals, Indiana public non-charter school superintendents, and Indiana public non-charter school board presidents about what were the personal characteristics that define effective superintendents. After review and analysis of the results, the interpretation concluded significance at the .05 level of significance. Considering all three sampled groups, public school superintendents, public school high school principals, and public school board presidents, and working with an alpha of .05, the only personal characteristic that had a significant difference was *charismatic*. Therefore, the null was rejected. Public high school principals value the personal characteristic of *charismatic* in superintendents significantly higher than public school board presidents. Therefore, there is a significant difference among Indiana public high school principals, Indiana public non-charter school superintendents, and Indiana public non-charter school board presidents about what are the personal characteristics that define effective superintendents.

In regards to *charismatic*, the only personal characteristic where significance was found, it is important to note that high school principals work more closely on a daily basis with superintendents as compared to school board presidents. Therefore, high school principals also

observe the superintendent in more diverse situations compared to school board presidents. Hence, it makes sense that high school principals would value charisma in an effective superintendent more so than school board presidents. Furthermore, a high school principal may also have more opportunities to see the benefit or gain from a superintendent displaying this personal characteristic.

When addressing the other 13 personal characteristics in which no significant difference was found among the independent variable groups, reflecting on the magnitude of the responsibilities associated with the position of superintendent is essential. In addition, the results showing such high average means of each item was also a cause for reflection regarding the magnitude of the responsibilities aligned with the position and qualifications necessary to be effective in such an important position. The results were a promising sign that high school principals and school board presidents understand and respect the level of complexity that surrounds a superintendency.

Professional Skills Defining Superintendent Effectiveness

Null Hypothesis Two stated there was no significant difference among Indiana public high school principals, Indiana public non-charter school superintendents, and Indiana public non-charter school board presidents about what were the professional skills that define effective superintendents. After review and analysis of the results, the interpretation concluded significance at the .05 level. In addition, when considering all three sampled groups, public school superintendents, public school high school principals, and public school board presidents, and working with an alpha of .05, the professional skills that had a significant difference were the following: *able to meet major mandates*, *serves as child advocate*, *empowers/develops others*, and *develops positive relations with board members*.

Public school board presidents value the professional skill of *able to meet major mandates* significantly higher than public high school principals. In addition, public school board presidents value the professional skill of *able to meet major mandates* significantly higher than the public school superintendents. Also, public high school principals value the professional skill of *serves as child advocate* significantly higher than school board presidents. Public high school principals also value the professional skill of *empowers/develops others* significantly higher than school board presidents. Lastly, public school superintendents value the professional skill of *develops positive relations with board members* significantly higher than school board presidents. Therefore, there is a significant difference among Indiana public high school principals, Indiana public non-charter school superintendents, and Indiana public non-charter school board presidents about what were the professional skills that define effective superintendents.

In regards to significant difference among independent variable groups, two differences may share the same reasoning behind such findings. Public school board presidents valued the professional skill of *able to meet major mandates* higher than both the high school principals and the superintendent group. One possible reason for such results included the assumption on the part of high school principals and superintendents that this professional skill is simply a must; therefore, not as much emphasis was placed on such item. In addition, school board presidents along with their fellow members seem to focus on this professional skill. School Board Association training and traditional school board roles tend to embrace this focus. Interestingly, this professional skill focus is quite timely. Given the current educational climate, no longer can district leaders be negligent in this arena. In addition, the sheer number

of major mandates seems to be increasing at an unprecedented rate, which will also add emphasis to the level of importance in defining an effective superintendent.

The next professional skill that resulted in significant difference was that of *serves as child advocate*. High school principals valued this higher than the school board presidents. Given the fact that high school principals deal with student issues daily and rely on the support of the superintendent to also act in the best interest of the student, the higher level of importance placed on this professional skill as compared to school board presidents makes sense. This same is true for the professional skill of empowers/develops others. Again, the high school principal placed a higher level of importance on this skill when compared to the school board presidents. High school principals know firsthand the benefits of such actions of an effective superintendent, as well as they know firsthand the pitfalls that can occur in the absence of such an important professional skill.

Lastly, the superintendents valued the professional skill of develops positive relations with board members significantly higher than school board presidents. This was both surprising and interesting. However, the superintendent's awareness of the power of a good board and a less-than-effective board is critical. Unfortunately, too often the emphasis placed on being a good and supportive board is not enough. Therefore, school board presidents do not always understand how critical this is to the operations of a district and it can be taken for granted. School board presidents usually have a more narrowed perspective regarding the quality of school boards. Superintendents, through networking or professional mobility, may have a more developed perspective regarding the importance of this professional skill.

When addressing the other 17 professional skills in which no significant difference was found among the independent variable groups, reflecting on the magnitude of the

responsibilities associated with the position of superintendent is essential. As was the case with personal characteristics, the results showing such high average means of each item was also a cause for reflection regarding the magnitude of the responsibilities aligned with the position and qualifications necessary to be effective in such an important position. Again, the results regarding the professional skills were a promising sign that high school principals and school board presidents understand and respect the level of complexity that surrounds a superintendency.

Conclusions

Interestingly, all but one item that resulted in significant difference showed difference between the high school principals' level of value and what school board presidents valued. The only significant difference between the superintendent group and another group was reflected in the professional skill of develops positive relations with board members.

In addition, only one of the 36 items surveyed did not have the highest number of responses fall into the EI or four rating, which fell as the rating between EI and MI. The only item with the majority of responses outside of those two specific ratings was charismatic. The top five surveyed items with the most EI rating in descending order were as follows: *displays integrity and fairness, passionate about education, effective communicator, maintains and models high expectations, and strong human relations skills*. All top five rated items were categorized as personal characteristics. In addition, these same top five items also had the highest five mean scores.

Although the personal characteristics monopolize the top five rated item list and highest five mean scores, personal characteristic items also dominate the bottom five spots scoring four out of the five lowest mean scores. Those four personal characteristics included the following:

charismatic, driven by set personal goals, creative, and committed to self-renewal/self-aware. The single professional skill scoring in the lowest five means was *eliminates distractions*.

As mean and overall categorical ranking are considered, it is important to reflect upon the literature review results discussed in Chapter 2. In order to maintain content validity, the content or specific items, was created from the complete list of items as identified through the literature review. Commonalities were then identified from the list and survey items were determined from those items which were identified through the current literature in three or more sources (Appendix A). Considering all 31 resources included on the literature review, there were eight surveyed items that were mentioned in at least 10 or more of the literature resources. Only one of those items was categorized as a personal characteristics, that one being *systemic thinker*. The remaining nine professional skills that fit this description were the following: *collaborative/inclusion of stakeholders, effective communicator, empowers/develops others, establishes clear academic goals, monitors/assesses academic goals, allocates resources to support academic goals, and develops, articulates, and implements a vision*. Overall, the professional skill that was mentioned the most frequently in the literature review was *empowers/develops others* ($n = 18$). The single common item that appeared on the five highest mean list, ranked in the highest survey category, and was mentioned in at least 10 literature resources was the professional skill *effective communicator*.

Given the results of such high ratings by leaders in the educational arena for most of the personal characteristics and professional skills, it is evident that an effective superintendent must possess many skills, seemingly leaving little room for weakness regarding personal characteristics and professional skills as it relates to effective superintendents. Considering the

timely attention on the superintendent position and the debate over the necessary qualifications, such findings resulting from this study can be helpful for future endeavors.

Recommendations for Further Research

The emerging views of leadership, along with current unique societal, political, and economic climate, demand that careful attention be placed on the personal characteristics and professional skills that define an effective superintendent. Using such information for recruiting, selecting, training, and retaining effective superintendents will be important. Bringing focus to such difficult tasks as those described could be very helpful in multiple ways. For example, the information gathered from the study could be used by a school board or search committee assigned with the responsibility of screening and hiring superintendents. The study information could also be used by associations and districts to better align superintendent professional development or provide guidance for the evaluation task centering around those skills defining effectiveness. Lastly, practicing superintendents can use the information as a reflection tool to self-evaluate and plan for personal and professional growth.

Educational leaders need to take time to reflect on the demands of their profession and positions and purposefully plan for future growth needs. By reviewing the results of this study, it is hoped that the information gained can assist in this professional growth charge. It is also important to consider the commonalities surrounding the professional skill effective communicator. Although this skill is discussed a great deal through leadership development, training is rarely taken to the next level.

Considering the difference in responsibilities associated with superintendent positions, a future study could be done on the same subject bringing even more focus to defining effective superintendents by using other factors such as size of district and type of district.

Summary

The purpose of this study was to determine the personal characteristics and professional skills that define effective superintendents according to a random sampling of practicing Indiana public high school principals, Indiana public non-charter school superintendents, and Indiana public non-charter school board presidents. In order to effectively fulfill the purpose of this study, answers to the following two research questions were obtained. Those questions were:

1. Is there a difference among Indiana public high school principals, Indiana public non-charter school superintendents, and Indiana public non-charter school board presidents about what are the personal characteristics that define effective superintendents?
2. Is there a difference among Indiana public high school principals, Indiana public non-charter school superintendents, and Indiana public non-charter school board presidents about what are the professional skills that define effective superintendents?

Answers to both research questions were obtained by making a generalization from the sample to the population regarding how these aforementioned groups defined superintendent effectiveness. Current research and literature was reviewed in order to develop the survey instrument which was utilized to obtain the desired input from the sample.

A review of all of the submitted and returned surveys revealed a total of 172 (37%) was used for data analysis. Of the superintendents' group, 53 (36%) were completed and submitted. The high school principals' group completed and submitted 54 (31%) surveys, and 65 (45%) surveys were completed and returned by school board presidents. All three independent

variable groups, public school superintendents, public high school principals, and public school board presidents, were asked to rate the importance of each item on the survey according to their perception of the level of importance of each item to defining a highly effective superintendent. Each item on the survey represented either personal characteristics or professional skills. Each of which also served as dependent variables.

There were 36 items on the survey. Each item was rated on the final draft of the survey using a five-point Likert scale from 1 representing not important (NI) to 5 representing extremely important (EI). A score of 3 on the Likert scale represented moderately important (MI). In addition, of the surveyed 36 items, all were divided into personal characteristics or professional skills. Personal characteristics made up the first 14 items. The remaining 22 items made up professional skills.

Two research questions were formulated for the study. Questions one and two were analyzed statistically through H_{01} and H_{02} . For each null hypothesis, a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to determine significance. The level of significance established for this study was .05. Descriptive data were also utilized to answer both research questions.

REFERENCES

- Bennis, W., & Thomas, R. (2002). *Geeks and geezers*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School.
- Bjork, L. (2009, October). *The superintendent as an instructional leader*. Paper presented at the West Virginia Superintendents' Institute, Charleston, WV.
- Bjork, L. G., Collier, V., Glass, T., & Hoyle, J. R. (2005). *The superintendent as CEO*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Bjork, L., & Kowalski, T. (2005). *The contemporary superintendent*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Cabal Group. (n.d.). A career in your suitcase. Retrieved from http://career.cabalgroup.com/exercises/professional_skills.htm
- Covey, S. (1989). *The 7 habits of highly effective people*. New York, NY: Fireside.
- Covey, S. (2004). *The 8th habit: From effectiveness to greatness*. New York, NY: Free Press.
- Drucker, P. (2001). *The essential Drucker*. New York, NY: HarperCollins.
- Education Writers Association. (2003). *Effective superintendents, effective boards: Finding the right fit* (Special Report). Washington, DC: Author.
- Fullan, M. (2009). Leadership development: The larger context. *Educational Leadership*, 67(2), 45-49.
- Gardner, H. (1995). *Leading minds: An anatomy of leadership*. New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Halal, W., & Taylor, K. (1999). *21st century economics: Perspectives of socioeconomics for a changing world*. New York, NY: St. Martin's Press.

- Harms, P., & Crede, M. (2010). Emotional intelligence and transformational and transactional leadership: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 17(1), 5-17.
- Harris, S. (2009). *Learning from the best: Lessons from award-winning superintendents*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Human Resources and Skills Development Canada. (2010). Introduction. Retrieved from http://www.hrsdc.gc.ca/eng/oas-cpp/cpp_disability/adjudframe/perscharact.shtml
- Institute for Educational Leadership. (2001). *Leadership for student learning: Restructuring school district leadership*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Judge, T., Piccolo, R., & Kosalka, T. (2009). The bright and dark sides of leader traits: A review and theoretical extension of the leader trait paradigm. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 20, 855-875.
- Kellerman, B. (2008). *Fellowship*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business Press.
- Lashway, L. (2002). *The superintendent in an age of accountability*. Retrieved from ERIC database. (ED468515)
- Leithwood, K. (1995). *Effective school district leadership: Transforming politics into education..* Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Leithwood, K., & Riehl, C. (2003). *What we know about successful school leadership*. Philadelphia, PA: Division A of the American Educational Research Association.
- Leithwood, K., Day, C., Sammons, P., Harris, A., & Hopkins, D. (2006). *Seven strong claims about successful school leadership*. Nottingham, UK: National College for School Leadership.

- Marzano, R., & Waters, T. (2009). *District leadership that works: Striking the right balance*. Bloomington, IN: Solution Tree Press.
- Mendez-Morse, S. (1992). *Leadership characteristics that facilitate school change*. Austin, TX: Southwest Educational Development Laboratory.
- Scherer, M. (2009). The leadership picture. *Educational Leadership*, 67(2), 7.
- Southwest Educational Development Laboratory. (2009). Advancing research, improving education. Retrieved from <http://www.sedl.org/>
- Thomas, J. (2001). *The public school superintendency in the twenty-first century: The quest to define effective leadership*. Retrieved from <http://www.csos.jhu.edu/crespar/techReports/Reports55.pdf>
- Uhl-Bien, M., Marion, R., & McKelvey, B. (2007). Complexity leadership theory: Shifting leadership from the industrial age to the knowledge era. *Leadership Quarterly*, 18, 298-318.
- U.S. Department of Education (1983). *A nation at risk: The imperative for educational reform*. Retrieved from <http://www.ed.gov/pubs/NatAtRisk/index.html>
- The Wallace Foundation. (2008, Spring). *Mission of the heart: What does it take to transform schools?* New York, NY: Public Agenda.
- Waters, T., & Marzano, R. (2006). *School district leadership that works: The effect of superintendent leadership on student achievement*. Denver, CO: Mid-continent Research for Education and Learning.
- Wilmore, E. L. (2008). *Superintendent leadership: Applying the educational leadership constituent council (ELCC) standards for improved district performance*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Zaccaro, S. (2007). Trait-based perspectives of leadership. *American Psychologist*, 62(1), 6-16.

APPENDIX A

Personal Characteristics, Professional Skills, and Supporting Research

Personal Characteristics	Supporting Research
Creative	9, 15, 27, 14, 17
Displays a specialized knowledge base/intelligent	9, 27, 21, 14, 17, 1, 30
Passionate about education	16, 28, 30
Proactive	5, 25, 30
Systemic thinker (focus on the whole organization)	5, 9, 22, 15, 18, 27, 21, 25, 19, 12, 1, 13, 30
Innovative/seizes opportunities	27, 17, 1
Strong human relation skills	25, 9, 17
Committed to self-renewal/self-aware	5, 9, 27, 21, 14, 17, 12
Charismatic	9, 14, 17, 13
Driven by set personal goals	9, 23, 17, 12
Calculated decision maker	9, 2, 27, 25, 17, 10
Displays integrity and fairness	30, 2, 3, 21, 28, 14
Maintains and models high expectations	22, 21, 25, 19, 13

Professional Skills

Able to meet major mandates	19, 2, 3, 4
Aware of political impact on education	19, 30, 2, 3, 4, 10
Collaborate/inclusion of stakeholders	19, 16, 9, 30, 2, 22, 18, 21, 4, 25, 29, 10, 1
Effective communicator	16, 5, 9, 2, 22, 4, 25, 10, 1, 13, 30
Serves as child advocate	16, 2, 10
Connects and builds community partnerships	16, 30, 2, 27, 21, 25, 17, 13
Recruits, selects, and retains productive staff	3, 21, 2, 28, 12
Understands school finance	2, 10, 30
Empowers/develops others	9, 30, 2, 3, 22, 15, 18, 27, 21, 5, 25, 28, 14, 17, 19, 10, 12, 1
Understands the complexity of perception	9, 2, 14, 17
Establishes clear academic goals	23, 2, 22, 15, 21, 4, 29, 14, 12, 17
Eliminates distractions	23, 21, 25, 28
Monitors/assesses academic goals	22, 16, 2, 3, 22, 15, 28, 14, 19, 12
Allocates resources to support academic goals	23, 30, 2, 3, 27, 25, 29, 28, 17, 19, 10, 12
Develops, articulates, and implements a vision	2, 3, 22, 15, 5, 21, 4, 25, 29, 28, 19, 10, 12, 13, 30
Displays curricular and instructional leadership skills	23, 30, 2, 3, 29, 28, 19, 10
Operates a safe and effective environment	30, 2, 22, 21
Responds to legal, societal, and economic contexts	30, 2, 15, 25, 27, 4
Demonstrates cultural competency	30, 2, 3, 4

Professional Skills (continued)

Develops positive relations with board members	30, 2, 3, 21, 29, 19, 10
Formulates student-focused district policies	3, 4, 25, 10
Mediates conflict effectively	3, 4, 25, 17
Visible	2, 28, 19, 10

APPENDIX B

Supporting Research Sources

Supporting Research Sources	Corresponding Survey Number
Bennis, W., & Thomas, R. (2002)	1
Bjork, L. (2009)	2
Bjork, L. G., Collier, V., Glass, T., & Hoyle, J. R. (2005)	3
Bjork, L., & Kowalski, T. (2005)	4
Covey, S. (1989)	5
Covey, S., (2004)	6, 7
American Educational Research Association (2003)	8
Drucker, P. (2001)	9
Education Writers Association (2003)	10, 11
Fullan, M. (2009)	12
Gardner, H. (1995)	13
Harms, P., & Crede, M. (2010)	14
Harris, S. (2009)	15
Institute for Educational Leadership (2001)	16
Judge, T., Piccolo, R., & Kosalka, T. (2009)	17

Supporting Research Sources (continued)	Corresponding Survey Number
Kellerman, B. (2008)	18
Lashway, L. (2002)	19
Leithwood, K. (1995)	20
Leithwood, K., Day, C., Sammons, P., Harris, A., & Hopkins, D. (2006)	21
Marzano, R., & Waters, T. (2009)	22, 23
Scherer, M. (2009)	24
SEDL (2009)	25
Thomas, J. (2001)	26
Uhl-Bien, M., Marion, R., & McKelvey, B. (2007)	27
The Wallace Foundation (2008)	29
Wilmore, E. L. (2008)	30
Zaccaro, S. (2007)	31

Superintendent Effectiveness- HSP(s)

* 2. Professional Skills

	Not Important			Moderately Important			Extremely Important		
Able to Meet Major Mandates	<input type="radio"/>								
Aware of Political Impact on Education	<input type="radio"/>								
Collaborative/Includes of Stakeholders	<input type="radio"/>								
Serves as Child Advocate	<input type="radio"/>								
Connects and Builds Community Partnerships	<input type="radio"/>								
Recruits, Selects, and Retains Productive Staff	<input type="radio"/>								
Understands School Finance	<input type="radio"/>								
Empowers/Develops Others	<input type="radio"/>								
Understands the Complexity of Perception	<input type="radio"/>								
Establishes Clear Academic Goals	<input type="radio"/>								
Eliminates Distractions	<input type="radio"/>								
Monitors/Assesses Academic Goals	<input type="radio"/>								
Allocates Resources to Support Academic Goals	<input type="radio"/>								
Develops, Articulates, and Implements a Vision	<input type="radio"/>								
Displays Curricular and Instructional Leadership Skills	<input type="radio"/>								
Operates a Safe and Effective Environment	<input type="radio"/>								
Responds to Legal, Societal, and Economic Contexts	<input type="radio"/>								
Demonstrates Cultural Competency	<input type="radio"/>								
Develops Positive Relations with Board Members	<input type="radio"/>								
Formulates Student Focused District Policies	<input type="radio"/>								
Mediates Conflict Effectively	<input type="radio"/>								
Visible	<input type="radio"/>								

2. Thank you for taking the time to submit the survey.

APPENDIX D

Final Survey

Superintendent Effectiveness- SUPT(final)

1. Superintendent Effectiveness- HSP.final

Directions: Please respond to the following items according to your perceptions of the personal characteristics and professional skills that define an effective superintendent. Mark the bubble along the spectrum that corresponds to the degree to which you feel the characteristic and skill define an effective superintendent. The survey is anonymous.

To guide in your responses, use the following scale:

1= Not Important; 5= Extremely Important

1. Personal Characteristics

	Not Important		Moderately Important		Extremely Important
Creative	<input type="radio"/>				
Displays a Specialized Knowledge Base/Intelligent	<input type="radio"/>				
Passionate about Education	<input type="radio"/>				
Proactive	<input type="radio"/>				
Systemic Thinker	<input type="radio"/>				
Innovative/Seizes Opportunities	<input type="radio"/>				
Strong Human Relation Skills	<input type="radio"/>				
Committed to Self-Renewal/Self-Aware	<input type="radio"/>				
Charismatic	<input type="radio"/>				
Driven by Set Personal Goals	<input type="radio"/>				
Calculated Decision Maker	<input type="radio"/>				
Displays Integrity/Fairness	<input type="radio"/>				
Maintains and Models High Expectations	<input type="radio"/>				
Effective Communicator	<input type="radio"/>				

Superintendent Effectiveness- SUPT(final)

	Not Important		Moderately Important		Extremely Important
Able to Meet Major Mandates	<input type="radio"/>				
Aware of Political Impact on Education	<input type="radio"/>				
Collaborative/Includes of Stakeholders	<input type="radio"/>				
Serves as Child Advocate	<input type="radio"/>				
Connects and Builds Community Partnerships	<input type="radio"/>				
Recruits, Selects, and Retains Productive Staff	<input type="radio"/>				
Understands School Finance	<input type="radio"/>				
Empowers/Develops Others	<input type="radio"/>				
Understands the Complexity of Perception	<input type="radio"/>				
Establishes Clear Academic Goals	<input type="radio"/>				
Eliminates Distractions	<input type="radio"/>				
Monitors/Assesses Academic Goals	<input type="radio"/>				
Allocates Resources to Support Academic Goals	<input type="radio"/>				
Develops, Articulates, and Implements a Vision	<input type="radio"/>				
Displays Curricular and Instructional Leadership Skills	<input type="radio"/>				
Operates a Safe and Effective Environment	<input type="radio"/>				
Responds to Legal, Societal, and Economic Contexts	<input type="radio"/>				
Demonstrates Cultural Competency	<input type="radio"/>				
Develops Positive Relations with Board Members	<input type="radio"/>				
Formulates Student Focused District Policies	<input type="radio"/>				
Mediates Conflict Effectively	<input type="radio"/>				
Visible	<input type="radio"/>				

2. Thank you for taking the time to submit the survey.