2001

A Study of the Relationship Among Long-Term Independent School Heads in Terms of Their Personality Types and Leadership Styles

Chad B. Small
Seton Hall University

A STUDY OF THE RELATIONSHIP AMONG LONG-TERM

INDEPENDENT SCHOOL HEADS IN TERMS OF THEIR

PERSONALITY TYPES AND LEADERSHIP STYLES

by

Chad B. Small

Dissertation Committee

Joseph Stetar, Ph.D., Mentor

Joseph Conroy, Ph.D.

Rev. Dr. Chris Hynes

Steven Loy, Ed.D.

Submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Education
Seton Hall University
2001

Acknowledgements

Many people helped make this project a reality and it is my pleasure to thank them for their assistance. Dr. Stetar's encouragement and counsel were invaluable. Dr. Loy, Rev. Dr. Hynes, and Dr. Conroy must also be recognized for their advice during the process. The members of the Board of Trustees of the Rumson Country Day School, and particularly its President, Francis Branin, were generous in their support of me. Also, thanks must be given to the faculty and staff at RCDS for their patience and advice. Staphanie Hurtt provided computer assistance, as did Stonier Grunow. Dr. John Collins contributed his statistical expertise. Jamelyn Johnson at CAPT was very helpful compiling the Myers-Briggs data. My brother, Clay, assisted in editing the manuscript. The 27 long-term Heads were fantastic and generous with their time. They are an inspiration. Finally, various members of my family, particularly Susan, my children and my parents, furnished much-needed and unwavering support. To all, I thank you.

Dedication

This study is dedicated to Susan, with thanks for her guidance, patience, support, love, and friendship.

Table of Contents

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

THE RESEARCH PROBLEM

Statement of the Problem

Perhaps the word "calling" comes closest to an accurate description of
being a head of school, as it embodies the nobleness of purpose, the total
commitment and the implicit goodness of the enterprise
(Gilvar, 1992, p.11)

Independent schools are durable and venerable organizations, thirty-eight

of the National Association of Independent Schools (NAIS) institutions were

founded before 1800 (Goldsborough, 1996). Parents and students often choose

these schools because of their stability, autonomous decentralized structure, and

strong traditions. At the center of each independent school is the Head. The

position is a unique one in American elementary and secondary education.

Unlike a public school principal, with mid-level administrative duties, a Head of

School is in a far better position to lead an institution, as the school is free from

the external control of the central office or state government (Ruoss, 1992). It is

he or she who, much like a small college president, serves as the chief

administrator and therefore has authority for faculty, staff, and student selection.

In past times the position of Head was stable and that individual was viewed as a

benevolent despot who reigned supreme and often, unquestioned (Nostrand,

1973). However, the position of Head of an independent school is changing. Today, because of societal and familial changes, a more complex governance model, and a more hostile school environment, the traditional leadership models are being challenged. Because of these changes, the average length of a Head's term is decreasing. This study seeks to find if there is a relationship between a Head's personality type and leadership style and his or her effective, long-term success at a school. For the purposes of this study, long-term is considered 15 years at the same independent elementary school as Head. This is at least three times the national average according to Jeff Moredock, Vice-President of the National Association of independent Schools (J. Moredock, personal communication, September 1,1999) and four Head search consultants: Stephen Di Cicco of Educational Directions (S.G. DiCicco, personal communication, September 14, 1999); Clay Stites of Independent Educational Services (C. V. Stites, personal communication, September 14, 1999); James Marks, of Educator's Collaborative, Inc. (J.L. Marks, personal communication, September 14, 1999); and James Wickenden, of Wickenden and Associates (J. Wickenden, personal communication, September 14, 1999).

Significance of the Study

There has never been a direct path to a Headship as most candidates come from the teaching, coaching and mid-administrative level. The leader learns most of the skills "on the job" (Ruoss, 1992). Moreover, there are many anecdotal and "how to" manuals written by or about former Heads, or commissioned prose by The National Association of independent Schools

(NAIS). These books, such as The Trustees Handbook, The Search Handbook, and Business Management for Independent Schools are useful; yet, they lack relevant, empirical data about successful leadership in Independent schools (Ledyard, 1987).

Successful and long-term Heads were once part of the common lore in the Independent school world. However, during the past 20 years, the times and the position have changed, and long-term Heads of School are a rare breed (Edwards, 1994; Ledyard, 1987; Nostrand, 1973; Ruoss, 1992). The position is more complex, and the work environment more hostile as the multiple constituencies bring conflicting pressures on the school (Edwards, 1994; Hedges, 2000). Resulting from these tensions are premature separations between the school and the Head. The financial and emotional costs to the institution are enormous, as a search for a new Head can cost a school in excess of $50,000 and the school loses a great deal of continuity and stability (Edwards, 1994). Premature terminations come in two forms. First, the Head leaves voluntarily for greener pastures or, exits the field of education completely. Second, the Board decides to fire the Head. In any event, a school goes through pain, loss, and suffering. Termination can be devastating, as the school has a difficult time maintaining, much less improving, programs and the Board might have a difficult time filling the vacant spot with a qualified replacement, on account of the termination. From the perspective of the Head, and his or her family, the dismissal can be at least as devastating to them as it is to the school (Edwards, 1994; McLaughlin, 1996). In an article about the college presidency

McLaughlin wrote there are three reasons why a president leaves early: inappropriate candidate choice; events occurring at the institution; and, small but unresolved grievances (McLaughlin, 1996). Edwards (1994), Griffin (1999), Ledyard (1987), and Scott (1997) note similar reasons for independent school Heads departing.

Scott (1997) queried Heads about job security and reported the three top reasons cited concerned Board relations: poor governance, frequent turnover of Board members, and personal agendas of Board members. Edwards (1994) studied Head-Board relations and concluded that successful Heads actively cultivated their Boards and utilized effective communication and practiced the rule of "no surprises". According to NAIS, there are only 35, out of 314, current elementary school Heads with 15 years or more experience in one school as its Head. Nationally, the average tenure of an independent school Head is decreasing: in 1972 the average tenure was 7.3 years; in 1992 it was 6.9 years (Edwards, 1994); in 1999 it was between 5 and 6 years (J. Moredock, personal communication, September 1, 1999). The demands of the position, the new breed of "consumer parents", relations with faculty and the changing connection with the governing body, commonly named the Board of Trustees, are additional reasons for the shorter length of term (Hedges, 2000).

There is a "vast and bewildering" amount of literature (Yukl, 1998) regarding successful leadership; yet, there is a paucity of research concerning one of the most important traits of effective and successful leaders – longevity, and therefore stable relations with one organization. This study seeks to find a

correlation between the personality types and leadership styles of current, long-term, independent, elementary Heads of School. What is it about these individuals that they are able to lead a school for at least 3 times the national average? How are these individuals able to withstand the myriad of new pressures from internal and external forces and continue to lead their schools effectively? Do they share common personality types and leadership styles? For example, are they resilient, extraverted, and transformational leaders? Or, are they inflexible, introverted, and transactional leaders? Or, are these individuals successful not because their personalities and leadership styles are similar, but because their personal characteristics match the particular environment, climate, and culture of the schools they serve?

Benezet, Katz, and Magnusson (1981) classified college presidents, a position with many similarities to that of a Head of an independent school. The six classifications were founding presidents, explorers, take-charge, standard-bearers, organization presidents, and moderators. A founding president is rare in today's world. The explorer Head brings new programs and generally is a risk-taker. The take-charge leader is one who holds everything together in a school that is in crisis. The standard-bearer leads an institution that has "arrived" and the organization president is a utilitarian leader. Finally, the moderator is a democratic Head, who delegates and consults with his faculty (Benezet, Katz, & Magnusson, 1981). In a study of Heads and Boards of Trustees Edwards wrote about successful Heads, "in essence, the fundamental characteristics of the human relationships within each organization were far more instrumental in

determining overall effectiveness than was the presence or absence of prescribed structures and operating systems" (Edwards, 1994, p.189). Dr. Edwards was alluding to a leader's development and maintenance of a school's humane and far-reaching culture.

Erickson defined culture as, "a system of ordinary, taken for granted meanings and symbols with both explicit and implicit content that is, deliberately and non-deliberately, learned and shared among members of naturally bounded social group"(Erickson, 1987, p.120). In writing about corporate culture, Deal and Kennedy write,

> Still, cultures endure in every workplace. They preserve because as social animals we yearn for some sort of existential anchor. We need cultures to give meaning to our lives at work. We need to define and learn acceptable rules of workplace behavior. We need to justify, or at least rationalize, hours spent on the job (Deal and Kennedy, p. 169).

Schein in his book, Organizational Culture and Leadership, defines culture,

> A pattern of shared basic assumptions that the group learned as it solved its problems of external adaptation and internal integration, that has worked well enough to be considered valid and, therefore, to be taught to new members as the correct way to perceive, think, and feel in relation to those problems (Schein, 1992, p.12).

Attention to a school's culture is an integral aspect of a Head's job. Sergiovanni (1992) indicated schools with an inter-connectedness, where the bonds among the teachers are familial, are the true learning communities. However, one must differentiate between congeniality and collegiality. Congeniality is when teachers get along with one another. Collegiality is when teachers share with one another, observe one another, and teach and learn from one another (Barth, 1990). A culturally collegial faculty (CCF) is bonded in their commitment to their school and its students. Rather than simply closing their individual room doors and teaching by themselves, a CCF share a sense of shared practice and sense comfort and empowerment collaborating with one another in a shared purpose. Creating and, more importantly, maintaining a culture which is collaborative, open, nurturing, trusting, respectful, and supportive is one which calls for, in part, transformational leadership.

In the corporate world, there are many similarities to independent schools, in terms of culture and success. Kotter and Heskett (1992) concluded the following in their book, Corporate Culture and Performance:

1. Corporate cultures can have a significant impact on a firm's long-term economic performance.

2. Corporate cultures will probably be an even more important factor in determining the success or failure of firms in the next decade.

3. Corporate cultures that inhibit strong long-term financial performance are not rare; they develop easily, even in firms that are full of reasonable and intelligent people.

4. Although tough to change, corporate cultures can be made more performance enhancing (Kotter and Heskett, 1992, p.11-12).

As stated earlier, leadership is critical to an institution's culture. According to Burns (1978) the process of leadership emerges in one of two practices. It is either transactional or transformational. Gardner (1990) wrote succinctly, "Transactional leadership accepts and works within the structure as it is. Transformational leadership renews" (Gardner, 1990, p.122). Transactional leadership is typically viewed as the world of the manager; whereas, transformational leadership is the world of a change agent. According to Maslow (1954) self-actualization is the highest level of maturity attainable. Some characteristics of the well being of a self-actualized individual are acceptance of oneself, toleration of uncertainty, and lack of self-centeredness. Leaders tend to self-actualize more than non-leaders (Bass, 1990). Burns (1978) proposed that people who were self-actualized were prospective transformational leaders on account of their potential for personal growth. One of the primary strengths of a transformational leader is his/her ability to raise a follower's consciousness above the lower levels of Maslow's hierarchy of safety and security to the higher levels of achievement and self-actualization.

Many studies have investigated the relationship between transformational and transactional leadership. For example, King (1989) utilizing the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) in a leadership study of K-12 and higher education administrators concluded that transformational leadership predicted success in both those systems. Hoover (1991) studied 45 secondary school

headmasters in the South and, also utilizing the MLQ, found that satisfaction and success were more correlated with transformational leadership than transactional leadership. Benison (1993) suggested that a combination of transactional and transformational leadership styles is more effective for the long run. She believed a style that adjusts to the institution's climate and pursues improvements at the same time is the best strategy. This is different from previous studies that tended to separate and distinguish between the two classifications. Silins (1994) agreed there is a positive relationship between the two styles, "Transactional leadership may provide the indispensable bureaucratic linkages between transformational leadership and improved school reform" (Silins, 1994). Ingram (1997) found that principals have a greater impact on teacher motivation and institutional change if they are transformational leaders. She found that transformational leaders successfully move an institution through three stages during the process of change. Similar to Lewin (1997) Ingram stated the leader first realizes the need for a change and mobilizes key people. Second, the leader develops, with the key personnel, a new vision of the future. Finally, the leader cements the commitment of the key people in the new vision. Lewin wrote, unfreeze, change, and re-freeze (Lewin, 1997).

About different styles of leadership, Zaleznik wrote, "Most societies, and that includes business organizations, are caught between two conflicting needs: one, for managers to maintain the balance of operations, and one for leaders to create new approaches and imagine new areas to explore" (Zaleznik, 1977, p.68). Instead of simply responding, transformational leaders shape.

In addition to the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire, which distinguishes between transactional and transformational leadership, the long-term heads will be given the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI), which is one of the most often used instruments to determine an individual's type preference (Spoto, 1995). Based on the interpretation of the work of Carl G. Jung by Isabel Myers and Katharine Briggs, the Indicator expects differences in individual people that are observable (Myers, McCaulley, Quenk & Hammer, 1998). Briefly, the psychological types indicated in the Myers-Briggs are:

Extraversion (E) or Introversion (I):

In the extraverted (E) attitude an individual gives preference with the people and the world around them.

In the introverted (I) attitude, people give preference to their inner world.

Sensing (S) perception or Intuitive (N) perception:

Sensing people prefer what is real, practical and observable by utilizing the senses.

Intuitive (N) people prefer theoretical patterns and future possibilities.

Thinking (T) or Feeling (F):

Thinking (T) people make decisions by linking ideas through a logical process.

Feeling (F) people make decisions by weighing the relative values and merits of the questions at hand.

Judging (J) or Perceiving (P):

Judging (J) people enjoy planning, organizing, and coming to decisions quickly.

Persons using perceiving (P) enjoy keeping their options open and delaying decision-making in case something better turns up (McCaulley, 1990a, p.2).

Individuals utilize all eight processes; however, according to Jungian theory, people prefer one of each pair over the other. The MBTI questions force choices between E or I, S or N, T or F, and J or P. Scores are determined by the direction of the preference and the consistency of the preference by a number (example E 21, F 22, etc.). Four letters – ENFJ, INTP, ISTJ, etc. denote types. Descriptions are written for each type and show the characteristics that a person displays and some of the problems one might face. A type table was established in order to readily see all 16 types in relation to each other.

Type is not to be confused with trait. Human characteristics such as weight, age, and IQ are traits, as everyone has a weight, an age, and an IQ. Traits tend to be normally distributed in the general population. In contrast, type is not normally distributed, as there is no norm or best type. Actually, there are 16 "norms" rather than one norm (Quenk, 1993). In addition, type theory states that no type is superior to another and preferences do not cause behavior (Pearman & Albritton, 1997).

As stated earlier, an individual uses all eight preferences, but prefers four. As individuals mature successfully, they begin to use their neglected processes. Jung called this type development or individuation (De Laszlo, 1993). Similar to

Maslow's (1954) self-actualized person, a well developed, mature type keeps growing and developing his/her less preferred attitudes and functions.

> The last stage only comes to people who not only live their lives
>
> fully, but continue growing. Without abandoning the values of
>
> best-developed processes, they can use their self-understanding
>
> to recognize and cultivate the values of the previously neglected
>
> third and fourth processes. Thus, they ultimately transcend their
>
> type (Myers,1995, p.176).

Csikszentmihalyi also noted this complex integration when he wrote about the ten pairs of contrasting personality traits in creative individuals (Csikszentmihalyi, 1997). Stein (1977) identified 3 stages of mid-life, according to Jungian theory: rite of separation, rite of liminality, and rite of reintegration. Corlett and Millner note the second half of life is a journey in which individuals seek wholeness in their personalities (Corlett & Millner, 1993). Storr (1983) wrote that self-regulation and compensation are integral aspects of type theory: "There was, therefore, within every individual, a striving toward unity in which divisions would be replaced by consistency, opposites equally balanced, consciousness in reciprocal relation with the unconscious" (Storr, 1983, p. 18).

Currently there is no instrument to confirm if an individual has attained a balance in his/her type development. Some research has suggested that successful leaders may be clearer in their preferences and therefore know themselves better and are able to utilize their auxiliary preferences to a greater degree. Other research implies that developed types may show less clarity in

their scores. Obviously, the research in this area is inconclusive (McCaulley, 1983; Fitzgerald, 1992; Myers, 1995; Myers & Kirby, 1993; Murphy, 1994; Quenk, 1984). It will be interesting to note if the long-term Heads show clear distinctness in their preferences, or are moderate in their clarity.

In addition, there is a great deal of research concerning type and leadership (Helmstetter, 1999; Matan, 1999; Orwin, 1999). While no one type stands out at the top, some of the research suggests that when a shift is framed from manager to leader, the type is different. The "typical" manager in the United States is a sensing, thinking (ST) or a sensing, judging (SJ). These types, transactional leaders, seek stable environments and are very good at guiding those types of organizations. However, transformational leaders, who develop vision, take risks, innovate, and excite an organization are likely to be intuitive, feeling (NF) or intuitive, perceiving (NP) (Walck, 1996, p. 65). Finally, because extraverts (E) tend to have a more positive sense of well-being, they may be able to handle the stress of executive positions than introverts (I) (Walck, 1996).

Research Question

Are there similarities among long-term, elementary Heads of Independent Schools (minimum of 15 years in the same school) in terms of their personality types and leadership styles?

Subsidiary Questions

1. In the MLQ, do the long-term Heads of Schools utilize transactional leadership styles, transformational leadership styles, or both in guiding their schools?

2. In the MBTI, are their preferences distinct and polar, or are their preferences close together? For example, in the E/I type, are the Heads strictly and/or predominantly E, or do they utilize both E and I with a weak preference?

3. In the MBTI, are the Heads predominately extraverted (E) and intuitive (N)?

4. Are the Heads' relationships with their Boards of Trustees collaborative?

Terms

1. Independent School: For the purpose of this study an independent school is defined as a member of the National Association of Independent Schools. In order to be a member, an institution must be nonproprietary and incorporated as a non-profit, tax-exempt organization (501(c)(3). In addition a self-perpetuating Board of Trustees, who have the fiduciary responsibility of the school and establish policies related to the school, govern the schools. Independent Schools have a myriad of organizational design. Some educate only boarders; some are single sex; others are non-sectarian. By far the most common organization is the coeducational elementary and secondary school.

2. National Association of Independent Schools (NAIS) The National Association of Independent Schools is an organization of over 1,000 schools in the United States and abroad. Member schools must be non-profit, adhering to non-discriminatory policies, have a self-perpetuating governing body, and be accredited by an appropriate state or regional association.

3. The Board of Trustees: For the purpose of this study, The Board of Trustees is the ultimate authority of an independent school. The board can only act as a single body; no individual can act for the board unless expressly asked by the board to do so.

4. Head of School: For the purposes of this study the Head of School is the chief executive officer of an independent school. The Head, hired by the Board of Trustees, is the only employee directly accountable to them.

5. Elementary School: For the purposes of this study an elementary school is one which serves students from at least 3rd grade and no further then the 9th grade.

6. Transformational Leadership: Transformational leadership motivates followers more than they originally expected to do, by raising their level of awareness, by getting them to transcend their own self-interest, or by altering their need levels (Bass, 1985).

7. Transactional Leadership: Transactional leadership recognizes what the follower needs and clarifies for the follower how these needs will be fulfilled in exchange for the follower's satisfactory effort and performance (Bass, 1985).

8. Type Theory: Type theory refers to Carl Jung's theory as interpreted by Isabel Myers and Katharine Briggs. Type theory involves the interaction of an individual's four basic preferences.

Limitations of the Study

The research is limited specifically to current, elementary independent school Heads, who have served their school for at least 15 years, which is three

times the national average. The results of this study are limited to this population only and may not be applied to other populations. The selection of the Myers-Briggs (Form G) and MLQ (5-x short) are further limitations.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

It is important to understand the history of independent schools and review the literature that is applicable to independent schools in order to perceive why some independent school Heads remain at a school for a much longer time than the average tenure. While there is little relevant independent school literature, there is a great deal of research about public school administration, and in the past 10 years an extensive amount has been written about the leadership and governance of nonprofit organizations. The review of the literature can be divided into roughly four parts: history and definition of Independent schools, leadership research, the executive's relationship with the Board of Trustees, and leadership and personality traits.

Historical Overview

Independent schools have been a major part of the American education landscape since colonial times. The National Association of Independent Schools (NAIS), founded In 1962, has 1,000 member schools teaching 450,000 students. The member schools range in size from under thirty to over thirty-eight hundred students. The age of member schools ranges from 5 to over three hundred

years. There are a variety of schools classified as independent: boarding, coed, single sex, day, elementary schools, middle schools and upper schools. The programs can also vary, as some may be vary traditional and some wildly experimental. Some schools may be church-related, some are not. Despite the relatively small percentage of the total U.S. population they serve, independent schools have educated "proportionately, a far larger number of presidents, senators, governors, business leaders, reformers, writers and scientists" (Edwards, 1994, p.1). Of the 1,000 NAIS member schools, 716 are considered day (as opposed to boarding) schools and of those 314 are elementary day schools (National Association of Independent Schools, 1998).

The roots of the modern independent day school can be traced to two sources: the proprietary town schools of the colonial period and the church schools of that era. Entrepreneurs willing to teach anything a person wished to learn founded many of the proprietary schools. By the end of the 19th century, a new type of school was emerging in the environs of major cities. The first of these, Gilman School, in Baltimore, was founded in 1897 in order to offer the best aspects of boarding schools, yet the students would be safely home at night and during the weekends (Kraushaar, 1972). Early in the 20th century, more "country day" schools opened throughout the country and by 1937 over 100 schools were founded to offer: "1) A full day program of academic and extracurricular activities and 2) close home ties with full involvement of parents" (Kraushaar, 1972, p.77). Educators founded some of the schools and others

were founded by groups of parents wishing to offer an alternative to the local public schools.

While certainly under the umbrella of private (or non-public) schools, independent schools are proud of their independence and are markedly different than other types of private schools, such as proprietary or parochial. There are three criteria used to define an independent school: they are non-profit and tax-exempt operating under a 501(c)(3), which requires a racially nondiscriminatory policy; they have freedom from local, state and federal government control; and they have self-perpetuating Boards of Trustees. The independence of these schools was secured by two important Suprame Court cases, without which private educational institutions would be controlled by the state. The first was Dartmouth College vs. Woodward, which, interestingly, was argued by Daniel Webster in 1819. The Dartmouth case provided the under pinning for independence from the government by holding that private schools are contractual not constitutional entities. The second important case was decided in 1925, Pierce vs. the Society of Sisters. The decision in Pierce gave the right to parents to choose the appropriate school setting for their children (Calder, 1998).

At the center of independent schools is the Head of School (some prefer Headmaster or Headmistress). In the traditional role, Heads were viewed as benevolent despots, to whom everybody reported, and he/she was always considered "the boss"(Powell, 1996). John McPhee's book about Frank Boyden of Deerfield, The Headmaster, is perhaps the best description of the traditional, stable authority figure. Mr. Boyden, who served as Deerfield's Headmaster for

over sixty years, described himself as, "indestructible and infallible" (McPhee, 1966,p.13). In addition, the traditional role is also prevalent because many of the Heads who founded their schools also owned them. As the founders became older, most of these schools dropped private ownership and sought not-for-profit status, with a governing Board (Powell, 1996). In similar writings about the college presidency, McLaughlin (1996) notes that a successful college president becomes a "living logo" of the institution and "to many people, the president is the institution" (McLaughlin, 1996, p.8). And, Merante and Ireland, in writing about 10 successful small colleges, agreed, " the president is the undisputed flag carrier of the institution" and "embodies the life of the college" (Merante, J. A. & Ireland, R.C., 1993, p.28).

This portrait is changing. The position of Head is now far more complicated and the expectations of the leader are far reaching (Hedges, 2000). Many independent school newsletters chronicle the changing role and new demands on the Head. Interestingly, twenty-five years ago, Stevens (1974) interviewed several Heads about the changing tide of Headship. Most of their concerns centered on the evaporation of standards, Board-Head relations, and the mounting pressures from the school's different constituencies. More current, popular Head newsletters, such as The Head's Letter and Ideas and Perspectives also are pointing to the myriad of problems that Heads are having with their governing bodies, the "consumer" parent, and the increasing complexity of administering an Independent school. For instance,

Today's parents tend to view their child's private-independent school with a profound sense of ownership. Since they "make payments" to the institution, parents reason that their proper role should include making explicit demands on teachers, on administrators, on Trustees, and on the curriculum itself (Staff, ideas & Perspectives, August 9, 1999, p. 37).

Compare that sentiment with that of one written in 1973 about the relationship between a school and the parents, "Traditionally there has been a limited relationship between the parents and the headmaster" (Nostrand, 1973, p.13). And,

More and more headmasters are finding ways to encourage parental contributions to the educational experience at the school. It is not inconceivable, then, to imagine the day when parents assume a greater role in the teaching area, perhaps even in the actual administration, of the school (Nostrand, 1973, p.15).

As the role of the Head is changing, the length of time a person spends as Head in one school is decreasing. In 1972, the average tenure for heads was 7.3 years, twenty years later, in 1992, it was 6.9 years (Edwards, 1994) and, according to Jeff Moredock, Vice President for Institutional Leadership of NAIS, the average tenure of a Head in 1999 is between 5 and 6 years (J. Moredock, personal communication, September 1, 1999). Heads are not remaining at the same school for as long as they did a generation ago. There are countless stories of executives being fired, or leaving their posts early (Edwards, 1994;

Hedges, 2000; Lawson, 1991; Ledyard, 1987). Because of their briefer stints, schools suffer in a number of ways: financially, emotionally and educationally (Edwards, 1994). If, as Nason (1980) wrote about college presidents, leaders with long tenure guided the greatest creative periods in institutional development, then why is the average tenure of a school Head declining? There are a number, albeit small, of current elementary day school Heads, who have served their current schools for more than 15 years. What makes these leaders successful in times of frequent Head turnover?

Leadership

Research in effective leadership began in the 20th century. Many definitions and theories of leadership have surfaced and the results "have created a vast and bewildering literature" (Yukl, 1998, p.8). Bennis & Nanus (1997) add, " Never have so many labored so long to say so little. Multiple interpretations of leadership exist, each providing a sliver of insight but each remaining an incomplete and wholly inadequate explanation" (Bennis & Nanus, 1997, p.4). Sergiovanni (1992) states that leadership can come in many forms and Burns (1978) distinguishes leadership from power-holding and brute power. However, "most definitions share the assumption that it involves a social influence process whereby intentional influence is exerted by one person over other people in an attempt to structure the activities and relationships in a group or organization" (Yuki, 1998, p.14).

Burns (1978) in his Pulitzer Prize winning book, Leadership, identified two types of leadership: transactional and transformational. Transactional is exactly

what it says, a transaction. A leader will bargain or exchange gratification. The satisfactions gained in transactional relationships are usually short-lived and superficial. There are two major aspects of this type of leadership: contingent reward and management by exception. Transformational leadership, on the other hand, occurs when a higher level of human conduct, motives, and values are shaped. Loftier goals are pursued and the leader and followers are transformed. Perhaps the best modern example of transformational or charismatic leadership is Ghandi, who elevated the hopes and demands of millions of Indians. Charisma has a certain mystique. The word is from the Greek meaning "gift" and was restricted to the Christian church to describe healing talents until 1947 when Max Weber used the term to describe certain political leaders. In recent writings, the popular term has evolved into a synonym for innovative leadership and the moral undertone has faded (Bensimon, 1993, p. 6). Gardner writes,

> Common sense suggests that we drop the historical and theoretical baggage that comes with the word, and accept the fact that it is now part of the popular vocabulary, referring in a more or less uncomplicated way to the magnetism, persuasiveness, or nonrational appeal of certain people (Gardner, 1990, p.35).

The presence of a single trait does not make a charismatic leader; rather, there is a constellation of behaviors, dependent on one another with vision being the cornerstone (Conger, 1989). There are possible negative aspects to a charismatic leader. For example, the leader is so wrapped up in the big picture that he/she forgets the details that make the organization operate successfully.

Also, succession is difficult and a vacuum is often created when a charismatic leaves, as he/she is too fond of the spotlight to share it (Conger, 1989).

As is the case with most studies of leadership, there has been controversy over the relationship between transactional and transformational leadership, or sometimes posited as leadership and management (Yuki, 1989). Some authors believe there is no correlation between the two, described as orthogonal, and others write that some leaders share both processes (Silins, 1994). Hoover (1991) found the model proposed by Bass in 1985 in business, concerning transactional and transformational strategies, also emerged in independent school Heads. Hoover selected forty-five Heads to determine whether these individuals utilized similar leadership styles to Army officers and business leaders studied in the past. As documented in Bass's original work, employees' satisfaction and efficacy were more correlated with transformational leadership than transactional leadership. Fields and Herold (1997) suggested that subordinates could distinguish between the two types of leadership when they describe behaviors of their superiors. Silins (1994) presented evidence that there is a positive link between the two types of styles, as transactional behaviors provide linkages to transformational leadership. In addition, some forms of leadership may inspire some followers, while causing contempt in others (Yammarino and Bass, 1990). An effective (long-term) school head must employ both types of leadership in order to run a successful school. The transactional-transformational model is a continuum where both styles are utilized. Leadership should be viewed as an extension of management, not as an opposite (King,

1989). Covey articulates, "Obviously both kinds of leadership are necessary. But transformational leadership must be the parent" (Covey, 1991, p.287).

Two influential writers concerning transformational leadership in education are Leithwood and Sergiovanni. Leithwood (1994) describes four dimensions of transformational leadership in education:

1. development of a widely shared vision for the school;

2. providing individual support and intellectual stimulation;

3. encouraging democratic decision-making; and

4. strengthening a school's culture by using symbols and rituals to signify the institution's values.

Sergiovanni (1990) proposed five dimensions to school-related transformational leadership:

1. technical leadership and sound management techniques;

2. human leadership which harnesses social and interpersonal potential;

3. leadership which demonstrates expertise about education;

4. symbolic leadership; and

5. cultural leadership, which gives the school identity over time.

Gurr (1996) agrees with both Leithwood and Sergiovanni but believes that this concept of school leadership must be built upon. He anticipates that future administrators will not only need to be transformational leaders, but also educational strategists. He believes that leaders will be working in an environment where the future is not known with any certainty. Therefore, effectiveness will be determined by a leader's understanding resource

implications of adopting different school-related strategies. Similarly, reflecting on his role as a leader, Steven Jobs of Apple Computer noted, "a leader should operate as both architect of the future and keeper of the vision" (Bass and Avolio, 1994, p. 133).

In their book, Reframing Organizations: Artistry, Choice and Leadership, Bolman and Deal (1997) write about leaders working effectively in the four frames of an organization: structural, human resource, political, and symbolic. They note that effective leaders examine any situation from different vantage points in order to develop a full picture. The ability to frame and reframe a problem allows a leader to develop new strategies, as each of the frames offers advantages and, of course shortcomings.

Goleman (1998) creates a strong case for emotional intelligence as the crucial part of effective leadership. While analyzing his collected data, which included IQ and technical skills, he found emotional intelligence to be two times as important as the other traits and skills for employment success. His five components of emotional intelligence: self-awareness, self-regulation, motivation, empathy, and social skill are both genetic and acquired. Similarly, the five-factor model of leadership was developed many years ago and lay dormant for over twenty years (Cannella & Monroe, 1997). During the 1980s the model was revived and is now considered a major concept of leadership (McAdams, 1992). The five factors that comprise the model are neuroticism, extraversion, openness to experience, agreeableness, and conscientiousness (Cannella & Monroe, 1997). In the late 1980s a high correlation was found between the MBTI and four

of the five factors. The researchers, McCrae and Costa, found strong correlations between the MBTI extraversion/introversion and the five-factor extraversion, the MBTI sensing/intuition and five-factor openness, the MBTI thinking/feeling and five-factor agreeableness, and the MBTI judging/perceptive and the five-factor conscientiousness (Fitzgerald & Kirby, 1997).

Board-Head Relationship

As stated earlier, a Head's relationship with the Board is an important, and a potentially contentious one. The relationship between the board and the head is crucial in determining organizational performance (Edwards, 1994). In many ways a Head's relationship with the Board is similar to that of a Superintendent of schools, a private college President, or a Chief Executive of a nonprofit organization with their Boards and a great deal of adaptable research has been completed in those spheres. All of these executives report to a Board, and are ultimately responsible to them. Boards of these organizations are often termed tripartite systems in which the three branches of the organization: the executive, the staff, and the board are separate entities. The first tripartite system was documented at Harvard University in 1636 when, sure enough, the Board fired the president (Houle, 1989). In their book about the college presidency, Presidential Leadership, Fisher and Koch (1996) draw parallels to the Head's position when they note, "the woeful state of the college presidency is a direct and almost inevitable result of unwise governing board policies and presidents who do not understand the principles of leadership and power" (Fisher and Koch, 1996, p.334). In terms of Presidential (and Head) success, they write, "The board

must endow the president with authority and both its policies and practices must require all campus constituencies to deal with the president" (Fisher and Koch, 1996, p.331).

In an article entitled, "The Community College Presidency: Qualities for Success", Pierce and Pedersen (1997) draw a parallel to a Headship and his or her relationship to a Board when they name three qualities needed to succeed as a President of a Community College: personal adaptability; role flexibility; and sound judgment. In order to achieve personal adaptability an individual must be able to move comfortably around and among all the various stakeholders and constituencies, including the Board of Trustees. Role flexibility is the ability to mediate among the constituencies and build collaboration. Finally, sound judgment is the ability of the individual to listen to various and wide-ranging voices leading to a common ground.

The Board-Head relationship requires "a strong sense of balance, a high degree of trust, a willingness to follow as well as lead" (Robinson, 1998, p.1). In the past, it was clear that the Board set policy and the Head administered the school. However, a lack of trust, insufficient nurturing of the Head, poor communication, and minimal cultivation and education of Board members by the Head have led to strained relations between the Executive and the governing body in many institutions (Edwards, 1994). Inappropriate Board meddling is documented thoroughly (Edwards, 1994; Hawley 1994; Lawson, 1991; Ledyard, 1987; McKay & Grady, 1994). Furthermore, high trustee turnover and not enough disinterested Board members were also major reasons for frequent head

turnover (Hawley, 1994,1995). In Hawley's research, the data suggested when members of the Board do not have their own children enrolled in the school (defined as disinterested), the Heads remain longer. This is interesting to note, as nation-wide over 70% of trustees on elementary day school boards are current parents (Ledyard, 1987). Also, the extended tenure of the Board chair and his/her positive relationship with the Head lead to longer Head term of office (DeKuyper, 1998; Griffin, 1999). Wickenden (1996) promoting a new Head-Board model, lists three factors for Board ineffectiveness:

1. High levels of frustration among trustees about the quality of their Board experience;

2. increasing concern among Heads about Board interference;

3. a general lack of effectiveness among Boards in furthering the strategic development of their schools.

In an article about community-based not-for-profit trustees, Roberts and Connors (1998) outlined reasons for partnership failures between Boards and the Chief Executive Officer:

1. Failing to keep trustees fully informed;

2. failing to involve trusteas in crucial strategic directions early enough to enable effective input;

3. expecting unqualified support without effective involvement; and

4. putting a low priority on trustees' development efforts.

Furthermore, Orlikof and Totten (1999) summarized the "seven deadly sins" of ineffective governance:

1. Representational governance is when Board members believe they were chosen to serve in order to represent a particular constituency.

2. Lack of mission focus;

3. Resisting change rather than leading it.

4. Bad governance information is when the Board receives too much irrelevant information and not enough detail about strategic issues.

5. Reluctance to remove nonperforming or dysfunctional Board members;

6. bad governance structures;

7. lack of job descriptions.

In recent literature concerning Heads and Boards the emphasis is on collaboration (Herman and Heimovics, 1991; National Center for Nonprofit Boards, 2000; Rubin, 1998; Taylor, Chait and Holland, 1996) and trust (Edwards, 1994, 1999). The accepted rules of the past: governance is governance, administration is administration, and "governance is not management" are being questioned (Dayton, 1987,p. 4). The Board's progress, performance, and successes have become the executive's responsibility (Herman and Heimovics, 1991). Traditionally, nonprofit organizations are hierarchical. While that norm has changed, many institutions have been slow to reflect the change (Edwards, 1994). The emerging model is one where "the chief executive is the center of leadership for the organization" (Herman and Heimovics, 1991,p. 54) [Italics theirs] Effective executives take more responsibility for creating board-centered

leadership. Rubin (1998) defines collaborative leaders as interpersonal and interinstitutional managers. This is not to state that Heads take over the board's role; rather, the Head assists the board as never before in fulfilling their duties (Taylor, et. al., 1996). Creating a relationship that includes formal and informal interactions, as well as meeting with individual trustees each year and developing personal ties with each trustee are considered time well-spent (Scott, 1997). An independent school newsletter translated Herman and Heimovics work into a working model for a Head's evaluation. The six skills utilized were:

1. Facilitating interaction with the Board.

2. Showing consideration and respect toward Board members.

3. Envisioning change and innovation with the Board.

4. Promoting Board accomplishments and productivity.

5. Initiating and maintaining a structure for Board work.

6. Providing helpful information to the Board (Staff, ideas & Perspective, 1992b, p.23).

In addition, trust level in the Board's relationship with the Head is also deemed as critical to a school's success. The following suggestions for improving trust were written recently in an article in a newsletter to Independent School Trustees:

1. Honor your commitments.

2. Communicate openly and honestly.

3. Always use appropriate channels of communication.

4. Understand and fulfill your role and responsibilities.

5. Be prepared by keeping yourself informed.

6. When making decisions for the organization, leave your personal agendas at home.

7. Understand what constitutes conflicts of interest and strive hard to avoid them in your relationship with the institution.

8. Honor the "Principle of No Surprises".

9. Respect and uphold the confidentiality of the board's business.

10. Respect each other's time, feelings, and points of views (Edwards, 1999, p.6).

In a recent nonprofit newsletter it was noted,

The short tenures and relatively high turnover in nonprofit executive directors present a real threat to the health of the nonprofit sector and suggest that many board-executive relationships may suffer from a trust deficit. Although other problems contribute to this repid turnover, the absence of trust alone is enough to undermine otherwise potentially effective relationships. Therefore it is time we started being deliberate about developing and maintaining trust in our organizations (Bowman and Edwards, p.1).

Collaboration and trust are very different topics of discussion about governance than witnessed a generation ago when Heads had a traditional, hierarchical, and distant relationship with their Boards (Staff, ideas & Perspectives, 1992b). For example, a dissertation written in 1973 about Heads of Schools explained the practices of the day,

In a sense, the headmaster is the primary "trustee" of the School since the school has been placed in his charge. Furthermore, he was hired because the board felt he was the best man for the position. It would therefore seem logical to assume that although there were a few sacred trustee grounds upon which the headmaster could not trespass, he should have a fairly free reign to conduct the school as he saw fit (Nostrand, 1973, p.16).

The lack of concern and the limited research in successful Board-Head relations in the past is also punctuated by Otto Kraushaar's book (1972), which was a major study about American non-public schools. Out of almost 400 pages, only four are dedicated to independent school trusteeship.

In addition to the above changes in governance styles, scholars find that successful executives are "boundary spanning" (Dollinger, 1984, p.352). More than networking, boundary spanning "is directed externally across the boundaries of the organization to manage the organization's dependence on those external factors that determine the availability of the resources necessary to carry out its mission" (Herman and Helmovics, 1991, p.128). Executives who boundary span are more successful as they are able to deal with a variety of stimuli and ambiguous information (Dollinger, 1984). Also, Dollinger correlates personal characteristics with those who boundary span and mentions "flexibility, extroversion, tolerance of ambiguity, self-assurance, need for visibility, and savoir fair " (Dollinger, 1984, p.353). Effective Heads know how to strengthen and

expand their connections with external interests in order to retain reliable information and plan strategically (Herman and Heimovics, 1991). Finally, scholars worry that heads that do not boundary span will become more like middle managers as the Board controls the broader strategies (Staff, Ideas & Perspectives, 1992). The readings suggest that long-term Heads will be somewhat extraverted and understand the importance of Board relations and boundary spanning.

The corporate world is also showing some of the same problems. As corporate boards continue to add independent outside directors, the position of CEO is also changing. The average tenure of a Fortune 500 CEO is seven years (Carey and Ogden, 2000). Similar to Heads of School, the CEOs are facing Board trouble:

> Once asked to join the board, these outside directors, more than likely selected by the CEO, are then expected to do an about-face and act as guardians of shareholder interest. Directors are caught in a bind because of the conflicting nature of their duties. They feel a natural loyalty to the CEO who may have selected them, whom they may have worked closely with for some time, and who may even be a personal friend. On the other hand, directors increasingly feel the weight of their fiduciary responsibilities as boards are regularly singled out by institutional shareholder groups, aided by the press in their efforts to push for greater company performance and to dispense with CEOs who appear to be thwarting that effort

(Carey and Ogden, p.93).

As companies continue the trend of outside directors, scholars note that directors will become "less beholden to the CEO: less like employees, more like owners" (Carey and Ogden, p. 193).

Leadership Traits and Personality Types

The study of leadership traits has had a turbulent past. Most of the trait studies in the first half of the 20th century were dispelled by Stogdill in 1948 as his review of that early research failed to support the basic premise that a person must possess a particular set of traits to become a successful leader and that traits of leaders tend to differ with the circumstances (Bass, 1990). Current research proclaims that possession of particular traits increases the likelihood that leaders will be effective, but they do not guarantee effectiveness. A leader with certain traits could be effective in one situation but ineffective in a different situation (Gardner, 1990; Yukl, 1998). In 1974, Stogdill revised his beliefs about leadership traits in a new study:

> The leader is characterized by a strong drive for responsibility and task completion, vigor and persistence in pursuit of goals, venturesomeness, and originality in problem solving, drive to exercise initiative in social situations, self-confidence, and sense of personal identity, willingness to accept consequences of decisions and action, readiness to absorb interpersonal stress, willingness to tolerate frustration and delay, ability to influence other persons' behavior, and

capacity to structure social interaction systems to the purpose at hand

(Bass , 1990, p.86).

Are there common personality types and leadership traits among the long-term Heads? The literature suggests there are. In order to verify this conjecture, the Myers-Briggs and the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) will be administered to each Head. The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) is a notable and widely used personality instrument (Evans, 1996). Studies of Myers-Briggs "suggest a far from random distribution of temperament types across occupations" (Clark & Guest, 1995). Form G of the MBTI determines preferences on four scales, with 126 questions:

1. Extraversion-Introversion

2. Sensing-Intuition

3. Thinking-Feeling

4. Judging-Perceiving

The combinations of these preferences result in 16 different personality types. Katharine Cook Briggs and her daughter Isabel Briggs Myers developed the instrument in the 1940's, guided by the works of Carl G. Jung, the Swiss psychiatrist.

Jung was considered the "heir apparent to Freud's psychoanalytical kingdom" (Spoto, 1995, p.4) but separated himself from Freud's camp in the following letter, written in 1912:

> Dear Professor Freud,
>
> I shall submit to your wish to discontinue our personal

relationship, for I never force my friendship on anyone. For the

rest, you yourself know best what this moment means to you. "The

rest is silence..."

Yours sincerely,

Jung (Spoto, 1995, p. 4)

Jung's book, Psychological Types, was published in 1921, the first subsequent to

his break with Freud (Hopcke, 1999). Here Jung postulated that people sort

mental habits among three opposite poles: extraversion/introversion,

sensing/intuition, and thinking/feeling. Briggs and Myers added a fourth

dimension labeled judgement/perception.

Before she was introduced to Jung's Psychological Types, Katharine Cook

Briggs wrote an essay in 1926 for The New Republic describing four personality

types: meditative, spontaneous, executive, and sociable (Myers, 1995). She and

her daughter, Isabel, started a data bank from informal questioning of friends and

acquaintances about habits and decision-making processes. Once Katharine and

Isabel read Jung's book, they began to incorporate his work into theirs and

refined their instrument many times before publishing it for the first time in 1947

(Nadel, 1996).

Bass and Avolio developed the MLQ in 1990. The questionnaire measures

seven leadership factors. The self-rating form will be used in this study. The MLQ

has been utilized in many areas, including business, military, volunteer

organizations, and higher education. The literature suggests that the MLQ is

reliable in measuring constructs of transformational and transactional leadership (Ingram, 1997).

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

The study seeks to determine if there are similarities among long-term Heads of independent elementary Schools in terms of their personality types and leadership styles. The leadership subjects for this study are Heads of National Association of Independent Schools (NAIS) affiliated independent elementary schools. All of the Heads identified are leading their respective schools for at least fifteen years. The original list was obtained from NAIS in Washington D.C. during a meeting with Jeff Moredock, Vice President, on October 29, 1999. The subjects (n=27) are from fifteen states and their schools provide instruction to students in the elementary grades, defined as at least as far as third grade and no further then ninth grade.

Research Method and Design

A nonexperimental, correlational design will be used in this study. The Instruments to be used are the Bass Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ-5x-Short), the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI Form G), and interviews.

In order to produce an instrument to quantify transactional and transformational leadership styles, Bass used responses from 70 male

executives and descriptions from literature in order to accumulate 142 items to describe the two forms of leadership. A cadra of graduate students culled the number of items to 73, which became the basis of the MLQ. After several analyses and revisions, Form Five (5x-short) of the MLQ was adopted. There are two questionnaire forms: the self-rating form, in which the leader rates him or herself as a leader, and the rater from in which the subordinates rate the leader. The self-rating form will be used in this study. Hoover (1991) found the leadership factors found in business by the MLQ were viable in educational leadership. In addition, the literature (Hoover, 1991; Ingram, 1997; King, 1989) suggests that the MLQ is valid and reliable for measuring the constructs of transformational and transactional leadership in educational settings.

The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire was developed in order to measure which behaviors leaders utilize. Included are questions that measure charisma, intellectual stimulation, and individual consideration. The term idealized influence has been substituted for charisma. When viewed collectively, these constitute transformational leadership. In addition, the MLQ asks questions which measure the elements of contingent reward and management by exceptions, which together constitute transactional leadership. In the MLQ, respondents are asked to answer 45 questions regarding their leadership styles. For example, in one item, the leader is asked to judge him or herself about, "I talk optimistically about the future." On another, he or she is asked, "I avoid making decisions". Each item has a five-step Likert scale, ranging from "Frequently, if not always" to "Not at all". Adding the items and dividing by the number of items that

make up the scale derives the scores. Al of the leadership styles (Idealized Influence, attributed and behavior, Inspirational Motivation, Intellectual Stimulation, Individualized Consideration, Contingent Rewards, Management-By-Exception, active and passive and Laissez-Faire) have four items. In addition, Extra Effort has three items, Effectiveness has four items, and Satisfaction has two items. The MLQ will measure the transformational and transactional leadership styles of the Heads of Schools.

As stated previously, Bass's (1985) model of transformational and transactional leadership Includes 3 factors that distinguish and define transformational leadership:

1. Charisma (or idealized influence). This factor is the degree to which a leader inspires loyalty, devotion, transmits a sense of mission, and followers want to identify with him or her.

2. Intellectual stimulation. This factor is the degree to which a leader encourages followers to develop their own problem-solving qualities and to question their own assumptions.

3. Individualized consideration. This factor is the degree to which a leader is concerned with the individual needs and development of his/her followers.

There are two factors that distinguish and define transactional leadership:

1. Contingent reward. This factor is the degree to which a leader recognizes what subordinates need and through extrinsic rewards motivates them to reach objectives.

2. Management by exception. This factor is the degree to which a leader utilizes negative feedback and avoids giving directions if performance standards are met.

In Form G of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI), the Heads will answer 126 items that determine preferences on four scales: Extraversion-Introversion (E-I), Sensing-Intuition (S-N), Thinking-Feeling (T-F), and Judging-Perceiving (J-P). The results provide a personality type, with 16 possibilities. The E-I Indicant was designed to ascertain if a person is an extravert or an introvert as he or she relates to the world. The extravert prefers to focus on people and activities, while the introvert prefers to focus on ideas and concepts. The S-N index also indicates how one perceives his or her world. The sensing person prefers to use facts and details and is practical, while the intuitive person is interested in future possibilities and implicit meanings. The T-F indicator is designed to ascertain one's judgement process. The thinking person is rational and makes decisions logically, while the feeling person depends on his or her feelings and prefers harmony in order to make choices. Finally, the J-P index refers to the preferred relationship with the external world, either organized, structured and orderly (J), or spontaneous, curious, and flexible (P). By combining the four letters a person's type is created. For example a person preferring the Extraversion, iNtuitive, Feeling, Perceiving scales would be called an ENFP type (Reardin, 1996).

The preference scores are the basic scores for the MBTI. The preference score reflects the relative preference of one type (i.e. Extravert) over another

type (i.e. introvert) (McCaulley, 1990b). However, types are not set in stone; rather, the types describe preferred ways of functioning in the world.

Based on Carl G. Jung's theory of personality types, the MBTi was developed by Isabel Myers and her mother, Katharine Briggs. In 1942, Myers began to develop an indicator she hoped would help people understand one another better and become a tool to help prevent future warfare and she spent many years refining her measure (Smith, 1991). In 1962, the Educational Testing Service (ETS) published the MBTi for research only and in 1976, Consulting Psychologists Press published the test for applied settings. Since its publication, the use of the MBTi has spread quickly and is utilized by professionals in business and not-for-profit organizations, as well as the public, in order to understand oneself better and improve relations with others (Reardin, 1996). McCaulley (1990b) has established the validity of the MBTi.

In addition to these two measures, a sample of ten of the leaders, from different states, will be interviewed. The researcher developed an interview instrument to collect information on the individual schools, the Board of Trustees, and the School's effectiveness, in terms of strategic planning. While not a part of the correlation study, the interviews will be used qualitatively to detect trends. The purpose of the study and the interview will be explained to each of the selected Heads by mail, telephone, and face-to-face (Rea & Parker, 1997). Each interview will last approximately one hour, and will be taped, with their permission.

The questions regarding their relationships with their Boards will revolve around how they participate in decision making. First, who determines the agenda for the Board meetings? Do the Head and Chair establish the agenda together? Second, what is the process for selecting new Board members? Third, is the Head involved with ongoing Board education? How? Fourth, does the Head have a personal relationship with each member? Fifth, does the Head believe there is open dialogue between him/her and the Board? Finally, is the Head's coalition with the Board, and particularly the chair, built from trust? The answers to these questions will establish if a successful, collaborative relationship exists with the Heads and their Boards of Trustees.

Additionally, the Heads will be asked questions about their school's effectiveness utilizing success indicators noted in an article by Merante and Ireland entitled "The Competitive Edge: Why Some Small Colleges Succeed" (Merante, J.A. & Ireland, R.C., 1993, p.12). These derived questions are predominantly concerned with strategies securing the institution's future.

Pilot interviews with three current NAIS, long-term secondary school Heads will precede the interviews with the selected group of long-term elementary school Heads. The Heads will be selected by their geographical proximity to the researcher. The purpose of the pilot interviews will be to determine if the questions are relevant to long-term Headship. After setting appointments with the individuals, the purpose of the study will be explained in detail and the questions will be asked in a formal manner. After the formal query, informal discussion will ensue regarding the relevancy of the questions asked.

Should some questions be deleted? Are there questions that should be added? Each conversation will be taped, with their permission, and the Heads will be assured there are no right or wrong answers and their responses are confidential. After the pilot interviews, if necessary, modifications will be made to the interview.

Data Collection

Following approval by the Institutional Review Board (IRB) to conduct the study, the researcher will make a personal phone call to each of the Heads and then send survey packets to the Heads who agree to participate. The packets will include a cover letter, copies of the instruments, and two self-addressed envelopes for returning the completed surveys. The cover letter will include the purpose of the study, consent forms (see Appendix A), assurances of confidentiality, explanation of the volunteer nature of the participation, and directions for returning the instruments. The MBTI will go directly to the Center for Application of Psychological Type (CAPT) and scored by a computer. Preference scores will be translated to a continuous scale. The second instrument (MLQ) will be returned anonymously to the researcher.

Out of the original group of selected long-term Heads, ten will be selected for an interview. The ten, each from a different state, will be called personally by the researcher to arrange a convenient time to meet in order to answer questions for an hour. The Heads will again be told about the research project, confidentiality, and the volunteer nature of participation in the project. Prior to the

interview, written informed consent will be obtained (See Appendix B). Each of the interviews will be taped, with the Head's permission.

Data Analysis

The statistical analysis is divided into descriptive and inferential statistics. The descriptive statistical procedures provide a profile of the Head's school, his/her relationship with the Board of Trustees, and strategic planning. Frequency distributions and measures of central tendency will be used. The descriptive statistics will be reported, interpreted, and recommendations made for future studies. The inferential statistical procedure used will be the Pearson product moment correlation, which will determine the strength and direction of the relationships between personality types, as measured by the MBTI. Leadership styles, as measured by the MLQ, of the long-term Heads of School will be measured by Spearman rho, for ordinal correlation. In addition, a one-sample t-test will measure the strength of the MBTI choices.

CHAPTER IV

THE FINDINGS OF THE STUDY

Introduction

The primary purpose of this study was to investigate the relationship, if any, in terms of personality types and leadership styles among long-term, elementary school Heads of independent schools. The study sought to determine if the Heads utilize transactional leadership styles, transformational leadership styles, or both. In addition, the study attempted to find if the Heads' preferences in the Myers-Briggs are distinct or polar. Also, in the MBTI, are the Heads predominately extraverted (E) and intuitive (N). Finally, the study sought to find if the Heads have a collaborative relationship with their Board of Trustees. Tables of summarized data are presented in Chapter IV, as are the findings of the study. The purpose of this chapter is to present, as well as analyze, the data in order to answer the research questions.

Characteristics of the Sample Population

During the 1999-2000 school year, 35 independent, elementary school Heads were identified as serving their current schools for at least 15 years. This list was obtained from Jeffrey Moredock, Vice-President of the National Association of Independent Schools. The researcher was able to obtain data

from 27 of these Heads (77%), all of whom completed the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ), sent back to the researcher, and the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI), sent to the Center for Applications of Psychological Type, Inc. (CAPT), in order to calculate continuous scores. Sixteen of the respondents were men and 11 were women. The inferential statistical utilized were: the Pearson product moment correlation, which determines the strength and direction of relationships between personality types, as measured by the MBTI; a one-sample t-test to measure the strength of the Heads' MBTI choices; and, the Spearman rho, a nonparametric correlation, which determines the strength and direction of leadership styles, as measured by the MLQ.

Additionally, ten of the Heads, each from a different state, were interviewed in order to determine if they work collaboratively with their Boards and plan strategically. General questions regarding the Heads' schools were also asked. Tables and summaries will be utilized to present this information.

After an initial phone call to each of the Heads, a packet of material containing an introductory and permission letter, a MBTI packet, a MLQ packet and two stamped self-addressed envelopes was sent to each Head. Responses from the 27 study subjects were received from April 7, 2000 to June 11, 2000. Additionally, ten (seven men and three women) of the Heads were called and requested to volunteer for a personal interview. A consent letter followed. The ten interviews were conducted from April 14, 2000 to May 12, 2000.

Table 1 displays the 27 Heads by their four-letter type as determined by the MBTI. For example, there are six Heads with the type designation ENTJ

(bottom right hand corner). This means they preferred Extraversion, iNtuition, Thinking, and Judging. On the far right each of the preferences is listed individually, by number and percent. Additionally, pairs of preferences are noted, such as IJ (Introverted, Judging) or ET (Extraverted, Thinking). These, too, are followed by the number and percentage of the Heads. The first grouping of four combines the direction of energy (E or I) with orientation to the external world (J or P). The second four combine perception (S or N) and judgment (T or F). The third foursome combines orientation of energy (E or I) and perceptions (S or N). The fourth grouping combines the judging function (T or F) and the orientation to the external world (J or P). The final group (S, N, T, and F) displays the number and percentage of the Heads whose dominant function is Sensing, iNtuition, Thinking, or Feeling. These two dichotomies, S-N and T-F, reflect basic preferences for utilizing perception and judgment. Jung postulated that everyone uses these four basic functions, but prefers one. In the MBTI Manual, the authors define the four functions:

-Sensing (S) seeks the fullest possible experience of what is immediate and real.

-Intuition (N) seeks the furthest reaches of the possible and imaginative.

-Thinking (T) seeks rational order in accord with the nonpersonal logic of cause and effect.

-Feeling (F) seeks rational order in accord with the creation and maintenance of harmony among important subjective values (Myers, I.B., McCaulley, M.H., Quenk, N.L. & Hammer, A.L., 1998, p. 25).

The table is organized so that similar types are contiguous. Each type has three letters in common with any adjacent type. Thus, one can look at the table and view qualities shared by the groups of type (See Table 1).

MBTI Results

Table 1

Frequencies for the MBTI

N=27

ISTJ	ISFJ	INFJ	INTJ
N= 2 %= 7.41	N= 2 %= 7.41	N= 0 %= 0.00	N= 2 %= 7.41
ISTP	**ISFP**	**INFP**	**INTP**
N= 0 %= 0.00	N= 0 %= 0.00	N= 2 %= 7.41	N= 3 %= 11.11
ESTP	**ESFP**	**ENFP**	**ENTP**
N= 0 %= 0.00	N= 0 %= .00	N= 0 %= .00	N= 2 %= 7.41
ESTJ	**ESFJ**	**ENFJ**	**ENTJ**
N= 3 %= 11.11	N= 3 %= 11.11	N= 2 %= 7.41	N= 6 %= 22.22

	N	%
E	16	59.26
I	11	40.74
S	10	37.04
N	17	62.96
T	18	66.67
F	9	33.33
J	20	74.07
P	7	25.92
IJ	6	22.23
IP	5	18.52
EP	2	7.41
EJ	14	51.85
ST	5	18.52
SF	5	18.52
NF	4	14.81
NT	13	48.15
SJ	10	37.04
SP	0	0.00
NP	7	25.92
NJ	10	37.04
TJ	13	48.15
TP	5	18.52
FP	2	7.41
FJ	7	25.92
IN	7	25.92
EN	10	37.04
IS	4	14.81
ES	6	22.22
ET	11	40.74
EF	5	18.52
IF	4	14.81
IT	7	25.92
S dom	4	14.81
N dom	4	14.81
T dom	12	44.44
F dom	7	25.92

Note: ■ = 1 person

While no one type stands out (ENTJ-22%, ESFJ-11%, ESTJ-11%, INTP-11%), the table is interesting as it is heavily loaded on the top (ISTJ-INTJ, representing 22.23% of the Heads) and bottom (ESTJ-ENTJ, representing 52% of the Heads). This indicates a very strong preference toward Judging (J), no matter what the type. At the bottom of the table (ESTJ-ENTJ), 58% of the Heads are represented, showing a strong inclination toward Extraversion (E) and Judging (J)—EJ. Additionally, 48% of the Heads are on the right hand side, which indicates a preference toward Intuitive (N) and Thinking (T)—NT. In the corners of the table are also 48% of the Heads, which shows a preference toward Thinking (T) and Judging (J)—TJ.

Overall, 59% of the Heads were Extraverted (E), 63% were Intuitive (N), 67% were Thinking (T) and 74% were Judging (J). As a group, the long-term Heads were similar in their preferences. In terms of gender, the women were 82% Extraverted, 73% Intuitive, 55% Thinking and 73% Judging. The men were 44% Extraverted, 56% Intuitive, 75% Thinking and 75% Judging. The 11 women described six types—ENTJ-3, ESFJ-2, ENFJ-2, INFP-2, ESFJ-1 and ENTP-1. The 16 men described 9 types—ENTJ-3, ISTJ-3, ESFJ-2, ISFJ-2, INTP-2, ESTJ-1, ENTP-1, INFP-1, INTJ-1. Six of the types were not found in the Heads—INFJ, ISTP, ISFP, ESTP, ESFP, and ENFP.

The table additionally notes the dominant functions – Sensing (S), Intuition (N), Thinking (T) and Feeling (F) - four distinct ways of knowing and interacting with the world. The two most prevalent functions for the Heads are thinking (44.44%) and feeling (25.92%). People who are well developed in these

two functions, "prefer to organize their experiences and plan for them. Once they've established a plan, they can be irritated by the unpredictability of the direct experience" (Thomson, 1998, p. 7).

Also, the MBTI yields continuous scores for each scale ranging from less than 40 to over 150 with a raw score of 100. The continuous score frequency charts are found in Appendix C. A continuous score of greater than 100 points to Introversion (I), Intuition (N), Feeling (F) and Perception (P). Scores less than 100 point to Extraversion (E), Sensing (S), Thinking (T) and Judgement (J). The farther a score is from 100, the stronger the preference. For example, a continuous score in J/P of 63 would show a stronger preference toward Judging (J) than a score of 95. Likewise a score of 125 would show a stronger preference toward Perceiving (P) than a score of 105.

Extraverted (E)/Introverted (I)

An extravert's mind is outwardly directed, while an introvert's mind is inwardly directed. Most extraverts are relaxed, confident, and active. Introverts tend to be reserved, questioning and idea-people. In the United States, extraverts outnumber introverts three to one (Kroeger & Thuesen, 1985, p.36). However, Benfari (1991) writes that, there are almost twice as many Introverts in management as there are in the general population—44 percent, compared with 25 percent generally (Benfari, 1991). In addition, in a National Representative Sample, it was found that 46% of men (n=1,478) were Extraverted and 53% of women (n=1,531) were Extraverted (Myers, McCaulley, Quenk & Hammer, 1998). As a group, the long-term Heads were 63% extraverted, which follows the

general population. However, there was a large gender difference. The women were 82% extraverted and the men were 56% introverted.

Sensing (S)/Intuitive (N)

Sensing people depend on their five senses for perception. Intuitive types are more interested in possibilities. Myers (1995) notes that Intuitive types (N) make up only one-quarter of the general population. Therefore, that 63% of Heads with a preference for intuition is interesting to note,

It may be that behaviors and skills natural to Intuition—such as future vision and long-range planning —are seen by organizations as particularly valuable at higher levels in organizations. Intuitive types more naturally deal with broader issues, which can be seen by organizations as "leader" behaviors (Fitzgerald & Kirby, 1997, p. 26).

Thinking (T)/Feeling (F)

Thinkers are often impersonal, logical and business-like. Feelers tend to be more personable, sentimental and sociable. The Thinking/Feeling preference is the only one that, in the general population, is gender- based (Myers, 1995). Most women are Feeling (F) and most men are Thinking (T). This may explain the difference in the sample. However, it is interesting to note that several studies (Eagly, Karau & Johnson, 1992; Weddle, 1992; Coleman, 2000) suggest a feminine leadership style. The more people-oriented, value-driven and collaborative feminine style is more indicative of a Feeling (F) type than a Thinking (T) type. In Coleman's research about women Heads in England and Wales, she noted,

most women manage their schools in a way that can clearly be identified as consultative and people oriented...the choices also endorsed the importance placed on teamwork and on 'power to' rather than 'power over' (Coleman, 2000, p.26).

Thinking types dominate in management positions in organizations—usually about 80% (Van Velsor & Fleenor, 1997, p.160). These authors additionally write,

Given the underrepresentation of Feeling managers in middle and upper levels of management, one might conclude that a group of potentially very effective managers is being seriously under-utilized in organizations (Van Velsor & Fleenor, 1997, p.160).

Judging (J)/ Perception (P)

Judging types tend to be more decisive than curious. Perceptive people tend to be more curious than decisive. The Heads were 74% Judging. This preference was the clearest between the genders and the most prevalent. This is not surprising, as a study of Canadian school administrators (n=124) found that 86% of them were Judging types and Myers (1995) notes about that phenomenon,

Probably the ability to make endless decisions, great and small, and not grow weary is a necessity of life for those responsible for keeping educational systems on an even keel (Myers, 1995, p. 51).

In order to ascertain which of the four dichotomies -E/I, S/N, T/F or J/P-(subsidiary question # 3) was the strongest and to test whether the Heads were distinct in their preferences (subsidiary question #2) , one-sample statistical and t-tests were calculated. These tests were calculated in order to display the strength of the Heads' preferences. The results are shown in tables 4.2 and 4.3. While certainly the t-value of −1.119 shows a preference toward Extraversion (E), which 59% of the Heads preferred and the t-value of 1.489 shows a preference toward Intuition (N), which 63% of the Heads preferred, neither is as strong as the overall preference toward Thinking (T) -2.253, which 67% of the Heads preferred or Judging (J) -3.439, which 74% preferred. Even though the percentages show strong preferences and are fairly close in the four dichotomies, 59% (E), 63% (N), 67%(T) and 74% (J), the statistical and t-test show a far stronger overall preference to Judging (J) and Thinking (T) than to Extraversion (E) and Intuition (N). Therefore, while the Heads are predominately Extraverted (E) and Intuitive (N), they, as a group, are even more strongly Thinking (T) and very much Judging (J).

Myers and Briggs added the J/P dichotomy, extending Jung's theory, "thereby making explicit one aspect of the theory that was implicit but undeveloped" (Myers, McCauley, Quenk & Hammer, 1998, p.22). Judging types like to settle things (Myers, 1995, p.69) and like to plan. They are decisive, rational, self-regimented, purposeful and exacting (Myers, 1995, p. 75).

The MBTI yields continuous scores for each preference, with a raw score of 100. Table 2 shows the strength of the judging dichotomy as its mean is 81.52,

with a standard deviation of 27.92, is 18.48 from the raw score of 100. The next farthest dichotomy is thinking with a mean of 90.48, a standard deviation of 21.95, is 9.52 from the raw score of 100.

Table 2 presents the one-sample statistical test of the four preferences.

Table 2

One –Sample Statistics

One-Sample Statistics

	N	Mean	Std Deviation	Std. Error Mean
E/I	27	95.30	21.85	4.21
S/N	27	109.44	32.95	6.34
T/F	27	90.48	21.95	4.22
J/P	27	81.52	27.92	5.37

Legend
E/I-Extraversion/Introversion
S/N-Sensing/iNtuition
T/F-Thinking/Feeling
J/P-Judging/Perception

Table 3 displays a one-sample t-test, which again displays the mean differences. This table further shows the strengths of the preferences. T-tests allow a researcher to determine if the small sample means differ statistically from the normal distribution. The judging t score of –3.439 is statistically significant at the .01 level (2.779). Additionally, the thinking t score is significant at the .05 level (2.056).

Table 3 presents the one-sample t-test of the four preferences.

Table 3

One-Sample Test

One-Sample Test

	Test Value = 100					
					95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Lower	Upper
E/I	-1.119	26	.274	-4.70	-13.35	3.94
S/N	1.489	26	.148	9.44	-3.59	22.48
T/F	-2.253	26	.033	-9.52	-18.20	-.84
J/P	-3.439	26	.002	-18.48	-29.53	-7.44

Legend
E/I-Extraversion/Introversion
S/N-Sensing/iNtuition
T/F-Thinking/Feeling
J/P-Judging/Perception

The Pearson product moment correlation was utilized in order to focus on the relationship between a pair of variables, in this case the four dichotomies. In this correlation, displayed in Table 4, a significant correlation is shown, at the .05 level, between the E/I preference and the J/P preference--.399 and the S/N dichotomy and the J/P preference--.432. Again, this shows the enormous strength of the Judging (J) clarity.

Table 4 presents the correlation between the preferences in the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI).

Table4

Correlations Between MBTI Dichotomies

Correlations

		E/I	S/N	T/F	J/P
E/I	Pearson Correlation	1.000	-.100	-.054	.399*
	Sig.(2-tailed)	.	.621	.791	.039
	N	27	27	27	27
S/N	Pearson Correlation	-.100	1.000	-.322	.432*
	Sig.(2-tailed)	.621	.	.102	.024
	N	27	27	27	27
T/F	Pearson Correlation	-.054	-.322	1.000	-.344
	Sig.(2-tailed)	.791	.102	.	.078
	N	27	27	27	27
J/P	Pearson Correlation	.399*	.432*	-.344	1.000
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.039	.024	.076	.

Legend
E/I-Extraversion/Introversion
S/N-Sensing/Nutrition
T/F-Thinking/Feeling
J/P-Judging/Perception

In addition, the means, medians and ranges were calculated for the eight dichotomies by individual preferences. This measurement was calculated in order to ascertain if the Heads were clear in their preferences in the four categories (E/I, S/N,T/F, and J/P).These are represented in Table 5. In Form G of the MBTI, a very clear preference score is 41 or greater, a clear preference is 20-39, a moderate preference is 10-19 and a slight preference is 1-9. The individual Heads were, in terms of the means, clear in six of their eight preferences: Extraversion (E), Sensing (S), Intuition (N), Thinking (T), Judging (J) and

Perception (P). The Introverted (I) and Feeling (F) Heads were moderate in their preferences. It appears that long-term Heads are relatively clear in their preferences, the highest means being Intuition (I)-31.5 and, of course, Judging (J)-32.4.

Table 5 presents the means, medians, and ranges of the four preferences.

Table5

Means, Medians, and Ranges For Preferences

	(E)	(I)	(S)	(N)	(T)	(F)	(J)	(P)
Mean	19.75	16.8	28.2	31.5	20.8	13.2	32.4	21.2
Median	21	17	17	33	20	13	30	17
Range	45-1	27-5	61-3	49-15	61-1	31-3	53-7	47-1

MLQ Results

In order to investigate whether the Heads were transformational leaders, transactional leaders, or both, the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire was administered. The scoring for the MLQ is as follows: 0-not at all; 1-once in a while; 2-sometimes; 3-fairly often and 4-frequently, if not always. The frequency results are presented in Appendix D. The Spearman rho was utilized in order to determine the relationship between a pair of variables, in which the data consists of rank. The reliability analysis is shown in Appendix E, showing an alpha of .7227. The entire Spearman rho correlation is displayed in Table 4.6. In the Spearman rho, the following were significant correlations:

1. Contingent Reward: at the .01 significance level—Ideal Influence Attribute (.667), Extra Effort (.665), Effectiveness (.496), and Intellectual Stimulation (.490).

2. Laissez- Faire: at the .01 significance level—Ideal Influence Behavior (-. 690), and Inspirational Motivation (-.547).

3. Satisfaction: at the .05 significance level –Extra Effort (.389) and Intellectual Stimulation (.453). At the .01 significance level—Effectiveness (.773).

4. Extra Effort: at the .05 significance level—Inspirational Motivation (.413) and Satisfaction (.389). At the .01 significance level—Contingent Reward (.655), Ideal Influence Attribute (.656), Effectiveness (.620) and Intellectual Stimulation (.624).

5. Effectiveness: at the .05 level of significance—Ideal Influence Behavior (.417), and Individual Consideration (.395). At the .01 significance level— Contingent Reward (.496), Ideal Influence Attribute (.577), Satisfaction (.773), Extra Effort (.620) and Intellectual Stimulation (.633).

6. Ideal Influence Attribute: at the .01 level of significance—Contingent Reward (.667), Inspirational Motivation (.488), Extra Effort (.656), Effectiveness (.577), and Intellectual Stimulation (.526).

7. Ideal Influence Behavior: at the .05 significance level—Effectiveness (.417). At the .01 significance level—Laissez-Faire (-.690), Inspirational Motivation (.548), and Intellectual Stimulation (.600).

8. Inspirational Motivation: at the .05 level of significance—Extra Effort (.413), Intellectual Stimulation (.452). at the .01 level of significance—Laissez- Faire (-.547), Ideal Influence Attribute (.488) and Ideal Influence Behavior (.548).

9. Intellectual Stimulation: at the .05 level of significance—Inspirational Motivation (.452) and Satisfaction—(.453). At the .01 level of significance— Contingent Reward (.490), Ideal Influence Attribute (.526), Ideal Influence Behavior (.600), Extra Effort (.624), and Effectiveness (.633).

10. Individual Consideration: at the .05 significance level—Effectiveness (.395).

Table 6 presents the correlations between the factors in the MLQ.

Table 6
Correlations

Correlations

Spearman's rho		Contingent Reward	Management By Exception (Active)	Management By Exception (Passive)	Laissez Faire	Satisfaction	Extra Effort	Effectiveness	Ideal Influence Attribute	Ideal Influence Behavior	Inspirational Motivation	Intellectual Stimulation	Individual Consideration
Contingent Reward	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	.573	.066	.011	.570	.000**	.496*	.667**	.107	.288	.490**	.202
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.068	.787	.955	.067	.000	.008	.000	.596	.177	.010	.312
	N	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27
Management By Exception (Active)	Correlation Coefficient	.573	1.000	.164	.222	-.076	-.042	.079	.091	-.120	-.108	.237	.017
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.068	.	.413	.266	.705	.835	.698	.652	.562	.596	.234	.933
	N	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27
Management By Exception (Passive)	Correlation Coefficient	.066	.164	1.000	.321	.108	-.114	.054	-.064	-.370	-.334	-.286	-.268
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.787	.413	.	.102	.593	.570	.790	.752	.057	.089	.179	.204
	N	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27
Laissez Faire	Correlation Coefficient	.011	.222	.321	1.000	-.091	-.138	-.230	-.238	-.680**	-.547**	-.180	-.268
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.955	.266	.102	.	.651	.491	.247	.232	.000	.003	.365	.182
	N	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27
Satisfaction	Correlation Coefficient	.570	-.076	.108	-.091	1.000	.389*	.773**	.379	.148	.288	.433*	.293
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.067	.705	.593	.651	.	.045	.000	.051	.489	.144	.018	.138
	N	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27
Extra Effort	Correlation Coefficient	.000**	-.042	-.114	-.138	.389*	1.000	.620*	.666	.361	.413*	.624*	.180
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.835	.570	.491	.045	.	.001	.000	.073	.032	.001	.343
	N	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27
Effectiveness	Correlation Coefficient	.496*	.079	.054	-.230	.773**	.620*	1.000	.577**	.417*	.342	.833**	.395*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.008	.698	.790	.247	.000	.001	.	.002	.030	.081	.000	.041
	N	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27
Ideal Influence Attribute	Correlation Coefficient	.667**	.091	-.064	-.238	.379	.666	.577**	1.000	.417*	.334	.486**	.331
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.652	.752	.232	.051	.000	.002	.	.030	.088	.010	.092
	N	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27
Ideal Influence Behavior	Correlation Coefficient	.107	-.120	-.370	-.680**	.148	.361	.417*	.577**	1.000	.545**	.545**	.538
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.596	.562	.057	.000	.489	.073	.030	.002	.	.003	.001	.087
	N	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27
Inspirational Motivation	Correlation Coefficient	.288	-.108	-.334	-.547**	.288	.413*	.342	.334	.545**	1.000	.452**	.285
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.177	.596	.089	.003	.144	.032	.081	.088	.003	.	.018	.150
	N	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27
Intellectual Stimulation	Correlation Coefficient	.490**	.237	-.288	-.180	.433*	.624*	.833**	.525**	.600**	.452**	1.000	.343
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.010	.234	.179	.366	.018	.001	.000	.006	.001	.018	.	.080
	N	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27
Individual Consideration	Correlation Coefficient	.202	.017	-.253	-.268	.293	.180	.395*	.331	.538	.285	.343	1.000
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.312	.933	.204	.182	.138	.343	.041	.092	.087	.150	.080	.
	N	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27

**. Correlation is significant at the .01 level (2-tailed).
*. Correlation is significant at the .05 level (2-tailed).

Additionally, in order to display central tendencies of the Heads' answers to the MLQ, the mean, median, and range of each sub-category, as answered by the long-term Heads, are shown in Tables # 7, 8, and 9. Table 7 shows the means of transactional leadership of 3.11, 1.38, 1.11, and 0.5. Table 8 displays the outcome means of 3.5, 3.33, and 3.45. And, table 4.9 shows the strength of transformational leadership with means of 3.29, 3.6, 3.75, 3.375, and 3.5.

Table 7 presents the means, medians, and ranges of transactional leadership in the MLQ.

Table7

Means, Medians, and Ranges of Transactional Leadership in the MLQ

	CR	MBEA	MBEP	LF
Mean	3.11	1.38	1.11	0.5
Median	3.24	1.125	1	0.5
Range	1.66-3.75	.25-3	0-2.5	0-2

Note. Legend
CR=Contingent Reward
MBEA=Management by Exception (Active)
MBEP=Management by Exception (Passive)
LF=Laissez-Faire

Key of Frequency
4.0=Frequently, if not always
3.0=Fairly often
2.0=Sometimes
1.0=Once in a while
0.0=Not at all

Table 8 presents the means, medians, and ranges of the outcomes in the MLQ.

Table 8

Means, Medians, and Ranges of the Outcomes in the MLQ

	SAT	EE	EFF
Mean	3.5	3.33	3.45
Median	3.5	3.33	3.5
Range	2.5-4	2.33-4	2.75-4

Note.Legend
SAT=Satisfaction
EE=ExtraEffort
EFF=Effectiveness

Key of Frequency
4.0=Frequently, if not always
3.0=Fairly often
2.0=Sometimes
1.0=Once in a while
0.0=Not at all

Table 9 presents the means, medians, and ranges of transformational

leadership in the MLQ.

Table 9

Means, Medians, and Ranges of Transformational Leadership in the MLQ

	II(A)	II(B)	IM	IS	IC
Mean	3.29	3.6	3.6	3.26	3.37
Median	3.4	3.75	3.75	3.375	3.5
Range	2.25-4	2.25-4	3.00- 4.00	2.25-4	2.25-4

Note. Legend
II(A)=idealized Influence (Attributed)
II(B)=idealized Influence (Behavior)
IM=inspirational Motivation
IS=intellectual Stimulation
IC=individualized Consideration

Key of Frequency
4.0=Frequently, if not always

3.0=Fairly often
2.0=Sometimes
1.0=Once in a while
0.0=Not at all

The specific questions for each of the 12 measures in Tables 7, 8, and 9 are found in Appendix F. From Tables 7, 8,and 9 one can see that the Heads tend to prefer transformational leadership qualities.

In the transactional leadership questions: Contingent Reward; Management-By-Exception-Active; Management--By--Exception-Passive and Laissez-Faire, the means, medians and renges were significantly lower than the transformational leadership data regarding Idealized Influence-Attribute, Idealized Influence-Behavior, inspirational Motivation and Individualized Consideration. The transactional leadership data were also far lower than the outcomes: Satisfaction: Extra Effort and Effectiveness. One aspect of transactional leadership stands out, Contingent Reward, with significant correlations in the Spearman rho and with a mean of 3.11, a median of 3.24 and a range of 1.66-3.75 in Table 8. The MLQ Manual notes,

> The high correlations between the transformational scales and transactional contingent reward leadership was expected for several reasons. First, both transactional and transformational leadership represent active, positive forms of leadership. Second, leaders have been shown in repeated investigations to be both transactional and transformational. Third, as Shamir argues, the consistent honoring of transactional agreements builds trust, dependability and the perceptions of

consistency with leaders by followers, which are each a basis for transformational leadership.

(Bass &Avolio, 1995, p.11).

Howell and Avolio additionally write, "Contingent reward leadership is viewed as an active and positive exchange between leaders and followers whereby followers are rewarded or recognized for accomplishing agreed upon objectives (Howell and Avolio, 1993, p. 891).

One can see that in the transactional Leadership factors, on Contingent Reward has positive correlations. Management by Exception Active and Management by Exception Passive have no significant correlations and Laissez-Faire has two negative correlations. On the other hand, in the transformational leadership factors, there are many significant correlations. In addition, the outcomes: Satisfaction, Extra Effort and Effectiveness also show a large number of significant correlations.

According to Bass,

> For optimal leadership, suggested is a mean of 3.0 or higher on each of the four scales of transformational leadership, whose magnitude-estimated anchors range from a true zero for the response of "never" to a maximum of 4.0 representing "frequently, if not always." The response "sometimes" is set at 2.0. Contingent reward and active management-by exception should be at about 2.5 and passive management-by exception and laissez-faire leadership at 1.0 or below on the average (Bass, 1998, p. 83).

One interesting note is the Individual Consideration (IC) score of 3.37. One of the questions (#15) is, "I spend time teaching and coaching." Almost ½ (13) of the long-term Heads answered with scores of 0-2. This appears to be low. It is possible that these educators read that question in terms of job, rather than that of a leader.

Interviews

Ten of the 27 Heads (37%, 7 men, 3 women) were selected to interview. They represent 10 different states: California, Connecticut, Maryland, Massachusetts, Missouri, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, Rhode Island and Virginia. The questionnaire is found in Appendix G. The Heads were asked general questions regarding the length of his/her current Headship, the number of schools he/she has led, the size of the school he/she leads, the year the school was founded, who were the founders of the school, how many Heads previously led the school, and the length of tenure of the previous heads. A general description of the schools and Heads is shown Table # 4.10. The average length of leading his/her current school is 19.4 years and for five of the Heads this is their first Headship, for four it is their second Headship and for one his/her third. The average size of the schools is 358 and the average founding date is 1934. Educators were the founders of five of the schools, parents were founders of two of the schools and a combination of educators and parents founded three of the schools. The number of previous Heads ranged from nine to

zero. Eight of the schools enjoyed a history of long-tenured Heads, one school had a history of short tenures and one was mixed.

Table 10 presents the means, medians, and ranges of the general descriptions of the Heads and their schools.

Table 10

Means, Medians, and Ranges of General Descriptions

	#1	#2	#3	#4	#5	#6	#6a
Mean	19.4	five-1	358	1934	Parents-2	nine-1	8-Long
Median	18.5	four-2	350	1924	Educators-5	seven-1	1-Short
Range	15-25	one-3	220-575	1897-1983	Both-3	six-1	1-Mixed
						five-1	
						four-2	
						three-1	
						two-2	
						zero-1	

Note.

Legend
#1-Represents the mean, median, and range of the number of years heading current school.
#2-Represents the mean, median, and range of the number of schools he/she has headed.
#3-Represents the mean, median, and range of the size of school he/she heads.
#4-Represents the mean, median, and range of the year school was founded.
#5-Represents the answer to the question who were original founders?
#6-Represents the number of previous Heads at the individual schools.
#6a-Represents the history of length of tenure of Heads at the individual schools.

A summary of each interview is presented for the questions regarding Board relations and school effectiveness in order to focus on certain trends.

Board Relations

A Head is hired by and responsible to a Board of Trustees. This is a crucial relationship as, "it is the relationships between boards and board chairs

and their paid executives that are pivotal in determining organizational performance" (Edwards, 1994, p.23). This complex relationship is integral in an independent school's success. The National Center for Nonprofit Boards surveyed chief executives and found they spent an average of nine hours a week on board-related issues. "Rather than feeling outnumbered by the board, the chief executive sees and utilizes its membership as a way to leverage talent, resources, and energy on behalf of the organization" (Robinson, 1998,p.2). The following summarizes the interviews with each of the ten Heads in terms of Board relations. The specific questions are found in Appendix G.

<u>Head#1</u>

The agenda for the Board of Trustees' meetings and year's goals are determined by a collaborative effort between the President of the Board and the Head. An active Committee on Trustees (COT) selects new Board members. The Board members are educated annually, mostly by personnel from NAIS (National Association of Independent Schools) and the regional independent Schools Association. This Head gets to know Board members through Board committees and writes a formal school report monthly as well as utilizes informal strategies. Head #1 has worked with 10 Presidents, with two-year term limit and perceived a sense of trust with each President. Sixty percent of Board members are current parents. The Head is not a voting member of the Board and is evaluated each year.

Head #1 appears to have a healthy relationship with the Board. For example, the Head stated that he/she had an "absolute" perception of trust with

each President of the Board of Trustees. Additionally, the Head works collaboratively with the President of the Board to determine the agenda for the school. The Board is annually educated and enjoys an active Committee on Trustees.

Head#2

The agenda for the Board of Trustees' meetings and year's goals are determined by a collaborative effort between the President of the Board and the Head, though it is "more in the Head's lap". An active Committee on Trustees (COT) selects new Board members and parents must serve on a Board committee before being selected as a member. The President and the Head conduct a two-night Board orientation each year. This Head prefers to get to know Board members through dinner parties. Head #2 writes a formal report nine times a year and also uses informal methods, such as notes and phone calls. This head has worked with twelve Presidents, with a six year limit and perceived a sense of trust with each, though some more than others. Sixty percent of Board members are current parents. The Head is a voting member of the Board and is evaluated each year.

Head #2 did not perceive trust in a few of the Presidents of the Board of Trustees that he/she served and this did cause turmoil during those years. However, overall the Head believed there was a strong connection between the Head and the Board. Of particular interest, the Board's policy is to have any member first serve on a committee before being asked on the Board.

<u>Head#3</u>

The agenda for the Board of Trustees' meetings and year's goals are determined by a collaborative effort between the President of the Board and the Head. An active Committee on Trustees (COT) selects new Board members. The President and the Head conduct a Board orientation each year. Head #3 gets to know Board members through the workings of the school. E-mail is the dominant communication used by the Head with the Board. This Head has worked with four Presidents with no pre-determined length of term, and perceived a sense of trust with each President. Sixty-six percent of the Board members are current parents. This Head is not a voting member of the Board and is not evaluated.

The Board of this school "is mostly male" and the Head appears to have a great deal freedom in his/her dealings with the Board. For example, the Head stated' "there was no real need to educate the Board in the field of governance". He/she did not socialize with Board members as, he/she "knew them through the school".

<u>Head#4</u>

The agenda for the Board of Trustees' meetings and year's goals are determined by a collaborative effort between the President of the Board and the Head. An active Committee on Trustees (COT) selects new Board members. The President and the Head conduct a Board orientation each year. Head #4 gets to know Board members through the workings of the school. This Head writes a report to the President every other week and a monthly report to the Board every month. This Head has worked with six Presidents, with no term limit and

perceived a sense of trust with each, except one. Eighty-five percent of the Board is current parents. This Head is not a voting member of the Board and is evaluated every other year.

This Head has a collaborative relationship with his/her Board of Trustees, "everything is out in the open". Early in his/her tenure, there was a rocky relationship with the President, which almost led to the Head's resignation.

Head#5

The agenda for the Board of Trustees' meetings and year's goals are determined by a collaborative effort between the President of the Board and the Head. This school does not have a self-perpetuating Board. Its parents, all of whom are members of the corporation, vote for the Board. A Board orientation occurs each year. The Head gets to know the Board as parents in the school. Head #5 uses written and oral communication with the Board. This Head has worked for six Presidents, with no pre-determined length of term and did not perceive a sense of trust with three of the Presidents. Eighty-eight percent of the Board is current parents. This Head is not a voting member of the Board and is evaluated each year.

This Head's relationship with the Board is a bit different. The Board is not self-perpetuating; the parent "corporetion" votes for the membership. This lack of self-perpetuation the Head believes led to a lack of trust with three of the six Presidents. The lack of trust stemmed from governance/administrative problems and a lack of confidentiality.

Head#6

The agenda and year's goals are determined at a formal planning session of the executive committee. An active Committee on Trustees (COT) selects new Board members. Each fall the school has a retreat with a consultant. New members of the Board must spend a day on campus. This Head gets to know the members of the Board by being an active member of the community. Head# 6 uses phone calls and oral reports to communicate to the Board. The Head has worked for three Presidents, who have a maximum term of two consecutive three year terms and the Head perceived a sense of trust with each president. One half of the Board is made up of current parents. This Head is a voting member of the Board and is not evaluated.

This school started as a proprietary school and became a not-for-profit in 1985. The school keeps a bit of the "proprietary" outlook, which the Head finds, "good for everybody". For example, the Board is only half current parents; however, each member is required to spend a full day on campus every year and the Board expects the Head to, "think of what is going to happen five years from now".

Head#7

The Head and the President, who meet formally once a month, determine the agenda for the Board's meetings and year's goals. In addition, all meetings of the Board will be satisfactory for all members. An active Committee on Trustees (COT) selects new Board members and financial obligations are told up front. Board members are educated in governance, particularly the areas of

institutional advancement, fiscal responsibility and non-interference. The head gets to know the Board through social functions. This head primarily uses e-mail to communicate. in addition, once a week he/she reviews the list of Board members to see if he/she has had contact with them. Head #7 has worked with seven Presidents, with three-year terms, and perceived a sense of trust with all of them. Eighty-nine percent of the Board is current parents. This Head is not a voting member of the Board and is evaluated each year.

This school incorporates many of the Quaker practices: "all meetings will be satisfactory for all members"; "mis-speaking about people is taboo" and "all decisions are made by consensus". Additionally, the Head is very social with the Board, getting to know them through cocktail and dinner parties. Before becoming a member of the Board, each person is told about their financial obligation to the school—"no less than $25,000".

Head#8

The agenda for the Board of Trustees meetings and year's goals are determined by a collaborative effort between the President of the Board and the Head, with input from committee chairs. A detailed orientation occurs each year and retreats every 18 months. Head # 8 gets to know Board members through the workings of the school. An active Committee on Trustees (COT) selects new Board members. This Head writes a monthly report and meets weekly with the Board President. He/she has worked with eight Presidents, with a pre-determined term of two-five years, and he/she perceived a sense of trust with

each Chair. Approximately twenty percent of the Board members are not current parents. This Head is a voting member of the Board and is evaluated each year.

Head# 8 appears to have a healthy relationship with his/her Board. The agenda is set collaboratively, the Committee on Trustees is active, and there is a detailed orientation regularly.

Head#9

The executive committee meets to discuss the agenda and year's goals and then the Head and President meet. New members are selected by the executive committee, who consult with the Head. There is a one-half day orientation each year. This Head gets to know the Board through the workings of the Board of Trustees. Through writing, phone calls and committee meetings, this Head communicates with the Board. Head # 9 has worked with three Presidents, with no term limits and he/she perceived a sense of trust with each Chair. Twenty percent of the Board is current parents. This Head is a voting member of the Board and is evaluated every other year.

This school is an anomaly as only 20% of its Board members are current parents. Additionally, the Executive Committee is very strong, as it determines the agenda and acts as the Committee on Trustees. Furthermore, the Head stated the "school is very stable" and when asked if he/she sensed trust with each of the Presidents answered, "absolutely".

Head# 10

The agenda for the Board of Trustees meetings and year's goals are determined by a collaborative effort between the President of the Board and the Head. The Head commented that the Board needed a Committee on Trustees, as the process for finding new Board members was not good. There is an orientation each year for the Board. This Head gets to know Board members as parents in the school. Head # 10 communicates primarily by an oral report at each meeting. This Head has worked with six Presidents, with no term limit, and perceived a sense of trust with each. Sixty-six percent of the Board is current parents. This Head is not a voting member of the Board and is not evaluated.

This school appears weak in its governance structura. For example, there is no Committee on Trustees—the Board "ranks volunteers" and the orientation according to the Head is "weak and not enough". There are no set limits of term and actually, the present President has served "longer than he/she should". Additionally, the Board never formally evaluates the Head.

Summary of Board Relations

The President of the Board and Head establish the agenda setting for meetings and for the year in seven of the schools and by the Executive Committee and the Head in three of the schools. In eight of the schools, the Committee on Trustees formally goes through a self-perpetuation process of selecting new Board members, one school chooses its members in a more random fashion and in one school the parents vote. All ten schools educate their Boards. The most common examples were orientations and retreats. The Heads

get to know their Board members in three different ways: through the daily workings of the school community-7, through social events—2 and through other committees-1. The Heads communicate with their Boards in different ways: write-4; phone-2; e-mall-2 and orally-2. While they utilize different means of communication, each of the Heads underlined the importanca of communication and the "rule of no surprises". The number of Board Presidents and his/her length of term varied. As would be expected, the number of Presidents would vary with the length of a Head's tenure. However, five of the Heads stated that there was no term limit for the President and one school had a term limit of six years and one five. Eight of the Heads perceived a sense of trust with all of the Presidents. The two that did not perceive a sense of trust stated that they had a lack of trust with a few of their Presidents, early in their career. In total, the Heads served with 71 Presidents and only with four (.06%) did they not perceive trust. Al of the schools had non-current parents on the Board of Trustees, with the average of 34.5% of the Board's membership. Six of the Heads were not voting members of the Board of Trustees. Finally, seven Heads said they were evaluated each year. Two stated they were never evaluated and one was evaluated every other year.

School Effectiveness

The following summarizes the interviews with each of the ten Heads in terms of school effectiveness. These factors for an institution's success were gleaned from an article entitled "The Competitive Edge: Why Some Small Colleges Succeed". The specific questions are found in Appendix G.

<u>Head# 1</u>

This school has a published long-range plan, with a five-year life span. All of the school's constituencies assisted in the planning. This Head utilizes Division Heads to assess the working relationship between the faculty and administration. Approximately 33% of the Head's time is spent on fund-raising and this has increased over his/her tenure. The Head works closely with the Admission Director to manage the school's enrollment and the school had defined its niche as certain targeted communities. The school plans for physical plant improvements through the long-range plan and has a capital budget line item.

<u>Head#2</u>

This school has a published long-range plan, with a five-year life span. All of the school's constituencies assisted in the planning. This Head assesses the working relationship between the administration and faculty informally. Approximately 10-15 percent of the Head's time is spent fund-raising and this has increased during his/her tenure. The Head works closely with the Admission Director to manage the school's enrollment and the school had defined its niche as certain targeted communities. The school plans for physical plant improvements through the long-range plan and has a capital budget line item.

<u>Head#3</u>

This school completes a long-range plan every three-five years. It does not publish the plan. This Head utilizes Division Heads to assess the working relationship between the faculty and administration. Head# 3 spends about five percent of his/her time on fund-raising and this has stayed the same. The Head

works closely with the Admission Director to manage the school's enrollment and the school had defined its niche as very traditional for able children. The school plans for physical plant improvements through the long-range plan and has a capital budget line item. The policy of the school is to incur no debt.

Head#4

This school has a published long-range plan, with a ten-year life span, with a mid-way evaluation point at five years. All of the school's constituencies assisted in the planning. This Head utilizes Division Heads to assess the working relationship between the faculty and administration. Head # 4 spends about five percent of his/her time on fund-raising and this has increased. The Head works closely with the Admission Director and admission committee to manage the school's enrollment and the school had defined its niche as certain targeted communities. The school plans for physical plant improvements through the long-range plan and has a capital budget line item.

Head#5

This school has a published long-range plan, with a five-year life span. All of the school's constituencies assisted in the planning. This Head utilizes the administrative team to assess the working relationship between the faculty and administration. Up to 50% of this Head's time is spent on fund-raising and this has increased dramatically. The Head works closely with the Admission Director and admission committee to manage the school's enrollment and the school had defined its niche as certain targeted communities. This school rents its buildings and grounds; therefore, it does not plan or allocate money for improvements.

Head #6

This school has a published long-range plan, with a five-year life span. All of the school's constituencies assisted in the planning. This Head interacts with everyone on a daily basis in order to assess the working relationship between the faculty and administration. Up to 50% of this Head's time is spent on fund-raising and this has increased dramatically. The Head works closely with the Admission Director and admission committee to manage the school's enrollment and the school has defined its niche as always positioning and re-positioning. The school plans for physical plant improvements through the long-range plan and has a capital budget line item.

Head #7

This school has a published long-range plan, with a five-year life span. All of the school's constituencies assisted in the planning and consensus was found. This Head utilizes the administrative team to assess the working relationship between the faculty and administration. Up to 40% of this Head's time is spent on fund-raising and this has increased. The Head works closely with the Admission Director and admission committee to manage the school's enrollment and the school had defined its niche as certain targeted communities. The school plans for physical plant improvements through the long-range plan and has a capital budget line item.

Head #8

This school has a published long-range plan, with a five-year life span. All of the school's constituencies assisted in the planning. As a Head, he/she

assesses the working relationship between faculty and administration through consensus. Approximately 10 % of the Head's time is spent on fund-raising and this has increased during his/her tenure. The Head works closely with the Admission Director and admission committee to manage the school's enrollment and the school had defined its niche as diversity—putting the right children together. The school plans for physical plant improvements through the long-range plan and has a capital line item in the budget, aiming for 2% of plant worth.

Head#9

This school has a long-range plan that was established during the accreditation process. This Head assesses the working relationship between faculty and administration through a gut feeling and his/her assistant. The Head is confident that the culture of the school is understood by all. Approximately 5% of the Head's time is spent fund-raising and this has stayed the same. The Head works closely with the Admission Director and admission committee to manage the school's enrollment and the school had defined its niche as certain targeted communities. The school plans for physical plant improvements through the long-renge plan and has a capital budget line item.

Head # 10

This school has a published long-range plan. The Board authored the plan. This Head utilizes gut feelings to assess the working relationship between the faculty and administration. Approximately 10-20% of the Head's time is spent on fund-raising and this has increased over his/her tenure. The Head works closely with the Admission Director to manage the school's enrollment and the

school had defined its niche as certain targeted communities. The school plans for physical plant improvements through the long-range plan and has a capital budget line item.

School Effectiveness Summary

The questions concerning school effectiveness were derived from success indicators noted in an article by Merante and Ireland entitled "The Competitive Edge: Why Some Small Colleges Succeed". These derived questions are predominantly concerned with strategies securing the institution's future. Similar to small colleges, independent elementary schools must look to the future. They do so by successful strategic planning, working with faculty and staff, fund raising, admissions, and plant improvement. Planning additionally requires leaders to work effectively with a variety of constituencies in the four frames described by Bolman and Deal (1997): political, structural, human resources, and symbolic.

All of the Heads strategize for the future of the school by Long-Range Planning. Five of the schools utilize a five-year plan and five vary in their length of plan: from two to ten years. All but one of the schools have a published Long-Range Plan. Eight of the schools utilize representatives from all of the stakeholder constituencies: Board, administration, faculty, alumni/ae, past parents, friends and students. One school primarily uses the Board and administration and in one school the Board wrote the plan. Five of the Heads rely on their Division Heads to assess the working relationships with the faculty. Four stated they assess informally and one does the assessment by consensus. The

Heads spend an average of 23% of their time fund-raising, ranging from 50% (2) to 5% (3). Eight of the Heads declared the amount of time fund-raising has increased during their tenure and two said it has remained the same. All of the Heads work closely with their Directors of Admission and admission committees in order to manage enrollment. Seven of the Heads target certain communities in their area, one stresses the school's traditional program and one school focuses on diversity. Nine of the school Heads stated they planned for physical plant improvements through the school's Long-Range Plan, while one Head said the school rented their buildings and grounds. Nine of the schools have a capital budget line item or a PRISM fund in order to fund improvements. Again, one school rented their property.

There were some interesting sentiments from the Heads concerning school effectiveness. For example, none of the Heads had any pressure concerning enrollment: "I feel no pressure to fill spots"; " the problem is siblings and legacies"; "we are attempting to adhere to maximum class size"; "each family is clarified about how they should act", "we put the right kids together, regardless of cost". In terms of faculty and staff relationships, the following were stated: "we work on three factors-complaints are OK, criticisms are OK, contempt is not OK"; "if, as a Head, you are not centered, than you should not be a Head"; "with the faculty, I really try to work on a consensus basis"; "my job with the faculty is to create the future"; "daily interaction is important"; "I personally evaluate all of the faculty each year"; and, "I depend on my gut reactions when it comes to faculty and staff".

Research and Subsidiary Questions

Subsidiary Question # 1

In the MLQ, do the long-term Heads of Schools utilize transactional leadership styles, transformational leadership styles, or both in guiding their schools?

The Heads use both transactional and transformational leadership styles; yet, prefer transformational. Collectively the means of the Heads were high in transformational leadership (Table 9): 3.29, 3.6, 3.6, 3.26 and 3.37. The means in the transactional leadership factors were relatively low: 3.11, 1.38, 1.11 and .5. Additionally, there were many more significant correlations (at the .05 and .01 levels) in the Spearman rho among the transformational leadership factors than the transactional.

From the MLQ web page (Kramer, 2000), the researcher found MLQ scores from a mix of industrial and not for profit middle to upper level managers. Table 11 shows the long-term Heads have higher means in the transformational categories. For example, in the Idealized Influence (Attributed) category, the MLQ mix had a mean of 2.95, while the long-term Heads garnered a mean of 3.29. In the transactional leadership categories all of the long-term Heads means were lower except for Contingent Reward, in which the Heads had a mean of 3.11 and the MLQ mix had a mean of 2.99. Additionally, all of the long-term Heads' outcome scores were higher than those of the MLQ managers.

Table 11 presents the descriptive statistics from long-term heads and a mix of industrial and not for profit upper level managers.

Table 11

Descriptive Means

MLQ	N	MEAN	L-T Heads
IIA	1326	2.95	3.29
IIB	1327	2.89	3.6
IM	1325	3.03	3.6
IS	1326	2.95	3.26
IC	1326	3.17	3.37
CR	1326	2.99	3.11
MBEA	1324	1.51	1.38
MBEP	1326	1.09	1.11
LF	1326	0.64	0.5
SAT	1326	3.14	3.5
EE	1320	2.76	3.33
EFF	1326	3.09	3.45

Note.

Legend
II(A)=Idealized Influence (Attributed)
II(B)=Idealized Influence (Behavior)
IM=Inspirational Motivation
IS=Intellectual Stimulation
IC=Individualized Consideration
CR=Contingent Reward
MBEA=Management by Exception (Active)
MBEP=Management by Exception (Passive)
LF=Laissez-Faire
SAT=Satisfaction
EE=Extra Effort
EFF=Effectiveness

Key of Frequency
4.0=Frequently, if not always
3.0=Fairly often
2.0=Sometimes
1.0=Once in a while
0.0=Not at all

One can see that the heads had stronger transformational and outcome scores than the sample of other managers in industry and non-profits.

Subsidiary Question # 2

In the MBTI, are their preferences distinct and polar, or are their preferences close together? For example, in the E/I type, are the Heads strictly and/or predominantly E, or do they utilize both E and I with a weak preference?

As a group, the Heads were pulled toward Extraversion (E), Intuition (N), Thinking (T) and Judging (J). The t-test (Table 3) shows the strengths of the group preferences: E (-1.119), N (1.489), T (-2.253) and J (-3.349). As individuals the Heads were clear in six of the eight preferences: E, S, N, T, J and P. In two of their preferences, I and F, the Heads were moderate. It appears that the Heads have a distinct preference in the dichotomies. About preferences, Walck notes,

> Successful managers may be significantly clearer about their preferences.
> Knowing yourself well may be the best path to success (Walck, 1997,
> p.91).

Subsidiary Question # 3

In the MBTI, are the Heads predominantly extraverted (E) and intuitive (N)?

Collectively, the Heads are predominantly Extraverted (E) and Intuitive (N). And, as individuals, the extraverted and intuitive heads show a clear preference toward those two dichotomies. However, it must be noted that, as a group, the Heads have even stronger inclinations toward Thinking (T) and

Judging (J). As, individuals, the Thinking (T) and Judging (J) Heads also show a clear preference.

<u>Subsidiary Question # 4</u>

Are the Heads' relationships with their Boards of Trustees collaborative?

The long-term Heads appear have to collaborative relationships with their Boards of Trustees and their schools' constituencies. The interviews with the Heads showed a consistent pattern of working together to set the agenda, to plan, to educate trustees, to communicate and to trust their Presidents. Additionally, the MLQ shows a strong preference toward transformational leadership. About this type of leadership in organizations, Bass writes,

In the organizational transformational culture, there is a sense of purpose, and a feeling of family. Commitments are long-term. Mutual interests are shared with a sense of shared fates and inter-dependence of leaders and followers.

Leaders serve as role models, mentors and coaches. They work to socialize new members into the epitome of a transformational organizational culture. Shared norms cover a wide range of behaviors. The norms are adaptive and change with changes in the organizational environment. Emphasized are organizational purposes, visions, and missions. In this pure organizational culture, challenges are opportunities, not threats (Bass, 1998, p. 65-66).

Research Question

Are there similarities among long-term, elementary Heads of Independent Schools (minimum of 15 years in the same school) in terms of their personality types and leadership styles?

While only 22% of the Heads were ENTJ, collectively the Heads had a strong preference for each of those dichotomies. Ten of the 16 types (62.5%) were found in the long-term Heads. As expected, individually the long-term Heads showed different personality types; however, as a group they showed distinct, similar personality types.

Similarly, the Heads, as a group, showed a strong preference toward transformational leadership. In Table# 4.9, one can see clear preference toward transformational leadership in terms of the mean, median and range. There is a similar distribution in the outcome factors (Table# 4.8). None of the ranges in these two examples surpass 1.75. However, the ranges in the transactional model (Table # 4.7) all are 2 or greater. Reviewing the frequency charts (Appendix C), one can easily view the strength toward transformational leadership and the relative randomness of transactional leadership.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Overview

The purpose of this study was to determine if there were similarities among long-term, elementary Heads of Independent schools (minimum of 20 years in current school) in terms of their personality types and leadership styles. The research was limited to 27 National Association of Independent School (NAIS) elementary school Heads. The selection of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) and the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) were also limits.

Summary

Successful leadership in an independent school requires a thick skin and an open heart (Scott, 1997). In order to lead a school for many years, a Head must learn to interact favorably with a myriad of constituencies. Over the past 15 years the position of Head has become more demanding due to the increasingly complex forces (Ruoss, 1992). This study attempted to discover if there were similarities among long-term elementary school Heads in terms of their

personality types, leadership styles, relations with their governing Board, and school effectiveness.

Personality Type

Each of the 27 long-term Heads was administered the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI). The results were that collectively the Heads showed a preference toward Extraversion (E)—63%, INtuition (N)—67%, Thinking (T)—67%, and Judging (J)—74%. A t-test was calculated in order to show which of the preferences in the MBTI was strongest. The t-test produced the following strengths: Judging (J)—3.439; Thinking (T)—2.253; INtuition (N)—1.489; and Extraversion (E)—1.119. The Pearson product moment correlation also garnered a strong correlation between the Judging (J) preference and the Extraversion (E)/Introversion (I) and the Sensing (S)/iNtuition (N) dichotomies. About leadership and type, McCaulley wrote,

> In summary, though any type can reach the top, executives most likely
> to do so are somewhat more likely to prefer extraversion and intuition,
> and are likely to prefer thinking and judgment. Leaders who inspire
> by communicating a vision of a better future may come from the
> Intuitives, especially the intuitives with feeling (McCaulley, 1990).

Leadership Style

Each of the Heads was administered the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ). Utilizing the Spearman rho, it was found that many of the of the transformational leadership qualities correlated with one another.

Additionally, the mean and median scores of the Head's transformational qualities were higher than the transactional leadership qualities.

Much has been written about the relationship between transformational and transactional leadership. Bass and Avolio wrote that transformational leadership is value-added with the four "I" dimensions of idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration (Bass and Avolio, 1994). Concerning transformational and transactional leadership as predictors of effectiveness, satisfaction, and organizational climate in K-12 and higher education King noted, "Transactional is ordinary leadership; yet the addition of transformational characteristics allows that leadership to become outstanding" (King, 1989, p. 162). Additionally, Stephen Covey articulates, "obviously both kinds of leadership are necessary, but transformational must be the parent" (Covey, 1991, p.287).

Board Relations

In order to ascertain relationships with the governing board and school effectiveness, 10 of the Heads, each from a different state, were interviewed. The questions concerning board relations and school effectiveness were garnered from an article entitled " The Competitive Edge: Why Some Small Colleges Succeed". In terms of Board relations, the Heads all attempted to assist in educating their Boards, communicated regularly and openly with members, and mostly (94%) perceived a sense of trust with the Presidents of the Board. Eight of the 10 heads were evaluated regularly. Ledyard in a study about independent Day School Boards of Trustees noted:

The healthiest boards and board-head relationships exist in those schools where there is a relatively high level of board activity; where there are frequent, minor confrontations over a wide range of issues; where the board and school head trust one another and cooperate in the distribution of influence; where the board is in touch with the various school constituencies on a regular basis; and where there are explicit, periodic assessments of the school head's performance (Ledyard, 1987, p. 135).

Wickenden (1996) also notes factors causing an independent School Board of Trustees' ineffectiveness: frustration by individual members about the quality of the experience; inappropriate Board interference; and, lack of strategic planning.

School Effectiveness

"Because organizations are complex, surprising, deceptive, and ambiguous, they are formidably difficult to understand and manage (Bolman & Deal, 1997, p.34). In order to lead a school a Head must strategize for the future and work in and among the four frames presented by Bolman and Deal (1997): political, structural, human resources, and symbolic. They state, "Effective leaders change lenses when things don't make sense or aren't working" (Bolman & Deal, 1997, p.280). All of the Heads' schools devised long-range plans and formally and informally assess the working relationships with the faculty. The Heads spend almost one-quarter of their time (23%) fundraising and work closely with their directors of admission to manage enrollment. Ninety percent of the

Heads planned for physical plant improvement and utilized a capital budget line item in order to do so.

As stated earlier, Deal and Bolman present a theory of effective leadership, which incorporates the ability of the leader to work in and among four frames: political, structural, human resources, and symbolic. In writing about effective leadership, they note:

> Leaders think longer-term, look outside as well as inside, and influence constituents beyond their immediate formal jurisdictions. They emphasize vision and renewal and have the political skills to cope with the challenging requirements of multiple constituencies.
>
> (Bolman & Deal, 1997, p.295).

Conclusions

A relationship does exist between long-term Heads and their personality types and leadership styles. In the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI), collectively the Heads are Extraverted (E), INtuitive (N), Thinking (T), and Judging (J). While only six (22.22%) of the individual 27 Heads fit this description (ENTJ) perfectly, as a group they strongly preferred Extraversion (E), INtuition (N), Thinking (T), and Judging (J).

In terms of their leadership styles, the Heads were strongly transformational. Through the use of the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire, the long-term Heads were found to use transformational qualities (idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration) more than the transactional essences (contingent reward,

management-by-exception-active, management–by–exception-passive and laissez-faire).

As a group, the Heads appear to plan strategically and work effectively with the four frames provided by Deal and Bolman. Planning for the future permits the Head to focus on vision for the forecast for the institution he/she serves. Moreover, it appears the Heads emerge as leaders who intuitively know the four "frames" and move within each of the lenses effectively.

Recommendations for Further Research

The results and conclusions of any research effort are only authoritative if they are used in a positive framework for further improvement. The implications and recommendations of this study are offered to provide positive and constructive data to school leaders, particularly in the independent school sphere. The following recommendations for further study are rooted in the results of this study:

1. Future studies should replicate this study in terms of new Heads and more transient heads, to see if the findings are similar.

2. The study should be expanded to include secondary school Heads, to determine if the same premises would prevail.

3. A future study should replicate this study utilizing independent school Heads in their second Headship, to determine if the findings are similar.

4. A further study examining cognitive constructs such as "hardiness" and "dispositional optimism" , as they relate to coping with multi-faceted stresses, which could be associated with length of tenure, should be conducted.

5. A study of long-term business executives and military leaders should be undertaken to determine if similar results would prevail.

6. A longitudinal study should be undertaken to analyze the relationship between the Heads and the Boards of Trustees at NAIS member schools.

7. A further study employing the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire multirater report should be undertaken. This report would quantitatively show the relationship between the leader's perceptions and those of the raters.

References

Barth, R.S. (1990). Improving schools from within. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Bass, B.M. (1985). Leadership and performance beyond expectations. New York: The Free Press.

Bass, B.M. (1990). Bass and Stogdil's handbook of leadership (3rd ed.). New York: The Free Press.

Bass, B.M. (1998). Transformational leadership: Industrial, military, and educational impact. Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

Bass, B.M. & Avolio, B.J. (1994). Improving organizational effectiveness through transformational leadership. Thousands Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Bass, B.M. & Avolio, B.J. (1995). MLQ: Multifactor leadership questionnaire for research-- Manual. Redwood City, California: Mind Garden.

Benezet,L.T., Katz,J.,& Magnussson, F.W. (1981). Style and substance: Leadership and the college president. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education.

Benfari, R. (1991). Understanding your management style: Beyond the Meyer-Briggs Type Indicator. New York: Lexington Books.

Benison, Estela M. (1993). New presidents' initial actions: Transactional and transformational leadership. Journal for Higher Education Management: A Journal of the American Association of University Administrators,8(2), 5-17.

Bennis, W. & Nanus, B. (1997). Leaders (2nd ed.). New York: Harper Collins.

Bolman, L.G. & Deal, T.E. (1997). Reframing organizations: Artistry, choice and leadership (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Bowman, M. & Edwards, K. (2000). Creating trust intentionally. Nonprofit notes: Resources for strengthening nonprofits, 2 (2), p.1.

Burns, J. (1978). Leadership. New York: Harper Row.

Calder, F. (1998, February, March). The roots of independence, New York: Association of independent Schools Bulletin 225-226.

Cannella, A.A. & Monroe, M.J. (1997). Contrasting perspectives on strategic leaders: Toward a more realistic view of top managers. Journal of Management, 23 (3), p. 213-241.

Carey, D.C & Ogden, D. (2000). CEO succession. New York: Oxford University Press.

Clark, D.J & Guest, K. (1995, January) Executive Educator, 18-24.

Coleman, M. (2000). The female secondary headteacher in England and Wales: Leadership and management styles. Educational Research,42 (1), p.13-27.

Conger,J.A. (1989) The charismatic leader. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Corlett, E.S. & Millner, N.B. (1993). Navigating midlife: Using typology as a guide. Palo Alto: Davies-Black Publishing.

Covey, S.R. (1991). Principle-centered leadership. New York: Fireside.

Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1991). Flow. New York: HarperPerennial.

Csikszentmihalyi, M.(1997). Creativity. New York: HarperPerennial.

Dayton, K.N.(1987). Governance is governance. Washington, D.C.:
Independent Sector.

Deal, T.E. & Kennedy, A.A. (1999). The new corporate cultures:
Revitalizing the workplace after downsizing, mergers, and reengineering.
Reading, MA: Perseus Books.

DeKuyper, M.H. (1998). Trustee handbook: A guide to effective
governance for independent school boards. Washington, D.C.: National
Association of Independent Schools.

De Laszlo, V.S. (Eds.). (1993). The basic writings of C. G. Jung. New
York: The Modern Library.

Dollinger, M.J. (1984). Environmental boundary spanning and information
processing effects on organizational performance. Academy of Management
Journal, 27 (2), 351-368.

Eagly, A.H., Karau,S.J. & Johnson, B.T. (1992). Gender and leadership
style among school principals: A meta-analysis. Educational Adminstration
Quarterly, 28, 1, pp. 76-102.

Edwards, K.D. (1994). Five factors that affect the success of board-head
relationships in independent day schools. (Doctoral dissertation, The Fielding
Institute, 1994) Dissertation Abstracts International, AAT 9525943.

Edwards, K.D. (1999). The trust factor: Why it makes all the difference in
board-head relationships. The Trustee's Letter. Educational Directions Inc., 11
(2), p. 6.

Erickson, F. (1987). Conceptions of school culture: An overview. Educational Administration Quarterly, 23 (4), 11-24.

Evans, R. (1996). The human side of school change. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Fields, D. & Herold, D. (1997). Using the leadership practices inventory to measure transformational and transactional leadership. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 57, (4), 569-579.

Fisher, J.L. & Koch, J.V. (1996). Presidential leadership. Phoenix: The Oryx Press.

Fitzgerald, C. (1992). Use of the MBTI in management development: Research findings and issues. In R.R. Pearman (Eds.), The Best of the Bulletin of Psychological Type (pp.175-180). Kansas City: Association for Psychological Type, Inc.

Fitzgerald, C. & Kirby, L.K. (1997). Developing leaders: Research and applications in psychological type and leadership development. Palo Alto: Davies- Black Publishing.

Gardner, J.W. (1990). On Leadership. New York: The Free Press.

Gilvar, B. (1992). The search handbook: A step by step guide to selecting the right leader for your school. Washington, D.C.: National Association of Independent Schools.

Goldsborough, M. (1996). [NAIS-Yearfounded report]. Unpublished raw data.

Goleman, D. (1998, November-December). What makes a leader? Harvard Business Review, 92-102.

Griffin, R. (1999). The changing role of the independent school headmaster. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Washington, Seattle.

Gurr, D. (1996). On conceptualising school leadership: Time to abandon transformational leadership? Leading and Managing, 2 (3), p. 221-239.

Hawley, D.B. (1994). How long do international heads survive? A research analysis (Part I). International Schools Journal, 14 (1), 8-21.

Hawley, D.B. (1995). How long do international heads survive? A research analysis (Part II). International Schools Journal, 14 (2), 23-36.

Hedges, C. (2000, January 26). Fund-raising takes toll on private school heads. The New York Times, p. B8.

Helmstetter, D.W. (1999). Stress factors of Minnesota school superintendents as correlated with leadership skills and personality types. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Minnesota, 1999). UMI Dissertation Services, AAT9924666.

Herman, R.D., & Heimovics, R.D. (1991). Executive leadership in nonprofit organizations: New strategies for shaping executive-board dynamics. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Hoover, N.R. (1991). Transformational and transactional leadership: An empirical test of theory. (Report No. EA 022 939) Springfield, VA: Dynedrs. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service NO. ED 331 177).

Hopcke, R.H. (1999). A guided tour of the collected works of C.G. Jung. Boston: Shambhala.

Houle, C.O.(1989). Governing boards. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Howell, J.M. & Avolio, B.J. (1993). Transformational leadership, transactional leadership, locus of control, and support for innovation: Key predictors of consolidated –business –unit performance. Journal of Applied Psychology, 78 (6), pp.891-902.

Independent School Management Staff. (1992a). The new alliance of head and board chair. Ideas and Perspectives. , 17 (12), p. 45-46.

Independent School Management Staff. (1992b). Taking responsibility for your own board...as head. Ideas & Perspectives., 17 (6), p. 23.

Independent School Management Staff. (1999). Conflict resolution in the context of your parent education plan. Ideas and Perspectives, 24 (10), p.37-38.

Ingram,P. (1997). Leadership behaviors of principals in inclusive educational settings. Journal of Educational Administration, 35 (5), 411-427.

Jung, C.G. (1971). Psychological types. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

King, M.i. (1989). Extraordinary leadership in education: Transformational and transactional leadership as predictors of effectiveness, satisfaction, and organizational climate in K-12 and higher education. (Doctoral dissertation, University of New Orleans, 1989). Dissertation Abstracts International, 9002882.

Kotter, J.P. & Heskett, J.L. (1992). Corporate culture and performance. New York: The Free Press.

Kramer, W. (2000). MLQ Norms. Center for Leadership Studies [On-line]. Available: http://cls.binghamton.edu.

Krathwohl, D.R. (1998). Methods of educational and social science research: An integrated approach (2nd ed.). New York: Longman.

Kraushaar, O.F. (1972). American nonpublic schools: Patterns of diversity. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Kroeger, O. & Thuesen, J.M. (1988). Type talk: The 16 personality types that determine how we live, love, and work. New York: Dell Publishing.

Lawson, J.H. (1991). Conflict between school board members and superintendents of schools. (Report No. EA 022 861). Springfield, VA: Dynedrs. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 331 132)

Ledyard, J.C. (1987). Independent day school boards: A governance study. (Doctoral dissertation, Claremont Graduate School, 1987). Dissertation Abstracts International, 48, 10A.

Leithwood, K. (1994). Leadership for school restructuring. Educational Administration Quarterly, 30 (4), p. 498-515.

Lewin, K. (1997). Resolving social conflicts and field theory in social science. Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association.

Maslow, A.H. (1954). Motivation and personality. New York: Harper.

Matan, L.K. (1999). A profile of the effective catholic high school administrator. (Doctoral dissertation, University of San Francisco, 1999). UMI Dissertation Services, AAT 9933945.

McAdams, D.P. (1992). The five-factor model: A critical appraisal. Journal of Personality,57 (1), p.17-40.

McCaulley, M.H. (Speaker). (1983, May). Principles of type development and the meaning of the MBTI scores (Cassette Recording No. P211-7AB, 2 tapes). Garden Grove, CA: Infomedix.

McCaulley, M.H. (1990a). The Myers-Briggs type indicator and leadership. Gainesville, Florida: Center for Applications of Psychological Type, Inc.

McCaulley, M.H. (1990b). The Myers-Briggs type indicator: A measure for individuals and groups. Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling and Development, 22 181-195.

McKay, J. & Grady, M. (1994). Turnover at the top. Executive Educator ,16 ,37-38.

McLaughlin, J.B. (1996). Entering the presidency. New Directions for Higher Education, 93, 5-13.

McPhee, J. (1966). The headmaster. New York: Farrar, Straus, and Giroux.

Merante, J.A. & Ireland, R.C. (1993, Fall). The competitive edge: Why some small colleges succeed. College Board Review, 169, 8-13, 28-29.

Murphy, E. (1994) On the brink of awareness. In R.R. Pearman (Ed.), The Best of the Bulletin of Psychological Type. Kansas City: Association for Psychological Type, Inc.

Myers, I.B. (1995). Gifts differing. Consulting Psychologists Press, Inc.

Myers, I.B., McCaulley, M.H., Quenk, N.L. & Hammer, A.L. (1998). MBTI manual: A guide to the development and use of the Myers-Briggs type indicator. Palo Alto: Consulting Psychologists Press, Inc.

Myers, K.D. & Kirby, L.K. (1993). Type development: The Jungian model for lifelong growth. In R.R. Pearman (Ed.), The Best of the Bulletin of Psychological Type (pp.129-130). Kansas City: Association for Psychological Type, Inc.

Nadel, L (1996). Introverted intuitives: Managing diversity in the workplace. In R. Frantz & A.N. Pattakos (Eds.), Intuition at Work (pp. 237-251). San Francisco: New Leaders Press.

Nason, J.W. (1980). Presidential assessment: A guide to the periodic review of the performance of chief executives. Washington D.C.: Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges.

National Association of Independent Schools (1998). NAIS statistics 1998. Washington: Author.

National Center for Nonprofit Boards. (2000). The board-staff partnership : Lessons from a leading foundation. Board Member, 9, 10-13.

Nostrand, P.F. (1973). Headmasters: in theory and practice. (Report No. EA 005163). Springfield, VA: Dynedrs. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 077 140.

Orlikoff, J.E. & Totten, M.K. (1999). Systems thinking in governance. Trustee ,52 (1), p. 1-8.

Orwin, J.F. (1999). Personality types and leadership styles of principals in accredited and unaccredited elementary schools. (Doctoral dissertation, Wayne State University, 1999). UMI Dissertation Services, AAT 9933005.

Pearman, R.R. & Albritton, S.C. (1997). I'm not crazy I'm just not you: The real meaning of the sixteen personality types. Palo Alto: Davies-Black Publishing.

Pierce, D.R. & Pedersen, R.P. (1997). The community college presidency: Qualities for success. New Directions for Community Colleges, 25 (2), 13-20.

Powell, A.G. (1996). Lessons from privilege: The American prep school tradition. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Quenk, N. (1984). The dynamics of type development. In R.R. Pearman (Ed.), The Best of the Bulletin of Psychological Type (pp.109-111). Kansas City: Association for Psychological Type, Inc.

Quenk, N. (1993). Personality types or personality traits: What difference does it make? In R.R. Pearman (Ed.), The Best of the Bulletin of Psychological Type (pp.121-127). Kansas City: Association for Psychological Type, Inc.

Rea, L.M. & Parker, R.A. (1997). Designing and conducting survey research: A comprehensive guide (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Reardin, V.L. (1996). Predicting leadership behaviors from personality as measured by the Myers-Briggs type indicator. (Doctoral dissertation, North Carolina State University, 1996). UMI Dissertation Services.

Roberts, C.C. & Connors, E.J. (1998). Achieving effective trusteeship. Journal of Healthcare management 43, (5) 389-392.

Robinson, M.K. (1998). The chief executive's role in developing the nonprofit board. Washington, D.C.: National Center for Nonprofit Boards.

Rubin, H. (1998). Collaboration skills for educators and nonprofit leaders. Chicago: Lyceum.

Ruoss, E.G. (1992). Essential competencies for independent school leaders. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Virginia, 1992). UMI Dissertation Services, 9324891.

Schein, E.H. (1992). Organizational culture and leadership (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Sergiovanni, T.J. (1990). Value-added leadership. New York: Harcourt, Brace Jovanovich.

Sergiovanni, T.J.(1992). Moral leadership: Getting to the heart of school improvement. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Scott, J.A. (1997). Women and leadership: A study of issues in independent schools. Unpublished manuscript, Teachers College-Columbia University.

Silins, Halia C. (1994). The relationship between transformational and transactional leadership and school improvement outcomes. School Effectiveness and School Improvement: An International Journal of Research, Policy and Practice 5, (2)ÿ-272-298.

Smith, F.H. (1991) Personality types and administrative potential. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Houston, 1991). UMI Dissertation Services, 9213885.

Spoto, A. (1995). Jung's typology in perspective. Wilmette, Illinois: Chiron Publications.

Stein, M. (1977). In midlife: A Jungian perspective. Dallas: Spring Publications.

Stevens, P. (1974,May). The Headmaster's Letter,1,1-4.

Storr, A. (1983). The essential Jung: Selected writings. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Taylor, B.E., Chait, R.P., & Holland, T.P. (1996, September-October). The new work of the nonprofit board. Harvard Business Review. 4-11.

Thomson, L. (1998).Personality type: A practical guide to understanding yourself and others through typology. Boston: Shambhala.

Van Velsor, E & Fleenor, J.W. (1997). The MBTI and leadership skills. In C. Fitzgerald & L.K. Kirby (Eds.), Developing leaders: Research and applications in psychological type and leadership development (pp.139-162). Palo Alto: Davies-Black Publishing.

Walck, C.L. (1996). Management and leadership. In A.L. Hammer (Ed.), MBTI applications (pp. 55-79). Palo Alto: Consulting Psychologists Press.

Walck, C.L. (1997). Using the MBTI in management and leadership: A review of the literature. In C. Fitzgerald & L.K. Kirby (Eds.), Developing leaders: Research and applications in psychological type and leadership development (pp.63-134). Palo Alto: Davies-Black Publishing.

Weddle, C.J. (1992). Leadership styles of successful women administrators in higher education. In K. Clark, M. Clark & D. Campbell (Eds.), impact of Leadership. (pp. 517-527). Greensboro, North Carolina: Center for Creative Leadership.

Wickenden, J. (1996, October). Thriving in an age of transition: Five steps to a better board. Wickenden Associates.

Yammarino, F.J. and Bass, B.M. (1990). Transformational leadership and multiple levels of analysis. Human Relations, 43, (10), 975-995.

Yuki, G. (1998). Leadership in organizations (Rev. ed.). Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Zaleznik, A. (1977). Managers and leaders: Are they different? Harvard Business Review, 55 (1), 68-79.

Appendices

Appendix A

Dear,

My name is Chad Small, and I am Head of the Rumson Country Day School (PS-8, 440 students), located in Rumson, New Jersey. In addition, I am a doctoral candidate at Seton Hall University in the Executive Ed.D. Program in the Department of Educational Administration and Supervision. I need your help. For my dissertation I am researching the topic: "Are there similarities among long-term elementary Heads of Independent Schools (minimum of 15 years at the same school) in terms of their personality types and leadership styles?" The purpose of the study is to gain a better understanding of long-term leadership. I am asking you to be a participant in the study. If you decide to participate in the study, your involvement will take no more than one hour of time. I will ask you to complete two inventories: the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) and the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI).

Because of your long tenure at _____, you have been selected to take part in this study. Your participation is completely voluntary, and you will be free to stop at any time. There are no foreseeable risks or benefits from your participation, as this is an assessment study. All information will be strictly confidential.

If you have questions, now or later, please contact one of us at the addresses listed below:

Chad B. Small
The Rumson Country Day School
35 Bellevue Avenue
Rumson, NJ 07760
csmall@rcds.com or (732) 842-0527

Dr. Joseph Stetar
72 Person Road
Bloomsbury, NJ 08804-3504

Please read the following two paragraphs, and, if you agree to participate, please sign below and return to Chad Small using the enclosed stamped envelope.

This project has been reviewed and approved by the Seton Hall University Institutional Review Board for Human Subjects Research. The IRB believes that the research procedures adequately safeguard the subject's privacy, welfare, civil liberties, and rights. The Chairperson of the IRB may be reached through the Office of Grants and Research Services. The telephone number of the Office is (973) 275-2974.

I have read the material above, and any questions I asked have been answered to my satisfaction. I agree to participate in this activity, realizing that I may withdraw without prejudice at any time.

I understand that any information about me obtained from this research will be kept strictly confidential. Your completion and return of the questionnaires indicate your understanding of the project and willingness to participate.

When the researcher receives your signed authorization, he will send the instruments, with appropriate return postage.

Date _____   _____Your Signature

Date _____   _____Researcher

Appendix B

Dear,

My name is Chad Small, and I am Head of the Rumson Country Day School (PS-8, 440 students), located in Rumson, New Jersey. In addition, I am a doctoral candidate at Seton Hall University in the Executive Ed.D. Program in the Department of Educational Administration and Supervision. I need your help. For my dissertation I am researching the topic: "Are there similarities among long-term elementary Heads of Independent Schools (minimum of 15 years at the same school) in terms of their personality types and leadership styles?" The purpose of the study is to gain a better understanding of long-term leadership. I am asking you to be a participant in the study. If you decide to participate in the study, your involvement will take no more than one hour of time. Previously I asked you to complete two inventories: the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) and the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI). Now I am asking you, and nine other long-term Heads, to interview with me on other issues about Headship.

Because of your long tenure at _____, you have been selected to take part in this study. Your participation is completely voluntary, and you will be free to stop at any time. There are no foreseeable risks or benefits from your participation, as this is an assessment study. All information will be strictly confidential.

If you have questions, now or later, please contact one of us at the addresses listed below:

Chad B. Small
The Rumson Country Day School
35 Bellevue Avenue
Rumson, NJ 07760
csmall@rcds.com or (732) 842-0527

Dr. Joseph Stetar
72 Person Road
Bloomsbury, NJ 08804-3504

Please read the following two paragraphs, and, if you agree to participate, please sign below and return to Chad Small using the enclosed stamped envelope.

This project has been reviewed and approved by the Seton Hall University Institutional Review Board for Human Subjects Research. The IRB believes that the research procedures adequately safeguard the subject's privacy, welfare, civil liberties, and rights. The Chairperson of the IRB may be reached through the Office of Grants and Research Services. The telephone number of the Office is (973) 275-2974.

I have read the material above, and any questions I asked have been answered to my satisfaction. I agree to participate in this activity, realizing that I may withdraw without prejudice at any time.

I understand that any information about me obtained from this research will be kept strictly confidential.

When the researcher receives your signed authorization, he will contact you about an appropriate time for the interview.

_____

Date _____   _____Your Signature

Date_____   _____Researcher

AppendixC

E/I

		Freq.	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	55	1	3.7	3.7	3.7
	57	1	3.7	3.7	7.4
	67	2	7.4	7.4	14.8
	71	1	3.7	3.7	18.5
	73	1	3.7	3.7	22.2
	75	1	3.7	3.7	25.9
	77	1	3.7	3.7	29.6
	81	1	3.7	3.7	33.3
	91	1	3.7	3.7	37.0
	93	1	3.7	3.7	40.7
	95	3	11.1	11.1	51.9
	97	1	3.7	3.7	55.6
	99	1	3.7	3.7	59.3
	105	1	3.7	3.7	63.0
	107	1	3.7	3.7	66.7
	111	1	3.7	3.7	70.4
	113	1	3.7	3.7	74.1
	115	1	3.7	3.7	77.8
	117	1	3.7	3.7	81.5
	119	1	3.7	3.7	85.2
	121	1	3.7	3.7	88.9
	125	2	7.4	7.4	96.3
	127	1	3.7	3.7	100.0
	Total	27	100.0	100.0	

S/N

		Freq.	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	37	1	3.7	3.7	3.7
	39	1	3.7	3.7	7.4
	57	1	3.7	3.7	11.1
	61	1	3.7	3.7	14.8
	77	1	3.7	3.7	18.5
	83	1	3.7	3.7	22.2
	85	1	3.7	3.7	25.9
	87	1	3.7	3.7	29.6
	95	1	3.7	3.7	33.3
	97	1	3.7	3.7	37.0
	115	2	7.4	7.4	44.4
	119	1	3.7	3.7	48.1
	123	1	3.7	3.7	51.9
	127	1	3.7	3.7	55.6
	131	2	7.4	7.4	63.0
	133	3	11.1	11.1	74.1
	137	4	14.8	14.8	88.9
	139	1	3.7	3.7	92.6
	141	1	3.7	3.7	96.3
	149	1	3.7	3.7	100.0
	Total	27	100.0	100.0	

T/F

		Freq.	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	39	1	3.7	3.7	3.7
	55	1	3.7	3.7	7.4
	61	1	3.7	3.7	11.1
	67	1	3.7	3.7	14.8
	69	1	3.7	3.7	16.5
	71	1	3.7	3.7	22.2
	75	1	3.7	3.7	25.9
	77	1	3.7	3.7	29.6
	79	1	3.7	3.7	33.3
	61	1	3.7	3.7	37.0
	83	1	3.7	3.7	40.7
	69	1	3.7	3.7	44.4
	91	1	3.7	3.7	48.1
	95	2	7.4	7.4	55.6
	99	3	11.1	11.1	66.7
	103	2	7.4	7.4	74.1
	105	1	3.7	3.7	77.6
	107	1	3.7	3.7	61.5
	113	1	3.7	3.7	85.2
	117	1	3.7	3.7	88.9
	119	1	3.7	3.7	92.6
	121	1	3.7	3.7	96.3
	131	1	3.7	3.7	100.0
	Total	27	100.0	100.0	

J/P

		Freq.	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	47	1	3.7	3.7	3.7
	49	1	3.7	3.7	7.4
	51	1	3.7	3.7	11.1
	53	1	3.7	3.7	14.8
	55	1	3.7	3.7	18.5
	57	1	3.7	3.7	22.2
	61	1	3.7	3.7	25.9
	63	2	7.4	7.4	33.3
	69	1	3.7	3.7	37.0
	71	1	3.7	3.7	40.7
	73	2	7.4	7.4	48.1
	75	1	3.7	3.7	51.9
	77	1	3.7	3.7	55.6
	79	2	7.4	7.4	63.0
	81	1	3.7	3.7	66.7
	63	1	3.7	3.7	70.4
	93	1	3.7	3.7	74.1
	101	1	3.7	3.7	77.8
	103	1	3.7	3.7	81.5
	109	1	3.7	3.7	85.2
	117	1	3.7	3.7	88.9
	127	1	3.7	3.7	92.6
	145	1	3.7	3.7	96.3
	147	1	3.7	3.7	100.0
	Total	27	100.0	100.0	

Appendix D

Contingent Reward

		Freq.	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.66	1	3.7	3.7	3.7
	2.25	1	3.7	3.7	7.4
	2.50	2	7.4	7.4	14.8
	2.66	1	3.7	3.7	18.5
	2.75	1	3.7	3.7	22.2
	3.00	5	18.5	18.5	40.7
	3.25	8	22.2	22.2	63.0
	3.50	5	18.5	18.5	81.5
	3.75	5	18.5	18.5	100.0
	Total	27	100.0	100.0	

Management By Exception (Active)

		Freq.	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	.25	1	3.7	3.7	3.7
	.50	3	11.1	11.1	14.8
	.75	7	25.9	25.9	40.7
	1.00	3	11.1	11.1	51.9
	1.25	1	3.7	3.7	55.8
	1.50	3	11.1	11.1	66.7
	2.00	2	7.4	7.4	74.1
	2.25	3	11.1	11.1	85.2
	2.50	2	7.4	7.4	92.6
	2.75	1	3.7	3.7	96.3
	3.00	1	3.7	3.7	100.0
	Total	27	100.0	100.0	

Management By Exception (Passive)

		Freq.	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	.00	1	3.7	3.7	3.7
	.25	2	7.4	7.4	11.1
	.50	3	11.1	11.1	22.2
	.75	6	22.2	22.2	44.4
	1.00	4	14.8	14.8	59.3
	1.25	2	7.4	7.4	66.7
	1.50	3	11.1	11.1	77.8
	1.75	1	3.7	3.7	81.5
	2.00	3	11.1	11.1	92.8
	2.25	1	3.7	3.7	96.3
	2.50	1	3.7	3.7	100.0
	Total	27	100.0	100.0	

Laissez Faire

		Freq.	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	.00	4	14.8	14.8	14.8
	.25	9	33.3	33.3	48.1
	.50	7	25.9	25.9	74.1
	.75	4	14.8	14.8	88.9
	1.00	1	3.7	3.7	92.8
	1.75	1	3.7	3.7	96.3
	2.00	1	3.7	3.7	100.0
	Total	27	100.0	100.0	

Satisfaction

		Freq.	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	2.50	1	3.7	3.7	3.7
	3.00	10	37.0	37.0	40.7
	3.50	6	22.2	22.2	63.0
	4.00	10	37.0	37.0	100.0
	Total	27	100.0	100.0	

Extra Effort

		Freq.	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	2.33	2	7.4	7.4	7.4
	2.66	3	11.1	11.1	18.5
	3.00	8	29.6	29.6	48.1
	3.33	2	7.4	7.4	55.6
	3.66	4	14.8	14.6	70.4
	4.00	8	29.6	29.6	100.0
	Total	27	100.0	100.0	

Effectiveness

		Freq.	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	2.75	4	14.8	14.8	14.8
	3.00	2	7.4	7.4	22.2
	3.25	3	11.1	11.1	33.3
	3.50	9	33.3	33.3	66.7
	3.75	4	14.8	14.8	81.5
	4.00	5	18.5	18.5	100.0
	Total	27	100.0	100.0	

ideal Influence Attribute

		Freq.	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	2.25	1	3.7	3.7	3.7
	2.50	3	11.1	11.1	14.8
	2.75	3	11.1	11.1	25.9
	3.00	3	11.1	11.1	37.0
	3.25	2	7.4	7.4	44.4
	3.33	1	3.7	3.7	48.1
	3.50	7	25.9	25.9	74.1
	3.75	2	7.4	7.4	81.5
	4.00	5	18.5	18.5	100.0
	Total	27	100.0	100.0	

Ideal Influence Behavior

		Freq.	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	2.50	1	3.7	3.7	3.7
	2.75	1	3.7	3.7	7.4
	3.00	2	7.4	7.4	14.8
	3.25	2	7.4	7.4	22.2
	3.50	5	18.5	18.5	40.7
	3.75	7	25.9	25.9	66.7
	4.00	9	33.3	33.3	100.0
	Total	27	100.0	100.0	

Inspirational Motivation

		Freq.	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	3.00	4	14.8	14.8	14.8
	3.25	4	14.8	14.8	29.6
	3.50	5	18.5	18.5	48.1
	3.75	3	11.1	11.1	59.3
	4.00	11	40.7	40.7	100.0
	Total	27	100.0	100.0	

Intellectual Stimulation

		Freq.	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	2.25	1	3.7	3.7	3.7
	2.50	2	7.4	7.4	11.1
	2.75	3	11.1	11.1	22.2
	3.00	5	18.5	18.5	40.7
	3.25	3	11.1	11.1	51.9
	3.50	8	22.2	22.2	74.1
	3.63	1	3.7	3.7	77.8
	3.75	3	11.1	11.1	88.9
	4.00	3	11.1	11.1	100.0
	Total	27	100.0	100.0	

Individual Consideration

		Freq.	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	2.50	1	3.7	3.7	3.7
	2.75	3	11.1	11.1	14.8
	3.00	4	14.8	14.8	29.6
	3.25	5	18.5	18.5	48.1
	3.50	6	22.2	22.2	70.4
	3.75	4	14.8	14.8	85.2
	4.00	4	14.8	14.8	100.0
	Total	27	100.0	100.0	

Appendix E

Correlation Matrix

	CONT	MBEA	MBEP	LF	SAT
CONT	1.0000				
MBEA	.3761	1.0000			
MBEP	.0652	.1627	1.0000		
LF	.1575	.3698	.0772	1.0000	
SAT	.2972	-.0369	.0749	-.1056	1.0000
EE	.6304	-.0156	-.1048	-.0122	.3817
EFFECT	.4563	.1277	.0377	-.1109	.7492
IIA	.6120	.1407	-.0663	-.0891	.3530
IIB	.0677	-.0230	-.4154	-.4961	.0694
IM	.2758	-.0604	-.2858	-.4367	.3406
IS	.3529	.2402	-.3143	.0154	.4676
IC	.1800	-.0468	-.2543	-.1766	.2796

	EE	EFFECT	IIA	IIB	IM
EE	1.0000				
EFFECT	.5968	1.0000			
IIA	.6576	.5715	1.0000		
IIB	.3410	.3675	.3005	1.0000	
IM	.4181	.4048	.5243	.5603	1.0000
IS	.5987	.6427	.5062	.5014	.4830
IC	.2252	.3601	.3746	.3378	.3184

	IS	IC
IS	1.0000	
IC	.3141	1.0000

N of Cases =   27.0

Reliability Coefficients   12 items

Alpha = .7227   Standardized item alpha = .7589

Appendix F

MLQ –Variables of the Study

TRANSACTIONAL LEADERSHIP

Contingent Reward

Items

1. I provide others with assistance in exchange for their efforts.

11. I discuss in specific terms who is responsible for achieving performance targets.

16. I make clear what one can expect to receive when performance goals are achieved.

35. I express satisfaction when others meet expectations.

Management by Exception (Active)

Items

4. I focus attention on irregularities, mistakes, and deviations from standards.

22. I concentrate my full attention on dealing with mistakes, complaints, and failures.

24. I keep track of all mistakes.

27. I direct my attention toward failures to meet standards.

Management by Exception (Passive)

Items

3. I fail to interfere until problems become serious.

12. I wait for things to go wrong before taking action.

17. I show that I am a firm believer in "If it ain't broke, don't fix it."

20. I demonstrate that problems must become chronic before I take action.

Laissez-Faire

Items

5. I avoid getting involved when important issues arise.

7. I am absent when needed.

28. I avoid making decisions.

33. I delay responding to urgent questions.

OUTCOMES

Satisfaction

Items

38. I use methods of leadership that are satisfying.

41. I work with others in a satisfactory way.

Extra Effort

Items

39. I get others to do more than they expected to do.

42. I heighten others' desire to succeed.

44. I increase others' willingness to try harder.

Effectiveness

Items

37. I am effective in meeting others' job-related needs.

40. I am effective in representing others to higher authority.

43. I am effective in meeting organizational requirements.

45. I lead a group that is effective.

TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP

Idealized Influence (Attributed)

Items

10. I instill pride in others for being associated with me.

18. I go beyond self-interest for the good of the group.

21. I act in ways that builds others' respect for me.

25. I display a sense of power and confidence.

Idealized Influence (Behavior)

Items

6. I talk about my most important values and beliefs.

14. I specify the importance of having a strong sense of purpose.

23. I consider the moral and ethical consequences of decisions.

34. I emphasize the importance of having a collective sense of mission.

Inspirational Motivation

Items

9. I talk optimistically about the future.

13. I talk enthusiastically about what needs to be accomplished.

26. I articulate a compelling vision of the future.

36. I express confidence that goals will be achieved.

Intellectual Stimulation

Items

2. I re-examine critical assumptions to question whether they are appropriate.

8. I seek differing perspectives when solving problems.

30. I get others to look at problems from many different angles.

32. I suggest new ways of looking at how to complete assignments.

Individual Consideration

Items

15. I spend time teaching and coaching.

19. I treat others as individuals rather than just as a member of a group.

29. I consider an individual as having different needs, abilities, and aspirations from others.

31. I help others to develop their strengths.

Appendix G

INTERVIEW

General Questions

1. How many years have you been Head of (SCHOOL)?

2. What is the number of Headships you have held, including this one?

3. What is the student population of (SCHOOL)?

For questions 4-6, please provide a catalog or history of the School, if necessary.

4. What year was (SCHOOL) founded?

5. Who founded (SCHOOL)?

6. What were the prevailing circumstances surrounding the founding of (SCHOOL)?

7. How many previous Heads have served (SCHOOL)?

8. How long was each of their tenure?

Board Relations

1. Describe how the agenda for the Board of Trustees is determined for meetings and for the year's goals.

2. How are potential new Board members selected?

3. Are Board members educated in the field of governance?

   Are there specific examples?

4. In what way(s) do you get to know each member of the Board of Trustees?

5. What strategies do you utilize to communicate with the Board?

   What strategies do you use to assess communication effectiveness?

6. How many presidents of the Board of Trustees have you worked with at

   (SCHOOL)?

   Is there a pre-determined length of term for a President?

7. Did you perceive a sense of trust with each of the Presidents you served?

   If yes, were there particular incidents or occurrences that increased the trust?

   If no, were there particular incidents or occurrences that decreased the trust?

8. How many Board members are current parents?

   How many Board members are not current parents?

9. Are you a voting member of the Board of Trustees?

10. Are you evaluated each year?

<div align="center">School Effectiveness</div>

1. Does (SCHOOL) strategize for the future?

   How?

   Does (SCHOOL) have a published long-range plan?

If yes, when was it conceived and what constituencies assisted in the planning? May I have a copy of the plan to review?

If no, what process do you utilize to plan for the future?

2. As a Head, how do you assess the working relationship between the faculty and administration?

3. What percent of your time is spent on fund-raising?

Has this increased or decreased during your tenure?

4. How is your enrollment managed?

5. How do you define your market niche and do you have positioning strategies?

6. How does the school plan for physical plant improvements?

How do you allocate funds for these improvements?