

## INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

**The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.** Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. Each original is also photographed in one exposure and is included in reduced form at the back of the book.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

# UMI

University Microfilms International  
A Bell & Howell Information Company  
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA  
313/761-4700 800/521-0600



**Order Number 9509193**

**Selected North Carolina school administrators and business  
leaders perceptions of behaviors when confronted with the  
same leadership situations and their rankings of eight leadership  
metaphors**

**Coaxum, Thomas Clifton, Ed.D.**

**The University of North Carolina at Greensboro, 1994**

**U·M·I**  
300 N. Zeeb Rd.  
Ann Arbor, MI 48106



SELECTED NORTH CAROLINA SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS AND  
BUSINESS LEADERS PERCEPTIONS OF BEHAVIORS WHEN  
CONFRONTED WITH THE SAME LEADERSHIP  
SITUATIONS AND THEIR RANKINGS OF  
EIGHT LEADERSHIP  
METAPHORS

By  
Thomas Clifton Coaxum

A Dissertation Submitted to  
the Faculty of the Graduate School at  
The University of North Carolina at Greensboro  
in Partial Fulfillment  
of the Requirements for the Degree  
Doctor of Education

Greensboro  
1994

Approved by

  
Dissertation Advisor

APPROVAL PAGE

This dissertation has been approved by the following committee of the Faculty of The Graduate School at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro.

Dissertation Advisor *Walter H. Arnold*  
Committee Members *Joseph E. Bryan*  
*Kathleen Casey*  
*Stacy Bond*

August 6, 1993  
Date of Acceptance by Committee

August 6, 1993  
Date of Final Oral Examination

COAXUM, THOMAS CLIFTON. Ed. D. Selected North Carolina School Administrators and Business Leaders Perceptions of Behaviors When Confronted With the Same Leadership Situations and their Rankings of Eight Leadership Metaphors. (1994) Directed by Dr. Dale Brubaker. 84 pp.

During the last decade, many school districts in North Carolina became involved in various forms of school-business partnerships. School districts have turned to corporations and other private-sector organizations for technical as well as financial support in many areas of school operations. Curriculum improvement, innovative teaching strategies, and effective managerial and leadership practices are just a few forms of partnerships to emerge over the last several years.

For the most part, school-business partnerships have enjoyed wide-spread private and public support in North Carolina. However, little research has been conducted to determine whether schools and their business benefactors shared the same values, assumptions, and beliefs when they were confronted with the same leadership situations. Research was also lacking to determine whether the two groups shared a common leadership language. This study sought to remedy these deficiencies by examining the following: (1) the leadership styles, ranges, and effectiveness of selected school administrators and business leaders in North Carolina when they were confronted with the same leadership situations, (2) whether significant gender, racial, and area effects were prevalent between the two groups with respect to their leadership styles, ranges, and

effectiveness, and (3) whether selected school administrators and business leaders in North Carolina agreed or disagreed on a common meaning of leadership when expressed in metaphorical terms.

Data were obtained from two questionnaires mailed to a select group of school administrators and business leaders in North Carolina. The questionnaires were mailed to 64 school administrators and 64 business leaders. The results of this study were as follows: (1) There were no significant differences in the leadership styles, ranges, and effectiveness among selected school administrators and business leaders in North Carolina when they are confronted with the same leadership situations and were asked to choose a course of action from among the same situational alternatives. (2) There were no gender, racial, or area (education or business) effects when the two groups were confronted with the same leadership problems and had to choose a course of action from among the same situational alternatives. (3) No common leadership language emerged when the two groups were asked to rank-order the definitions assigned to eight leadership metaphors.



## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This dissertation represents the culmination of a personal journey. A journey which would not have been possible without the guidance and encouragement from others. Many thanks go to my advisor, Dr. Dale Brubaker. He gave me the confidence to pursue this endeavor to the end. To Dr. Lloyd Bond, whom others often confused me with. I wish I had his mind! To Dr. Joseph Bryson, who taught me the true meaning of leadership, and to Dr. Kathleen Casey, whose cool and collective demeanor kept the dream alive. Each of these individuals left a mark on the finished product.

My appreciation is also extended to Ms. Anita Hawkins, Ms. Ann Harman, and Mrs. Jeanette Dean, whose help and encouragement I can never repay.

Special thanks go to my wife and friend, Linda Wharton Coaxum, who put up with the mood swings and growth pains during the course of my studies; to my daughter, Elisa Rene' Coaxum-Boyd, who was but an infant when this journey began. And to my grandsons Christopher Richard and Matthew Thomas Boyd. To my mother, Mrs. Janie N. Jenkins; to my father and step-mother, Mr. Thomas C. and Mrs. Ruthie Reid; to my mother-in-law, Mrs. Ruby Wharton, whose support and encouragement came at the most critical of times; to my step-daughter, Sonya Mechelle McCrae and my step-son, Cedric Demetrius Evans.

Finally, to my late, great-grandmother, Mrs. Annie Elisa Glover, the anchor that has steadied me during turbulence and calm---the mother who always reminded me that one day I would make her proud. This dissertation is dedicated in her honor.

## TABLES OF CONTENTS

	Page
APPROVAL PAGE .....	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS .....	iii
LISTS OF TABLES.....	vii
CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
Statement of the Problem.....	6
Purpose of the Study.....	6
Significance of the Study.....	7
Research Questions.....	7
Conceptual Base.....	8
Definition of Terms.....	10
Limitations of the Study.....	17
Hypotheses.....	18
Organization of the Study.....	19
CHAPTER	
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE.....	20
Introduction.....	20
Effective Leadership Research.....	21
Leadership Language and Metaphors.....	38
CHAPTER	
III. METHODOLOGY OF THE RESEARCH.....	43
Introduction.....	43
The Sample Population.....	43

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

	Page
Selection of Instruments.....	45
Description of Instruments.....	46
Validation of LEAD-Self.....	47
Description of Likert-scale Questionnaire.....	49
Administration of the Instruments.....	50
Treatment of Data.....	53
Hypotheses Testing.....	54
<b>CHAPTER</b>	
<b>IV. PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA.....</b>	<b>61</b>
Introduction.....	56
Test of Hypothesis 1 .....	58
Test of Hypothesis 2.....	61
Test of Hypothesis 3.....	64
Test of Hypothesis 4.....	66
Test of Hypothesis 5.....	67
Test of Hypothseis 6.....	67
<b>CHAPTER</b>	
<b>V. CONCLUSIONS, SUMMARY,     AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....</b>	<b>69</b>
Introduction.....	69
Conclusions.....	70
Summary.....	74
Recommendations.....	76
<b>BIBLIOGRAPHY.....</b>	<b>78</b>

## LIST OF TABLES

	Page
TABLE 1 Survey Response Rate .....	52
TABLE 2 Dominant Leadership Style Among School Administrators and Business Leaders (Gender Effect).....	60
TABLE 3 Dominant Leadership Style Among School Administrators and Business Leaders (Racial Effect).....	63
TABLE 4 Dominant Leadership Style Among School Administrators and Business Leaders (Area Effect).....	65
TABLE 5 Hypotheses Summary Table.....	68

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

Following the publication of A Nation at Risk (U.S. Commission On Excellence in Education 1983), the nation's secondary education system came under considerable scrutiny and criticism. Not since The Coleman Report (1966) has a publication on educational reform sparked as much controversy. It is fair to say that with its militaristic tone, A Nation at Risk had more to do with putting America's public education system back on the national agenda than any other study during the 1980s.

The Commission cited several areas of weakness in America's secondary educational system. One of the major concerns of the Commission was the leadership skills of many secondary school administrators. The Commission warned that many of the nation's secondary school administrators and elected school officials lacked the visionary leadership skills to enact the reforms that were necessary to reverse the growing numbers of "failing schools."

In order to remedy its leadership deficiencies, many states, including North Carolina, sought managerial and leadership expertise from various corporate and private-sector organizations. For the most part, corporate and private-sector leadership support to secondary education in North Carolina came through what is known as school-business "partnerships."

Marriages between schools and business are not new phenomena. In the past, partnerships between corporations, private-sector organizations and schools have been basically one-sided--a case of one side (schools)

with its hand out and the other (business) doling out money and advice. What's different now is the recognition that there can be mutual benefits, (business as well as schools have something to get out of partnerships), and there is the realization that both parties have to make a commitment to working together to meet partnership goals and objectives (Koltnow, 1993).

Superintendents, school boards, principals, and business organizations must be willing and able to embark on partnerships with the belief that one partner should complement the other in achieving what neither can achieve alone (Goodlad, 1978). Core beliefs must be anchored to the notion that the enjoyment of maximum benefit depends on each party's willingness to give up a measure of independence. Unfortunately, the vast majority of school-business partnerships have turned out to be more relationship between a benefactor (not always benign) and beneficiary than a successful partnership in its true sense.

The public relations aspects of most partnerships, especially those with managerial and leadership themes, lead the researcher to conclude that there is wide-spread private and public support. However, no significant research has been identified to shed light on whether those leadership behaviors that are found to be effective in corporate and other private-sector organizations are compatible, and if they are transferable to educational settings. In addition to the lack of behavioral research is the question of a language of leadership. Does a common leadership language exist between schools and their business partners?

When a school and business agree to become partners they go through what Sarason (1972) refers to as the creation of a new setting. In his book The Creation of Settings and The Future Societies, Sarason describes a new setting as the experiences two or more people have when they collaborate to form a new organization. He further theorizes that all settings go through a series of stages. The Before the Beginning Stage of any setting is critical to its success because its very nature will involve prior individual, and/or group values, assumptions, and beliefs about what constitutes effective leadership and how it should be measured. Conflicting ideas and organizational dogmatism from both parties can easily undermine the effectiveness of partnerships even before they are formed.

Successful partnerships become successful because the parties involved share a common vision. According to Bredesen (1987), "The steps that leaders take to articulate their visions are tightly linked to thought processes and bases of experience. Each leader's perceptions are products of diverse aggregates of knowledge, experiences, and understandings of them" (p. 16). Visionary leadership in school-business partnerships can only be realized when participants are guided by a similar constellation of leadership values, assumptions, and beliefs grounded in both a common language and a common meaning system.

Languages of leadership in educational and business settings can and do take on different forms and meanings. A major portion of the language educators and business people speak is deeply rooted in metaphorical



structures that are reflective of, and influential in the meaning of reality. The language of metaphor is not only connected to, but also serve as the conveyor along which individual and group thought processes and bases of experience are transmitted. This is in evidence during, and after the formation of a partnership. Whether an acceptable language of leadership will emerge in a school-business partnership is largely dependent on how participants interprets various symbols, rituals, artifacts, and metaphors (Deal & Kennedy, 1980).

Metaphors can be potent modes of expressions whether they are verbalized openly, expressed symbolically, or hidden in organizational structures such as schools and corporations. The images metaphors reveal tell school-business partnership participants a great deal about how they interpret their organizational roles. This includes how participants conceptualizes schooling and how they put their beliefs and values into practice. It is not so important who controls the language of metaphor. This is not central to its acceptance. What is important is the impact these figures of speech bear to their times.

The language of metaphor can be a unique framework from which school-business partnerships can frame and filter leadership ideas and beliefs. Deconstructing and reconstructing individual and/or group languages of leadership and the metaphors they are grounded in becomes critical elements in successful and meaningful discourse between school and business participants. The process of deconstructing and reconstructing individual and group language systems can also provide greater insight and clarity into those personal dynamics that individuals

and groups divulge to their publics, as well as those ideas and beliefs they prefer to keep to themselves.

Goffman in The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life (1959), suggests that the responses persons get from their audiences are partially a product of the impressions they create---the more favorable the impression, the more positive the response conduct of others, especially their responsive treatment of them. This control is achieved largely by influencing the definition of the situation which others come to formulate, and they can influence this definition by expressing themselves in such a way as to give them the kind of expression that will lead them to act voluntarily in accordance with his own plan. Thus, when an individual appear in the presence of others, there will usually be some reason for him to mobilize his activity so that it will convey an impression to others which it is in his interest to convey (p. 3).

If Goffman's assumptions are correct, then a leader's choice of language(s), along with the interpretations they channel and convey represents major sources of power, as well as potential conflicts to participants in school-business partnerships. When interpreted correctly, the school administrator or business leader can become an effective social architect to the extent that he or she can manage meaning (Bennis & Nanus, 1985).

### Statement of the Problem

The impact of school-business partnerships on the general purposes and needs of public education has been, and continue to be of concern to some (McDowell, 1989). Yet, no significant research has been identified that examined whether participants in school-business partnerships share a common set of values, assumptions, and beliefs concerning how different and sometimes contradictory leadership situations are addressed. Research is also lacking to determine whether or not school administrators and business leaders share and understand a common leadership language system when behavioral themes are grounded in common leadership metaphors.

### Purpose of the Study

The purposes of this study were two-fold. The first purpose was to examine the leadership styles of a select group of school administrators and business leaders in North Carolina to determine whether they shared a similar constellation of leadership values, assumptions, and beliefs as measured by the LEAD-Self questionnaire. The second purpose of this study was to determine whether the same administrators and business leaders shared a common language of leadership as measured by the definitions assigned to eight leadership metaphors.

### Significance of the Study

This study provided needed insight and information into questions concerning how selected school administrators and business leaders in North Carolina perceived their leadership styles, ranges, and effectiveness when they are faced with the same leadership situation and must choose a course of action from among the same situational alternatives. The study also provided needed insight and information into questions concerning whether participants in school-business partnership shared and/or understood a common leadership language which was grounded in selected leadership metaphors.

### Research Questions

This study attempted to answer the following research questions:

1. Will there be a significant gender effect between selected school administrators and business leaders in North Carolina when they were faced with the same leadership situation and had to choose a course of action from among the same alternatives?
2. Will there be a significant racial effect between selected school administrators and business leaders in North Carolina when they were faced with the same leadership situation and had to choose a course of action from among the same situational alternatives?
3. Will there be a significant area effect between selected school administrators and business leaders in North Carolina when they were faced with the same leadership situation and had to choose a course of action from among the same situational alternative?

4. Will the leadership language contained in any single metaphor be agreed upon by a majority of school administrators or business leaders?
5. Will the leadership language in any single metaphor be disagreed upon by a majority of school administrators or business leaders?

### Conceptual Base

According to Fisher (1985), understanding any concept requires something more than a definition; it requires some model or metaphor to guide the way we look at the phenomenon. The metaphor directs what to look for (central features), as well as where to look for it (the locus) and how the features are related with one another.

In order to examine individual and group self-perceived leadership styles, ranges, and effectiveness, Hersey and Blanchard's (1982) LEAD-Self questionnaire was used. The questionnaire measures the effectiveness of four leadership styles based on "task" and "relationship" behaviors of subordinates. In addition to LEAD-Self, a Likert-scale questionnaire was used in which respondents were asked to rank-order selected definitions assigned to eight leadership metaphors.

The LEAD-Self questionnaire consisted of twelve situational alternatives. Each alternative consist of four combinations of task behavior and relationship behaviors. Task behavior is the extent to which a leader is likely to organize and define the role of subordinates, to explain what activities each is to do and when, where, and how the tasks are to be accomplished (Hersey & Blanchard, 1983). Relationship behavior is the extent to which leaders are likely to maintain personal relationship

between themselves and members of their group by opening up channels of communication, providing socio-emotional support, psychological strokes, and facilitating behaviors (p. 96). Individual responses to the twelve task and relationship situational alternatives culminates in a leadership style indicative of one of four patterns of behavior.

The four leadership styles outlined in the situational leadership model are presented in individual quadrants which are curvilinear in design. That is, the leadership style sequence begin at Q1 and moves toward Q4. According to the situational leadership model, the movement from Q1 to Q4 is determined by the maturity level of subordinates. The style a leader gravitates to is dependent upon his or her perceptions of their subordinates' maturity.

According to the situational leadership model, Q1 is a "telling" or S-1 leadership style. It is based on high task and low relationship behaviors. Low relationship behaviors are reflected in one-way communication patterns where the leader tend to avoid supportive behaviors (Hersey & Blanchard, 1983, p. 153). It is assumed that subordinates at this level of maturity lacks the skills and motivation to perform the desired tasks.

As subordinates increases their level of "maturity," the leader moves along the quadrant from Q1 to Q2, or a "selling" (S-2) leadership style. High task and relationship behaviors are used by the leader to reinforce willingness and enthusiasm on the part of subordinates to accomplish tasks. If and when subordinates reaches Q2 quadrant, it is assumed that they are willing and confident to do what the leader asked, but lacks the necessary skills to perform the tasks. Two-way communication is very

important at this stage because the leader expects subordinates to "buy" into certain behaviors.

The third step along the quadrant is Q3, or a "participating" (S-3) leadership style on the part of the leader. The S-3 leadership style is effective when subordinates are able but unwilling to do what the leader wanted. Two-way communication, along with facilitative behaviors are required at this level of subordinates' maturity.

The final quadrant is Q4, or the S-4 leadership style. The S-4 leader is "delegating," and exhibits a style that is low in both task and relationship behaviors. Subordinates at this level are mature enough to have their tasks delegated to them. They are both willing and able to do the tasks and can provide their own reinforcement. The determinants of how, when, and where, are the responsibility of subordinates because the leader gives little support, direction, or encouragement.

### Definition of Terms

For the purpose of this study, the following selected terms were defined:

Language: The particular form or manner of selecting and combining words or characteristics of a person or group, or profession; form or style of expression in word (New World Dictionary, 1989).

Leadership: The process of influencing *the activities of an individual or a group in efforts toward goal achievement in a given situation....*the leadership process is a function of the *leader*, the *follower*, and other situational variables (Hersey & Blanchard, 1972, italics in original).

Leadership Style: The consistent behavior patterns that leaders use when they are working with and through other people as perceived by those people (Hersey & Blanchard, 1982).

LEAD Matrix Summary is a scoring form for the LEAD-Self questionnaire and provides feedback on several key leadership variables (Hersey & Blanchard, 1982).

Primary Style(s) or Basic Style(s) is defined as the quadrant or quadrants in which the respondent have the greatest number of responses (Hersey & Blanchard, 1982).

Secondary Styles(s) or Supporting Style(s) includes any quadrant, other than Primary Style quadrant(s) in which there are two or more responses (Hersey & Blanchard, 1982).

Style Range and Flexibility is the extent to which style can be vary, and is measured by the total number of quadrants in which there are two or more responses. Three or more responses in a quadrant indicates a high degree of flexibility in the use of behaviors in that quadrant. Two responses in a quadrant indicates moderate flexibility. One response in a quadrant is statistically insignificant, and it is difficult to predict flexibility into that style configuration (Hersey & Blanchard, 1982).



Style Adaptability is the degree to which changes in styles are appropriate to the level of readiness of the people involved in different situations. Adaptability scores in the 30 to 36 range are reflective of leaders who have a high degree of adaptability. Scores in the 24 to 30 range reflect a moderate degree of adaptability. If adaptability scores are less than 24 there is a need for self-development to improve the ability to diagnose task readiness and use appropriate leader behaviors (Hersey & Blanchard, 1982).

High Task/Low Relationship Behavior (S-1): A leadership style that focuses on the leader/follower relationship within a "telling" framework. This style of leadership is characterized by one-way communication in which the leader defines the roles of followers and tell them what, how, when, and where to do various tasks (Hersey & Blanchard, 1982).

High Task/High Relationship Behavior (S-2): A leadership style that focuses on the leader/follower relationship within a "selling" framework. This framework is characterized by the leader giving directions to followers with limited two-way communication (Hersey & Blanchard, 1982).

High Relationship/Low Task Behavior (S-3): A leadership style that focuses on the leader/follower relationship within a "participating" framework. This framework is characterized by the leader and followers sharing a role in decision-making through two-way communication. Due to increased levels of maturity of followers, the leader is a facilitator (Hersey & Blanchard, 1982).

Low Task/Low Relationship Behavior (S-4): A leadership style that focuses on the leader/follower relationship within a "delegating" framework. This framework is characterized by the leader giving very little supervision. Followers have limited or maximum autonomy in the decision-making process (Hersey & Blanchard, 1982).

Leadership Effectiveness: The degree to which a leader is able to appropriately vary his or her leadership style to the situation. The effectiveness of a leadership style is contingent upon how well the leader is able to interface with, and react to, the maturity level of followers in a given situation (Hersey & Blanchard, 1982).

Leadership Adaptability: The degree to which a leader is able to vary his or her style based upon the maturity level of subordinates and the requirements of the situation according to situational leadership theory (Hersey & Blanchard, 1982).

Leadership Range: The degree to which a leader is able to vary his or her leadership style. Although some leaders are able to adapt to only one leadership style, others are able to shift between and among the four leadership styles in the Situational Leadership Model. Leadership range is not influenced by the maturity level of subordinates (Hersey & Blanchard, 1982).

Situational Leadership Theory: A theory developed by Paul Hersey and Kenneth Blanchard. It describes leadership as a dynamic process, varying from situation to situation in relation to the leader, followers, and the situation. As the level of maturity increases, the leader should reduce

task relationship behavior and increase relationship behavior (Hersey & Blanchard, 1982).

Relationship Behaviors: The extent to which a leader engages in socio-emotional support, psychological compliments, and facilitating behaviors (Hersey & Blanchard, 1982).

Task Behaviors: The extent to which a leader engages in one-way communication by telling each subordinate what, when, where, and how tasks are to be accomplished (Hersey & Blanchard, 1982).

LEAD-Self Questionnaire: A questionnaire developed by Paul Hersey and Kenneth Blanchard to measure three aspects of leader behavior: (1) Style, (2) Style range, and (3) Style adaptability (Hersey & Blanchard, 1982).

Leadership Metaphor: Those leadership device(s) such as symbols and languages that people use to extend the sense-data that ties them to elements of their reality for the purposes of permitting us to understand and experience one kind of thing in terms of another (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980).

Leadership as "dramatism" metaphor: Leadership is a complex and multifaceted phenomena, with only a few consistent patterns of functional roles. There is a strong possibility that there is a relationship between personality and the taking of a particular role of leadership [act-agent ratio]. Situational demands are different from group to group [act-scene ratio]; therefore, leadership involves wearing many masks which are designed to enhance a leader's front as well as backstage performances (Goffman, 1959; Fisher, 1985).

Leadership as "economics" metaphor: Effective leadership is a form of cost/reward ratio between leader and follower. Each act as an individual in situations in which they weigh the benefits of group membership. If members find the membership sufficiently rewarding to them individually, they will continue that relationship. The relationship between the leader and his or her subordinates must have a credit balance of psychological satisfaction. It must be rewarding in both directions, since both leader and follower must be acting through this relationship to maximize individual [and group] satisfaction (Fisher, 1985).

Leadership as "growth" metaphor: Effective leadership entails providing an environment which allows for maximum growth and development on the parts of subordinates or followers. The effective leader is quick to recognize that while the environmental constructs of the leadership setting is the same for all of his or her followers, individually, their patterns and methods of growth are different. Because of this, all [subordinates or followers] are nurtured with great solicitude, [and the effective leader] makes no attempt to divert the inherent potential of the individual subordinate or follower from his own metamorphosis or development to the whims and desires of the [leader] (Kliebard, 1972, p. 403).

Leadership as "a journey" metaphor: Effective leadership is concerned with taking subordinates or followers to places they have never been before. The leader's role in this journey is that of guide and companion. Effective leaders know that each subordinate or follower will be affected differently on the journey since its effect is at least as much a

function of the predilections, intelligence, interest, and intent of the traveler [subordinate or follower] as it is the contours of the route(s) [they will travel] (Kliebard, 1972, p. 403).

Leadership as "physics" metaphor: Leadership is the exercise of influence. The "physics" metaphor views leadership as a kind of force or source of energy (Fisher, 1985). Leaders direct that force or energy on some object [subordinate or follower]. [Subordinates and followers] then react to the leader's force or energy to accomplish goals and objectives.

Leadership as "psychotherapy" metaphor: Occasionally the leader will be placed in role of therapist or facilitator. Subordinates or followers have problems to solve or goals to achieve, and the leader is the person who assists them. The more the leader helps other members achieve their goals, the more readily will those members follow the leader's suggestions and express satisfaction with his or her conduct (Gibbs, 1969).

Leadership as "production" metaphor: The ultimate goal of effective leadership is the production of a finished product (goal or objective). The effective leader is able to produce a finished product through the output of subordinates/followers. Subordinate or follower output during the "production" process is carefully plotted in advance according to rigorous design specifications, and when certain means of production prove wasteful, they are discarded in favor of more efficient ones (Kliebard, 1972, p. 403).

Leadership as "therapeutic" metaphor: The good leader should be a facilitator, possess considerable empathy, and be able to take on the role of follower if it mean that his or her leadership will be more effective. In

doing so, subordinates/followers will maintain their complementary [therapist-client] relationship with the leader by following the leader's suggestions. It is assumed that if subordinates or followers are "helped" in achieving their goals, they will be satisfied with the leader (Fisher, 1985).

Setting Any instance in which two or more people come together in a new relationship over a sustained period of time in order to achieve certain goals (Sarason, 1972; Brubaker, 1976).

### Limitations of the Study

This study had the following limitations:

1. The subjects used in this study consisted of two primary samples from a selected population of school administrators and business leaders in North Carolina.
2. School administrators consisted of four groups of principals. The four groups included the following: Eight (8) white males, eight (8) black males, eight (8) white females and eight (8) black females.
3. Business leaders also consisted of four groups. The racial and gender makeup were the same as those of educational leaders.
4. The findings and results of this study are limited to the strength of the instruments used.
5. The examination and evaluation are limited to the four leadership styles as predicted by the LEAD-Self questionnaire and respondent's ranking of eight leadership metaphors.

## Hypotheses

This study examined the following hypotheses:

Hypothesis I: There will be no significant gender effect in the perceived leadership styles, ranges, and effectiveness of selected school administrators and business leaders in North Carolina when they are faced with the same leadership situation and are asked to choose a course of action from among the same situational alternatives.

Hypothesis II: There will be no significant racial effect in the perceived leadership styles, ranges, and effectiveness of selected school administrators and business leaders in North Carolina when they are faced with the same leadership situation and are asked to choose a course of action from among the same situational alternatives.

Hypothesis III: There will be no significant area effect (education or business) in the perceived leadership styles, ranges, and effectiveness of selected school administrators and business leaders in North Carolina when they are faced with the same leadership situations and are asked to choose a course of action from among the same situational alternatives.

Hypothesis IV: There will be no significant gender effect between selected school administrators and business leaders in North Carolina regarding a single leadership metaphor which accurately describe their own values, assumptions, and beliefs concerning the best meaning of leadership in metaphorical terms.

Hypotheses V: There will be no significant racial effect between selected school administrators and business leader in North Carolina regarding a single leadership metaphor which accurately describe their

own values, assumptions, and beliefs concerning the best meaning of leadership in metaphorical terms.

Hypothesis VI: There will be no significant area effect (education or business) between selected school administrators and business leaders in North Carolina regarding a single leadership metaphor which accurately describe their own values, assumptions and beliefs concerning the best meaning of leadership in metaphorical terms.

### Organization of the Study

The remainder of this study is divided into four major parts. Chapter II consists of an overview of the pertinent leadership literature leading to the development of the Situational Leadership Model. A review of the of eight leadership metaphors, along with definitions are also included. Chapter III identifies the methodology used in the study. Chapter IV includes the presentation, analysis, and interpretation of the data. Research questions are answered, hypotheses tested, and relationships presented and documented. Chapter V is the concluding chapter, and contain a summary of the results obtained from an analysis of the two questionnaires. The questions that were asked are reviewed and answered. Recommendations for further research involving leadership style questionnaires such as LEAD-Self, and the language of metaphor in various educational settings is formulated.



## CHAPTER II

### RELATED LITERATURE

#### Introduction

In 1983, the U.S. Commission on Excellence in Education (NCEE), cited a number of reform initiatives that had to be accomplished if America was to reverse what they called "a rising tide of mediocrity" in public education. One of the Commission's reform initiatives focused on the effectiveness of school leadership at the secondary level. Although the Commission's critique of secondary school leadership was less than enthusiastic, they noted that their lack of enthusiasm was not tempered by a scarcity of administrators in secondary education, but by a lack of visionary leaders who had the skills and courage to develop and implement the reforms that were needed to transform America's "failing schools" into "effective schools."

In order to address the leadership concerns of the Commission, many school districts throughout North Carolina sought assistance from various corporations and other private-sector organizations. One type of assistance which took on increased significance in the wake of the Commission's report was school-business partnerships. For the most part these partnerships have enjoyed wide-spread education and corporate support, yet, little research has been conducted in order to determine whether they can address and solve the unique and sometimes paradoxical leadership

issues and organizational constraints which confronts leaders in many educational settings.

While the publicly stated rationale for corporate support of secondary education was often mired in dense terminology, it was apparent that the primary reasons why many corporations and other private and public organizations supported the nation's public schools was the growing awareness that there was a connection between good schools and a prosperous economy, and the shortage of entry-level employees with sufficient job skills to meet the economic and social challenges of the 21st Century.

Many school administrators actively sought corporate and other private-sector leadership support. There is nothing wrong with administrators doing so. What is important is that administrators know beforehand whether or not the successful leadership performances and strategies they are seeking are applicable to their own culturally, socially, and economically diverse educational settings.

### Effective Leadership Research

From a historical perspective, the first and perhaps most common approach for studying leadership effectiveness in various settings was by isolating and training individuals who possessed certain leadership traits. Early researchers such as Halpin (1956), believed that certain traits or qualities gave a person an existing capacity to lead. Leadership was seen as a natural endowment; it could not be created. There are extremes to the theory. One states that there are born leaders, the rest of us are followers.

The other extreme is that everyone is a leader and that he/she leads in different ways (Baugher, 1986). Some (Jago, 1982) believe that individuals who possess outstanding intelligence, personal initiative, honesty and physical stature could through training and development become effective leaders. The Myers-Briggs Personality Type Indicators is based on this premise.

Although the notion that trait analysis could be used to predict one's leadership effectiveness was deeply rooted in biology as well as the group process and human potential movements, as a measure of leadership effectiveness, it yielded very few consistent findings (Bennis, 1977). A review of the salient literature from the last fifty years did not produce a single personality trait or set of qualities that could be used to separate effective leaders from noneffective leaders (Fiedler, 1967). According to Gibbs (1969), a major obstacle confronting many early trait theorists has been the lack of a universally accepted set of criterion to guide researchers in measuring "effectiveness." Gibbs also noted that no meaningful framework emerged for measuring leadership effectiveness because researchers not only disagreed on the applicable criterion to be used, but that:

Evaluations may be in terms of ratings by extra-group observers of the individual and group performances and of individual group-relations, or in terms of self-appraisals by leaders themselves [but] correlations between the different forms of criteria measure are not high because of unreliable and extraneous factors (p. 238).

Ralph Stogdill (1948), a distinguished leadership researcher for more than forty years also contended that his research produced little evidence

that traits and the capacity to lead effectively were systematically related. The most effective leaders appear to exhibit a degree of versatility and flexibility that enables them to adapt their behavior to the changing and contradictory demands made on them. (Stogdill, 1974). Stogdill suggested that:

A person does not become a leader by virtue of the possession of some combination of traits, but the pattern of personal characteristics of the leaders must bear some relevant relationship to the characteristics, activities, and goals of the followers. Thus, leadership must be conceived in terms of the interaction of variables which are in constant flux and change (p. 431).

James Owen (1981) shared many of Stogdill's sentiments and also concluded that there was no scientific evidence to support the notion that relationships existed between personal traits and effective leadership. He suggested the following: (1) no systematic relationship between personal traits and leadership has been established, (2) at least part of the inability to establish a clearer body of evidence lies in problems of research methodology, and (3) the situation in which leadership is attempted is probably at least as influential as the personal traits of the leaders themselves.

The lack of solid scientific evidence supporting trait theory may be because most leadership "theories" are, at this point, sets of empirical generalizations and have not developed into scientifically testable theories (Hersey & Blanchard, 1982). This does not make them "wrong," merely that they have not been supported.

The inability to find traits and develop standardized criterion for measuring leadership effectiveness led researchers to shift the effective versus noneffective leadership discourse from a single factor to a two-factor paradigm. The Bureau of Business Research at Ohio State University conducted the first comprehensive leadership studies in which the emphasis was shifted from what made a person a leader to what a person did as a leader. The goal of the Ohio State studies was to identify various dimensions of leader behavior (Stogdill, 1978).

Researchers at Ohio State were successful in narrowing the description of leader behavior from the single trait framework into two dimensions: Initiating Structure and Consideration. Researchers defined Initiating Structure as the leader's behavior in delineating the relationship between himself and members of the work group and in endeavoring to establish well-defined patterns of organization, channels of communication and methods of procedure. Consideration was defined as behavior centering of friendship, mutual trust, respect, and warmth in the relationship between the leader and members of his staff (Halpin, 1959, p. 4). A crucial break-through in the two-dimensional approach to leadership behavior occurred with the discovery that the two dimensions were not mutually exclusive (Wren, 1979).

The Ohio State Leadership Studies produced the first form of the Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ) (Halpin, 1956). The questionnaire was used to gather data about the leader behavior and describe how leaders carried out their activities (Cartwright & Zander, 1960). The questionnaire consisted of fifteen questions concerning

initiating structure and fifteen concerning consideration. Respondents (subordinates) were asked judge the frequency with which their leader engages in a particular form of behavior by checking one of five descriptions--always, often, occasionally, seldom, or never (Hersey & Blanchard, 1982). Through factor analysis techniques of the items intercorrelation, a determination could be made of the smallest number of dimensional descriptors subordinates use to describe their leader's behavior. These descriptors were compared with the individual leader's perceptions of his or her behavior with the aid of the Leadership Opinion Questionnaire (LOQ).

The LBDQ Questionnaire was first used in military applications (Halpin & Winer, 1952). Commanders who were rated high on initiating structure and consideration were evaluated high in overall effectiveness as judged by their superior officers. Other studies found that crew members not only preferred commanders who were considerate, but also knew their jobs and could provide clear plans and structures. In weighing the two dimensions, the commanders' superiors placed relatively more value on initiating structure, while the crews placed an equal value on consideration (Halpin, 1966, pp. 91-94). The same LBDQ studies found that military supervisors provided higher structure and consideration than their civilian counterparts (Holoman, 1967).

In addition to military applications, the LBDQ questionnaire was used to effectively measure leadership behaviors in educational settings (Hemphill, 1955). The questionnaire was first used in an educational setting at a small liberal arts college to examine leader behavior in various

departments. The study found that departments with above-average reputations were consistently led by chairpersons who scored high on both initiating structure and consideration dimensions (p. 396).

In another study, the LBDQ questionnaire was used to examine dimensions of initiating structure and consideration with reference to the leadership behaviors of selected school superintendents (Halpin, 1956). In his examination, Halpin defined initiating structure as the school superintendent's "behavior in delineating relationships between himself and the members of his work group, and in endeavoring to establish well-defined patterns of organization, channels of communication, and methods of procedures" (p. 4). Consideration referred to school superintendent's behavior and was "indicative of friendship, mutual trust, respect, and warmth in the relationship between the leader and the members of his staff" (p. 4). Halpin further noted that effective or desirable leadership behaviors were characterized by high scores on both initiating structures (goal achievement) and consideration (group maintenance). From the perspective of superintendents, staff members, and school board members, the ideal superintendent was one who scored high on both initiating structure and consideration dimensions. Additional research supported Halpin's earlier finding that there was a positive correlation between teacher satisfaction and the initiating structure and consideration behaviors of their respective principals (Fast, 1964).

Leaders who exhibits high levels of effective performance places primary attention on the human dimension aspects of their subordinates' problems while building effective work groups with high performance

expectations. Task-oriented managers generally assume leadership behaviors centering on the task, definition of subordinates' role and input, and performance evaluation, while employee-oriented leaders are considered to be friendlier, more supportive, and more concerned for the welfare of subordinates.

Extensive leadership research was also conducted at the Survey Research Center at the University of Michigan. The focus of the Michigan studies was on finding characteristics that related to each other and various forms of leadership effectiveness. The studies identified two concepts, employee orientation and production orientation (Hersey & Blanchard, 1982).

Rensis Likert (1961) expanded the "two-factor" model from the Michigan studies to "four factors." Likert's "four-factor" research defined the organizational structure, principles, and methods, which provided the best worker performance. Likert found that supervisors who were considered to be "employee-centered" had the best records of performance, and focused their attention on the human aspects of their subordinates' problems and on endeavoring to build effective work groups with high performance goals (p. 6). By comparison, "job-centered" supervisors placed primary attention on "getting the job done" and were likely to have low-producing sections (p. 6). Likert based his conclusions on data obtained from observing seven high-producing sections in industry. Six of the seven sections were supervised by employee-centered supervisors. Only one of the seven was supervised by a job-centered supervisor, and of the ten low-producing sections, only three were



supervised by employee-centered supervisors. Seven of the low-producing units were supervised by job-centered supervisors (p. 7).

Although the Ohio State and University of Michigan studies were successful in advancing the two-factor model of effective leadership, follow-up studies could not replicate many earlier findings (Stogdill, 1971). Critics complained that insufficient empirical data was found to prove that correlations existed between key variables such as consideration, structure, job satisfaction, and performance.

Korman (1966) attempted to review all research that examined the relationships between the Ohio State and University of Michigan studies. After more than twenty-five studies were reviewed Korman made the following observations:

Despite the fact that consideration and initiating structure have become almost by-words in American industrial psychology, it seems apparent that very little is now known as to how the variables may predict work group performance and the condition which affect such predictions. At the current time, we cannot even say whether they have any predictive significance at all (p. 360).

In a study conducted in an industrial setting in Nigeria, researchers found that a single ideal or normative style of leader behavior was unrealistic because it did not take into account cultural differences, level of education, standard of living, or industrial experience (Hersey, 1965).

Measuring effective versus noneffective leadership variables in organizational structures was the focus of a highly complex set of analyses called Systems 4. Systems 4 focused on four leadership factors: exploitative authoritative, benevolent authoritative, consultative, and

participative. The closer an organization's leadership style approached System 4, the more likely it had a continuous record of high productivity. The closer to System 1, the more likely there was a sustained record of low productivity (Hersey & Blanchard, 1982).

System 1 is a task-oriented, highly structured authoritarian management style. System 4 is a relationship-oriented management style based on teamwork, mutual trust, and confidence. System 2 and 3 are intermediate stages between the two extremes (Hersey & Blanchard, 1982, p. 96). System 4 was designed for organizations attempting to decide upon the best methods for setting goals and objectives. Although Systems 4 was classified as a predictor of leadership behavior, the four variables were treated as reference points for measuring leadership effectiveness.

The Managerial Grid was developed by Blake and Mouton (1964) within and response to the organizational development movement. The Grid was designed to clarify some of the findings from two-factor research. Blake and Mouton's most significant clarification focused on inconsistencies growing out of studies that claimed there was insufficient proof that a positive correlation existed between high morale and high production.

In order differentiate the Grid from earlier two-factor models, Blake and Mouton substituted initiating structure and consideration dimensions with task accomplishment and personal relationships dimensions. Five different types of leadership behaviors based on concern for production (task) and a concern for people (relationship). were established. The five types of leadership are located in four quadrants and are described

as follows:

1. (1,1) Impoverished Management--exertion of minimum effort to get required work done is appropriate to sustain organization membership (Blake & Mouton 1982).
2. (1,9) Country Club Management--thoughtful attention to the needs of people for satisfying relationships leads to comfortable, friendly organizational atmosphere and work tempo (Blake & Mouton, 1982).
3. (9,1) Task Management--adequate organization performance is possible through balancing the necessity to get the work out while maintaining morale of people at a satisfactory level (Blake & Mouton, 1982).
4. (5,5) Middle of the Road Management--adequate organization performance is possible through balancing the necessity to get out the work while maintaining morale of people at a satisfactory level (Hersey & Blanchard, 1982).
5. (9,9) Team Management--work accomplishments is from committed people; interdependence through a "common stake" in organization's purpose leads to relationships of trust and respect (Blake, 1964).

It has been argued that the Managerial Grid is an attitudinal model that measures values and feelings rather than behavioral concepts (Hersey & Blanchard, 1982). However, Burke (1980) responded to this argument in the following manner:

The best way to lead is to emphasize task accomplishment and relationship behavior equally...The weight of recent evidence support their [Blake & Mouton's] contention. The evidence strongly suggest that both tasks and relationship are of equal importance regardless of the situation (p. 56).

Tannenbaum and Schmidt's (1957) Continuum of Leaders Behavior was one of the most significant situational approaches to effective leadership style. Their model focused on a continuum of alternatives

available to the leader. Tannenbaum and Schmidt suggested that a wide variety of alternatives existed along the continuum. They contend that at least four internal factors are responsible for leadership style: (1) factors about the leader, factors about subordinates, (2) factors about the situation, and (3) priority of organizational goals. Tannenbaum and Schmidt noted that the factors were interdependent and suggested that the following strategies should be considered by leaders when making decisions:

1. Leaders make decisions and subordinates adhere to them.
2. Leaders should adopt a "selling" approach in order to ease subordinate acceptance.
3. Leaders decisions should be tentative, with emphasis on subordinate feedback.
4. Leaders decisions should be subject to change after followers' input.
5. Problem-solving should be in consultation with subordinates.
6. Leaders should allow subordinates to make decisions with defined organizational constraints.
7. Leaders and followers jointly make decisions within limit defined by organizational constraints (Tannenbaum & Schmidt, 1958, p. 173).

Zaleznik (1966) expanded the ranges of the two-factor and situational leadership models by focusing on factors relating to the leader's personality as primary dimensions(s) contributing to his or her behavior. According to Zaleznik, there are three types of leaders, each of which is predisposed to a certain leadership style. The persons-oriented leader

attempts to keep the organization functioning in an orderly and harmonious manner, while the task-oriented leader is mainly concerned with task completion. The fusion-oriented leader attempts to bring all organizational resources together to reach stated goals and objectives.

Fiedler's (1967) Contingency Theory of Leadership is the most widely researched and criticized leadership model to date. Contingency Theory examined situational variables to determine which leader style was likely to be more effective in a particular situation (Bass, 1981; Owen, 1987). Fiedler and Chemers (1984) suggested that three major situational variables determined whether a given situation was favorable to leaders. Fiedler (1975) predicted that the leader's assumptions about the conditions which influenced certain variables resulted in a task-oriented or people-oriented leadership style. According to Fiedler, leadership style is based on the following situational variables:

1. Leader - follower relations (good vs. poor).
2. Task structure - goal clarity, difficulty, and predictability (high vs. low).
3. Leader position power - level of authority and degree to which punishment and reward is available (strong vs. weak).

Fiedler believed that position power, or the amount of potential control and influence a leader had over his or her followers was the least important of the three conditions.

A favorable situation (high degree of control) occurred when leaders felt their decisions and actions had predictable results, and achieved

desired outcomes. An unfavorable situation occurred whenever a leader was disliked by his/her followers. Disfavor occurred whenever the leader was prone to unclear tasks and structure, or lacked positional power.

In order to measure the effectiveness of leadership styles in various situations, Fiedler developed two instruments: (1) the "esteem for the Least Preferred Co-worker," (LPC) and, (2) the Assumed Similarities of Opposites (ASO). The LPC asked respondents to think of a leader whom they have sustained the least favorable cooperation during their lifetime. The leader is then rated on a number of bipolar adjective scales such as friendly-unfriendly, helpful-frustrating, supportive-hostile, and quarrelsome-harmonious. The lower the leader's score on the LPC, the more task-oriented he or she is assumed to be. A high score is considered positive, and shows a greater relationship orientation. Contingency theory grew out of Fiedler's concerns about various perceptions within groups, and how possible errors in perceptions about each other affected group performance.

Although most contingency models are extensions of Fiedler's contingency theory, all have not been universally accepted as scientific modes of inquiry for conducting leadership research. Critics claim that there is limited verification of the content validity of the LPC Questionnaire. Some (Graen, Orris, & Alvares, 1971), argues that the point-predictions of the model are not very interpretable because the variance of correlations within octants are often without an apparent central clustering of values. Others maintains that when relevant studies were critically examined, and a distinction drawn between those that

constituted adequate test of the model and those that did not, the results were far from encouraging.

Strube and Garcia (1981) conducted a meta-analysis examination of the contingency model and concluded that even though the inferences from Fiedler's model were regarded as highly tentative, enough satisfactory empirical evidence existed to warrant continued examination of the model.

One of the most popular models to emerge after contingency's theory was Reddin's 3-D Theory (1970). His theory was the first to add an effectiveness dimension to the task concern and relationship concern dimensions of earlier attitudinal models such as the Managerial Grid (1967). Reddin warned that there was no evidence to prove that one leadership style was more effective than another. He further suggested that the difference between effective and ineffective leadership style is often not the actual behavior of the leader, but the appropriateness of his behavior to the environment in which it is used. (Hersey & Blanchard, 1982).

Reddin theorized that all leadership styles originated from a constellation of behaviors encompassing four basic managerial styles: integrated, dedicated, related, and separated. Any one of the four styles could be effective, or ineffective under certain conditions. Reddin recommended that management training incorporate a range of styles, and experiment with various strategies to formulate the best leadership style.

Another widely accepted leadership model was the Path-Goal model (Evans, House, 1974; House & Mitchell, 1974). The Path-Goal model built upon the two concepts developed at Ohio State and was strongly influenced by motivational factors and expectancy theory. An assumption guiding the model was leaders are effective because they positively influence the motivational needs of their followers (Mitchell, 1974). If leaders are to improve their leadership effectiveness they must clarify organizational paths which can lead to goals valued by followers. By increasing the personal rewards to followers for goal attainment, and making the path to such rewards easier to attain through clarity of purpose, organizational goals would be completed by more motivated workers.

According to the Path-Goal model it is the leader's responsibility to provide followers with appropriate guidance and motivation to accomplish desired goals based upon applicable situational factors. The model represented a somewhat common sense approach to the study of leadership behavior, however, it was extremely complex, and research results are not conclusive (Bass, 1981, Jago & Vroom, 1982).

Victor Vroom (1964) also built upon earlier contingency theories by formulating a decision-making model. His VIE model was grounded in expectancy theory, and was driven by three major concepts: valence, instrumentality, and expectancy. Valence was the strength of a person's preference for a particular outcome. Instrumentality was "first-level" or "second-level" outcomes. Both outcomes imply that people do not necessarily view the rewards from exceptional performance as an end



in themselves. For example, a substantial raise is not only viewed as increased income, but also the potential for a better life style. Based upon the results of the first two outcomes, expectancy is the reality of performing a given task and the valued outcome derived from its completion.

Victor Vroom and Phillip Yetton (1973) developed a normative model of leadership in which guidelines on how decisions ought to be made in given situations were outlined. Their model was similar to the managerial decision-tree framework, and predicted that there are prescriptive approaches to leader behavior. The effectiveness of an organization's decisions are viewed as "joint functions of situational variables expressed as problem attributes, and leader behavior is expressed as processes for making decision" (p. 204). The model consisted of the following seven managerial guidelines, or questions which should be answered by individuals prior to choosing a leadership style:

1. Does it have a quality requirement such that one solution is likely to be more irrational than another?
2. Does the manager have enough information to make a high quality decision?
3. Is the problem structured?
4. Is subordinate acceptance of the decision critical to effective implementation?
5. If the manager make a decision, is he or she reasonably certain that subordinates will accept it?
6. Do subordinates share organizational goals to be obtained in solving the problem?

7. Is there likely to be conflict among subordinates regarding preferred solutions?

A leader's responses to the seven situational questions led one along a decision-tree format (Cribbin, 1981). The format was designed to provide the leader with choices involving the most appropriate decision making style for the situation. The three decision-making leadership styles are: autocratic, consultative, and participative (p. 24).

Hersey and Blanchard's (1970) Situational Leadership Model is an extension of their earlier Tri-Dimensional Leadership Effectiveness Model and describes concepts similar to those from the Ohio State leadership studies. The concepts are based on adaptive behaviors of leaders and the maturity levels of their followers in various situations. The model was designed to be used exclusively with leader behaviors as they related to subordinates' level of maturity in task completion.

The situational leadership model focuses on four types of task autonomy of subordinates: (S-1) high task/low relationship, (S-2) high task/high relationship, (S-3) low task/high relationship, and (S-4) low task/low relationship. Task autonomy is concerned with two kinds of maturity: Job maturity and Psychological Maturity. Job maturity is the follower's competence, achievement-motivation, and willingness to assume the responsibility of an individual or group. Psychological maturity refer to factors underlying follower's self-concept.

The situational model predicted that as the follower's level of maturity increased, the leader will be able to reduce task behaviors and

focus more on relationship behaviors. As followers further matured, the leader should be able to reduce both task behaviors and relationship behaviors. It was assumed that as the maturity of the group continued to increase in terms of accomplishment of specific tasks, the leader could reduce his/her task behavior until the group reached a moderate level of maturity.

Hersey and Blanchard's Leadership Effectiveness and Adaptability Description (LEAD Questionnaire) was a product of their Situational Leadership Model. The questionnaire is used almost exclusively in leadership development programs in educational and business settings. Fiedler (1965) suggests that when using the questionnaire it should be made clear that leadership behavior, like many other behaviors, may be difficult to change and the list of situational variables to be considered are potentially infinite.

### Leadership Language and Metaphors

A review of the salient literature produced considerable evidence to conclude that there is a growing interest in how metaphor impact, shape, and guide educational and business organizational life. According to Kliebard, (1972) there are two assumptions about metaphor that should be made clear. The first assumption is that metaphor represents a fundamental vehicle of human thought, and "we need to get rid of the common-sense idea that metaphor presents a mere ornament to speech and writing [which] is irrelevant or incidental to the task of clarifying

and conveying meaning" (p. 13). The second assumption is in the process of performing their function in thought, metaphors are no more infallible routes to truth and righteousness than they are necessarily treacherous side roads that are irrelevant or an impediment to straightforward and logical thought (p. 13).

Lakeoff and Johnson (1980) believe that metaphors are useful organizers and analytical tools for examining the fundamental values in a culture "which will be coherent with the metaphorical structure of the most fundamental concepts in the culture." (p. 22). Metaphors can be rich and powerfully evocative languages of leadership. This is important because language is our means to communicate direct experience, meaning, and understanding. It is important to analyze which metaphors and symbols underlie and communicate individual experiences, perceptions and behaviors in those social organizations called schools (Bredeson, 1985). Emerging language systems which integrates factors leading to leadership effectiveness in schools and businesses can encounter variations in meanings and intended effects. Whenever variations do occur they are likely to be muddled by constricted uses of jargons and metaphors.

Individual and group language systems in school and business partnership arrangements, along with the metaphors they are likely to generate can detract from, rather than add to an emerging organizational synergism. It is important that participants in school and business partnerships consider the crucial links and uses of leadership language

and metaphors in their respective organizational cultures, and how metaphors impact the emerging cultures they are attempting to create. A new school-business partnership produces a new culture, and leadership synergism may be threatened by the nature of the phenomena itself.

According to Bredeson (1985), leadership is the exercise of influence, and the choice of metaphor is a source of power for leaders. The symbols a leader uses to stir the emotions, consciousness, energies, and loyalties of others are applications of vision as a skill used to create "the appropriate analog (thence symbol) of the appropriate object at the appropriate time" (Langer, 1953). Symbols are at the heart of what Goffman (1959) call manners. Goffman defined such manners as:

Systems of courtesy and etiquette [that] can also be viewed as forms of insurance against 'fatefulness' [losing face], this time in connection with the personal offense that one individual can inadvertently give another...The safe management of face-to-face interaction is especially dependent on this means of control (p. 176).

Most leaders either knowingly or unknowingly draw upon and use metaphor as alternate lens whenever they are attempting to frame and filter meanings, messages, and assumptions through the communication process. Goffman noted that such actions may be found in "the ultimate behavioral materials [such as] glances, gestures, positioning and verbal statements that people continually feed into the situation, whether intended or not" (p. 1).

Metaphors that guide and frame school-business leadership communication processes can be clouded in the mysteries of the two

organization's language and behavioral systems. Metaphor can become the mystery in language and therefore, powerful and provocative channels of power and sources of leadership. This is true not only because they can serve as clarifiers, but because they also have the potential to distort literal and habitual meanings that make evident previously unnoticed relations or similarities (Cinnamond, 1987).

The use of leadership as metaphor entails not only what it is, but also what it is not (Brent-Madison, 1979). Metaphor do more than just point out and clarify pre-existing reality. In addition to providing distinctive lens for viewing, describing, and helping us to understand social phenomena, metaphor help to create new realities, new concepts, and indeed, new ways of viewing the same phenomena (Bredeson, 1987, p. 9). It is imperative that school-business partnership participants consider the importance of language and its metaphorical meaning(s) when analyzing and solving leadership problems because language represent a conveyor along which thought processes of organizational life are carried. Metaphor consists of those devices that permit us to understand and experience one kind of thing in terms of another (Lakeoff & Johnson, 1980).

Leadership discourse between and among school-business partnership participants should be based on commonalties surrounding the meanings and intentions of leadership behaviors that are grounded in the language of metaphor. Metaphors enhance opportunities by suggesting hypotheses, presenting alternative lens and angles through which researchers can study particular phenomena; offering a means of

schematizing insight; providing labels for data and observation; and, establishing a basis for more formal theoretical constructs" (pp. 25-26).

## CHAPTER III

### METHODOLOGY OF THE RESEARCH

#### Introduction

This study examined the leadership styles, ranges, and effectiveness of selected school administrators and business leaders in North Carolina to determine whether or not significant gender, racial, or area effects were prevalent, and whether or not the two groups agreed or disagreed on a common language of leadership when asked to rank the definitions assigned to eight leadership metaphors. In order to answer these questions, a mailed survey methodology was chosen. The survey consisted of four phases: (1) selecting the sample population, (2) selecting the questionnaires, (3) administering the questionnaires, and (4) collecting and analyzing the data.

#### The Sample Population

In order to obtain a random sample of school administrators in North Carolina who are potential participants in school-business partnerships, the Institute of Government at the University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill was contacted. The Institute provided a mailing list of all school administrators who participated in the North Carolina Principals' Executive Program (PEP) during the 1991-1992 session. The list consisted of 345 names, along with each participant's school address. The 1992-1993 edition of the North Carolina Education Directory was checked for changes and deletions in



order to insure that the addresses provided by the Institute were still current.

The mailing list provided by the Institute of Government did not include certain demographic data such as age, race, years of experience, and highest degree earned. Since this information was crucial to the completion of the study, an addendum was attached to the Likert-scale questionnaire as part of the data-gathering process. In order to determine the race of PEP participants, telephone calls were made to several black and white colleagues who were members of the 1991-1992 class. The necessary information was obtained and a list of blacks who participated in the program was developed. The original list provided by the Institute of Government was then used to develop four separate groups of school administrators based on race and gender. A table of random numbers was then used to identify and randomly select sixteen school administrators from each of the four groups (white males, white females, black males, and black females).

Two sources were used to obtain a random sample of business leaders in North Carolina. The first source was the 1993 North Carolina Directory of Minority Businesses. The directory did not contain all black businesses in North Carolina. Many smaller firms were not listed in the directory for various reasons. In order to eliminate the smaller firms who were listed, only those firms with ten or more employees were selected for inclusion in the study. A table of random numbers was used to identify and randomly select sixteen (16) black male and sixteen (16) black female business leaders.

In order to obtain a sample of white male and female business leaders, the Forsyth County Library was contacted and a printout of North Carolina businesses was obtained. The size and scope of this printout made it difficult to consider all businesses. Therefore, only those firms whose payroll consisted of more than one hundred employees were considered. A table of random numbers was used to identify and randomly select seventeen (17) white males and seventeen (17) white females for the study.

### Selection of Instruments

Paul Hersey and Kenneth Blanchard's LEAD-Self (1982) questionnaire was one of two instruments used to gather data for this study. The questionnaire was designed to measure three aspects of leaders behavior: (1) style, (2) style range, and (3) style adaptability. A leader's style when measured by the LEAD-Self questionnaire, is one of perception. That is, how a leader thinks he or she behaves as a leader in certain situations. Most leaders have one dominant style and at least one backup style. A leader's range or flexibility measures the extent to which he or he is able to vary his or her leadership style, while style adaptability is the degree to which a leader is able to vary his or her behavior based upon situational conditions.

The second instrument used in this study is a Likert-scale questionnaire. This instrument was designed to allow school administrators and business leaders to rank the definitions assigned to eight leadership metaphors. The purpose of the rankings was to determine

whether or not the two groups agreed or disagreed on a common definition of leadership in metaphorical terms.

### Description of Instruments

The Leadership Effectiveness and Adaptability Description (LEAD-Self) questionnaire was developed by Paul Hersey and Kenneth Blanchard (1981) at the Center for Leadership Studies, Ohio State University. It was first known as the Leader Adaptability and Style Inventory (LASI). In addition to measuring three aspects of leader behavior, the questionnaire also measures four ipsative style scores and one normative adaptability (effectiveness) score. The ipsative score describes the level of one situational variable in relation to another, and focuses on individual differences while the normative score focuses on differences between individuals.

The LEAD-Self questionnaire was designed to measure leader behaviors in twelve leadership situations. The questionnaire asks users to assume that they are faced with each of the twelve situations and must select a course of action from among four situational alternatives. The alternative selected (1, 2, 3, or 4) represents an individual's perceived behavior in that particular situation. Individual scores are tabulated according to the guidelines provided by the developers and converted into a leadership style scores between S-1 and S-4.

Leadership styles as measured by LEAD-Self is based on a curvilinear sequence which begins at Q1 and ends at Q4. The sequence depicts the interaction between the four styles of leadership and four

levels of task maturity of followers. A brief description of the four leadership styles are as follows:

1. High task/low relationship (S-1) - Considered to be a "telling" leadership style; the leader exhibits strong directive behavior with less mature followers.
2. High task/high relationship (S-2) - Considered to be a "selling" leadership style; directive behavior is still in evidence, however, the leader now exhibits more supportive behavior in order to reinforce willingness and enthusiasm among more mature followers.
3. High relationship/low task (S-3) - Considered to be a "participating" leadership style; the follower is now capable, but is either unwilling or lacks the confidence to complete the task. The leader is now more participative and supportive.
4. Low relationship/low task (S-4) - Considered to be a "delegating" leadership style; the leader provides little support and direction to facilitate task completion. Followers are now at their highest maturity level.

#### Validation of LEAD-Self Instrument

Although the salient literature shows that a considerable amount of research has been conducted to test the validity of the LEAD-Self questionnaire, the results thus far are mixed (Boucher, 1980; Fish, 1981; Walter, Caldwell, & Marsh, 1980; Gwogulwong, 1981, & Hersey, Angelini, & Carakushanky, 1982). The only two data standardization studies in which the LEAD-Self was measured were conducted by the

developers Paul Hersey and Kenneth Blanchard (1982), and another by John F. Green (1980).

Standardization consisted of responses from two hundred sixty-four managers, constituting a North American sample. The managers ranged in age from twenty-one to sixty four; 30 percent were at the entry level of management; 55 percent were middle managers; 14 percent were at the high level of management.

The following information regarding the validity of the LEAD-Self questionnaire was summarize by John F. Green (1980):

The twelve-items validates for the adaptability scores ranged from .11 to .52, and ten of the twelve coefficients (83) percent were .25 or higher. Eleven coefficients were significant beyond the .01 level and one was significant at the .05 level. Each response option met the operationally defined criteria of less than 80 percent with respect to selection frequency. The stability of the LEAD-Self was moderately strong. In two administration across a six-week interval, 75 percent of the managers maintained their dominant style, and 71 percent maintained their alternative style. The contingency coefficients were both .71 and each was significant ( $p < .01$ ). The correlation for the adaptability scores was .69 ( $p < .01$ ). The LEAD-Self scores remained relatively stable across time, and the user may rely upon the results as consistent measures. (No Page).

The logical validity of the scale was clearly established. Face validity was based on a review of the items and content validity emanated from the procedures used to create the original set of items. The LEAD-Self scores remained relatively stable across time, and the user may rely on the results as consistent measures.

Several empirical studies have also been conducted utilizing the LEAD-Self. As hypothesized, correlations with the demographic/organismic variables of sex, age, years of experience, degree and management level were generally low, indicating the relative independence of the scales with respect to these variables.

Satisfactory results were reported supporting the four style dimensions of the scale using a modified approach to factor structure.

In forty-six of the forty-eight item options (96) percent, the expected relationship was found. In another study, a significant correlation of .67 was found between the adaptability scores of the managers and the independent ratings of their supervisors. Based upon these findings, the LEAD-Self is deemed to be an empirically sound instrument. (No Page).

### Description of Likert-scale Questionnaire

During the last decade there has been increased interest in examining the role metaphor play in organizational processes. The interest in metaphor as a research construct has not been confined to private-sector organizations, but also schools. Metaphors can become strong influences in shaping beliefs, attitudes, and values as well as guiding other aspects of school organization, leadership, and operations (Sergiovanni (1980).

Fisher (1985) postulated that there are three factors common to all metaphors used in understanding leadership: (1) social influence, (2) goal achievement, and (3) communication. Although all of the factors are interconnected, only one can be accomplished without the aid of the others. Exactly how and why social influence and goal achievement are inextricably dependent on the act of communication can only be understood when the definitional statements of the two are deconstructed and reconstructed into recognizable metaphors in school and business leadership discourse.

The Likert-scale questionnaire requested that participants rank-order eight leadership metaphors with respect to their level of agreement or disagreement with the definitions assigned to each. Leadership metaphors were ranked on a scale between one and eight. A rank of one indicated that an individual agreed with the values, assumptions, and beliefs contained in that definition of leadership from a metaphorical perspective. Conversely, a rank of eight indicated that an individual disagreed with the values, assumptions, and beliefs contained in that definition of leadership in metaphorical terms.

#### Administration of the Instruments

The LEAD-Self instruments were purchased from Pfiffer and Company, San Diego, California. The Likert-scale questionnaire was developed by the researcher. A copy of both instruments, cover letters explaining the nature and purpose of the research, and a self-addressed stamped envelope were inserted into a large envelope, which comprised the survey package. Attached to the Likert-scale instrument was an addendum consisting of the codes for each subject's area (education-business), race, sex, number of years in current position, and level of education. The codes and referents were maintained by the researcher. Neither of the two questionnaires identified respondents or their responses. This was done to insure anonymity of the respondent as well as to enable the researcher to monitor the return rate of instruments.

The survey package was mailed to sixty-four (64) school administrators and sixty-four (64) business leaders in North Carolina. Each returned instrument was examined by the researcher to insure that it was completed correctly. If the demographic data requirements were not completed, the instrument was not included in the survey. Only one instrument was eliminated for this reason (respondent failed to give age). After carefully examining each response, individual responses were transferred to a master list. Table 1 gives a summary of the survey results for the two groups.



Table 1.

Survey Response Rate

	<u>No. Surveyed</u>	<u>Responses</u>	<u>Response Rate</u>
<u>School Admin. (Total)</u>	64	40	63%
School Admin. (Gender)			
Males	32	21	66%
Females	32	19	59%
School Admin. (Race)			
Whites	32	21	66%
Blacks	32	19	59%
Business Leaders (Total)	64	38	59%
Business Leaders (Gender)			
Males	32	19	69%
Females	32	23	72%
Business Leaders (Race)			
Whites	32	16	50%
Blacks	32	18	56%

### Treatment of Data

Standard statistical procedures were used in the treatment of the data. The data are reported using both narrative and statistical formats. Tables and graphs are included where appropriate.

A data file was created from the master list, and appropriate computer programs were written. The analyses were performed with the University of North Carolina at Greensboro's SAS System. The various sources of information from both questionnaire were grouped into three classifications based on area (education and business), race, and sex. The dominant and secondary leadership styles, as well as style adaptability scores were obtained for each classification.

In order to determine whether there are gender, racial, or area differences among selected school administrators and business leaders in North Carolina when they are faced with the same leadership situation and had to choose a course of action from among the same situational alternative, the Chi-Square test of significance and Fisher's Exact Test (2-Tail) were used. Although individual t-tests could be performed for each leadership style comparison and each mean ranking of the preferred leadership metaphors, the number of such comparison increases rapidly. The probability of committing a Type I error when large numbers of comparisons are made is quite large. Therefore, a multivariate procedure was undertaken which yields an overall omnibus test of significance. In particular, the combined leadership rankings are analyzed via a multivariate analysis of variance, using Wilks lambda as the overall test statistic (Green, 1978). This statistic is one of the more popular and

preferred multivariate extensions of the simple t-test. It varies between 0 and 1.0, with lower values indicating greater overall differences between the groups under investigation (e.g., gender) on the variable of interest. Only if the lambda statistic is significant are differences in the individual ranking of the eight leadership metaphors tested for statistical significance.

### Hypotheses Testing

The review of the literature produced little research to indicate whether or not potential participants in school-business partnerships in North Carolina shared a similar constellation of leadership values, assumptions, and beliefs when they were faced with the same leadership situation and had to choose a course of action from among four situational alternatives. The same review failed to produce any substantial research to indicate whether or not the two groups shared a common leadership language that was grounded in selected leadership metaphors. In order to address these questions, Hersey and Blanchard's LEAD-Self (1982) and a Likert-scale questionnaire was used to test the following null hypotheses:

1. There will be no significant gender effect in the perceived leadership styles, ranges, and effectiveness of selected school administrators and business leaders in North Carolina when they are faced with the same leadership situation and had to choose a course of action from among four situational alternatives.

2. There will be no significant racial effect in the perceived leadership styles, ranges, and effectiveness of selected school administrators and business leaders in North Carolina when they are

faced with the same leadership situation and had to choose a course of action from among four situational alternatives.

3. There will not be a significant area effect (education or business) in the perceived leadership styles, ranges, and effectiveness between selected school administrators and business leaders in North Carolina when they are faced with the same leadership problem and had to choose a course of action from among four situational alternatives.

4. There will be no significant gender effect between selected school administrators and business leaders in North Carolina when they are asked to rank-order eight (8) leadership metaphors in order to select a single metaphor which best describe their own values, assumptions, and beliefs concerning the meaning of leadership in metaphorical terms.

5. There will be no significant racial effect between selected school administrators and business leaders in North Carolina when they are asked to rank-order eight (8) leadership metaphors in order to select a single metaphor which best describe their own values, assumptions, and beliefs concerning the meaning of leadership in metaphorical terms.

6. There will be no significant area effect between selected school administrators and business leaders in North Carolina when they are asked to rank-order eight (8) leadership metaphors in order to select the single metaphor which best describe their own values, assumptions, and beliefs concerning the meaning of leadership in metaphorical terms.

## CHAPTER IV

### RESULTS AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

#### Introduction

This chapter presents the data and an analysis of the results of the study. Two instruments were used in this study in order to collect leadership style data and rank-order eight leadership metaphors. The first instrument completed by respondents was the LEAD-Self questionnaire. The questionnaire was developed by Paul Hersey and Kenneth Blanchard (1983), and is designed to measure the self-perception of three aspects of leader behavior: (1) style, (2) style range, and (3) style adaptability.

The LEAD-Self questionnaire consists of twelve leadership situations. Respondents are asked to select a course of action for each of the twelve situations based on the following: (1) a high task/low relationship behavior, (2) a high task/high relationship behavior, (3) a high relationship/low task behavior, and (4) a low relationship/low task behavior. The four situational alternatives represents the respondent's perceived behavior for a particular situations (p. 120).

The questionnaire was used in the study to examine how a select group of school administrators and business leaders in North Carolina described their own behaviors when confronted with the same leadership situations and had to choose a course of action from among four situational alternatives.

A Likert-scale questionnaire was the second instrument used in the study. The questionnaire was designed to gather data and information to determine whether the same school administrators and business leaders in North Carolina shared commonalities or differences of leadership languages when they rank-order eight (8) leadership metaphors. Of major concern was whether the two groups agreed or disagreed on a single metaphor which best described their own values, assumptions, and beliefs concerning the meaning of leadership metaphorical terms?

One hundred and twenty-eight (128) sets of the two instruments were mailed to a select group of school administrators and business leaders in North Carolina. Eighty-three (83) questionnaires were returned, of which seventy-nine (79) were usable, a return rate of approximately sixty-two percent. Table 1 provides the survey results for the two instruments. The results and analyses of data for testing Hypotheses 1, 2, and 3 are provided in Tables 2 - 5 in both descriptive and statistical formats.

## Hypotheses

### Restatement of Hypothesis 1:

Hypothesis 1 stated that there will be no significant gender effect in the leadership style of selected administrators and business leaders in North Carolina when they are faced with the same leadership situation and must choose a course of action from among four situational alternatives.

### Test of Hypothesis 1:

The cumulative frequencies among the four leadership styles (S-1, S-2, S-3, S-4) indicated that there was no significant differences in the perceived leadership styles of male and female school administrators and business leaders in North Carolina when they were faced with the same leadership situation and had to choose a course of action from among four situational alternatives. Thirty-six of forty males (90%) and thirty-five of thirty-nine (89.7%) females had either S-2 or S-3 as their dominant leadership style. As can be seen in Table 2, there were also similarities in the secondary leadership styles of male (83%) and female (87%) school administrators and business leaders.

Since the majority of the respondents who completed the LEAD-Self questionnaire were classified as either having S-2 or S-3 leadership styles, a Chi-Square test of significance at  $P < .05$  level was conducted to include all styles (S-1, S-2, S-3, S-4). This procedure was conducted in order to determine whether or not after including the two least dominant styles (S-1 and S-4), a statistically significant gender effect could be found between male and female school administrators and business leaders in North Carolina. As is shown in Table 2, the Chi-Square probability is 0.951 for 3 df, and is not statistically significant.

It should be noted that 50% of the cells in the Chi-Square test of significance for the three effects had expected values of less than five, and hence the appropriateness of the Chi-Square test is questionable. In order to correct this deficiency, Fisher's Exact Test (2-Tail) for unpaired groups

was also computed. As can be seen in Table 2, Fisher's Exact Test produced a probability of 0.929, which was not significant.

The results of the three analyses strongly suggests that even though school administrators and business leaders in North Carolina work in completely different organizational settings, their perceptions of how they would behave in similar leadership situations are basically the same. The hypothesis of no difference in the perceived leadership styles of male and female school administrators and business leaders in North Carolina is not rejected.



Table 2.

Dominant Leadership Styles Among School  
Administrators and Business Leader  
(Gender Effect)

	School Administrators	Business Leaders	Totals
S-1	3	2	5
S-2	20	24	44
S-3	14	13	27
S-4	3	0	3
Totals	40	37	79
<u>Descriptive Statistics (Dominant Style)</u>			
Chi-Square	<u>df</u>	<u>Value</u>	<u>Prob.</u>
	3	3.589	.309, ns
Fisher's Exact Test (2-Tail)			.345, ns
<u>Descriptive Statistics (Secondary Style)</u>			
Chi-Square	<u>df</u>	<u>Value</u>	<u>Prob.</u>
	3	6.587	.086, ns
Fisher's Exact Test (2-Tail)			.097, ns

### Restatement of Hypothesis 2:

Hypothesis 2 stated that there will not be a significant racial effect in the perceived leadership styles of selected school administrators and business leaders in North Carolina when they are faced with the same leadership situation and must choose a course of action from among four situational alternatives.

### Test of Hypothesis 2:

The cumulative frequencies among the four leadership styles (S-1, S-2, S-3, S-4) indicated that there was a non-significant difference in the perceived leadership styles of white and black school administrators and business leaders in North Carolina when they are faced with the same leadership situation and had to choose a course of action from among four situational alternatives. Thirty-four of thirty-seven white (92%) and thirty-seven of forty-two black (88%) school administrators and business leaders in North Carolina had either S-2 or S-3 as their dominant leadership styles.

Although Table 3, shows a difference in the secondary leadership styles of white (78%) and black (90%) school administrators and business leaders, the disparity is likely to be accounted for in the variation between the two in S-4 secondary leadership styles. Table 3, presents the Chi-Square test of significance [ $F = 0.432$ , 3df, ns] and Fisher's Exact Test (2-Tail) for unpaired groups [P. 0.467, ns]. As can be seen, black and white school administrators and business leaders in North Carolina did not differ significantly in their perceptions when describing their own behaviors in the same leadership situations. The hypothesis that

race affect one's perceived leadership style when they must choose a course of action from among the same situational alternatives is rejected.

Table 3.

Dominant Leadership Styles Among School  
Administrators and Business Leader  
(Racial Effect)

<u>School</u>	<u>Administrators</u>	<u>Business Leaders</u>	<u>Totals</u>
S-1	3	2	5
S-2	20	24	44
S-3	14	13	27
S-4	3	0	3
Totals	40	37	79
<u>Descriptive Statistics (Dominant Style)</u>			
Chi-Square	<u>df</u>	<u>Value</u>	<u>Prob.</u>
	3	3.589	.309, ns
Fisher's Exact Test (2-Tail)			.345, ns
<u>Descriptive Statistics (Secondary Style)</u>			
Chi-Square	<u>df</u>	<u>Value</u>	<u>Prob.</u>
	3	6.587	.086, ns
Fisher's Exact Test (2-Tail)			.097, ns

### Restatement of Hypothesis 3:

Hypothesis 3 stated that there will not be a significant area (school or business) effect in the perceived leadership styles of selected school administrators and business leaders in North Carolina when they are faced with the same leadership situation and have to choose a course of action from among the same situational alternatives.

### Test of Hypothesis 3:

The cumulative frequencies among the four leadership styles (S-1, S-2, S-3, S-4) indicated that there was a slight difference in the perceived leadership styles of school administrators and business leaders in North Carolina when they are faced with the same leadership situation and had to choose a course of action from among the same situational alternatives. Table 4 shows that thirty-four (34) of forty (40) school administrators (85%), and thirty-seven of thirty-nine (95%) of business leaders in North Carolina were classified as either S-2 or S-3 leaders. The table also shows moderate similarities in the secondary leadership styles of school administrators (88%) and business leaders (82%).

As is displayed in Table 4, the Chi-Square test of significance [ $F = 0.309$ , 3 df, ns] and Fisher's Exact Test (2-Tail) for unpaired groups [Prob. 0.345, ns] indicates the area effect among selected school administrators and business leaders in North Carolina in their perceptions of how they would describe their own behaviors in similar leadership situations are basically the same. The hypothesis of no difference between areas (school and business) is not rejected.

Table 4

Dominant Leadership Styles Among School  
Administrators and Business Leader  
(Area Effect)

<u>School Administrators</u>	<u>Business Leaders</u>	<u>Totals</u>		
S-1	3	2	5	
S-2	20	24	44	
S-3	14	13	27	
S-4	3	0	3	
Totals	40	37	79	
<u>Descriptive Statistics (Dominant Style)</u>				
Chi-Square	<u>df</u>	<u>Value</u>	<u>Prob.</u>	
	3	3.589	.309, ns	
Fisher's Exact Test (2-Tail)			.345, ns	
<u>Descriptive Statistics (Secondary Style)</u>				
Chi-Square	<u>df</u>	<u>Value</u>	<u>Prob.</u>	
	3	6.587	.086, ns	
Fisher's Exact Test (2-Tail)			.097, ns	

#### Restatement of Hypothesis 4:

Hypothesis 4 stated that there will not be a significant gender effect among selected school administrators and business leaders in North Carolina when they are asked to rank-order eight (8) leadership metaphors in order to select a single metaphor which best described their own values, assumption, and beliefs concerning the meaning of leadership in metaphorical terms.

#### Test of Hypothesis 4:

The results for gender comparisons were performed with the Multivariate Analysis of Variance. The multivariate test of whether men and women differed in their rankings of the eight leadership metaphors is indicated by the Wilks' Lambda statistics. Men and women did not differ in their overall ranking of the eight leadership metaphors [Lambda = .8333, F = .4975, ns]. The hypothesis that there will be no gender effect when men and women are asked to rank-order eight leadership metaphors is not rejected.

#### Restatement of Hypothesis 5:

Hypothesis 5 stated that there will not be a significant racial effect among selected school administrators and business leaders in North Carolina when they are asked to rank-order eight leadership metaphors in order to select the single metaphor which best described their own values, assumptions, and beliefs concerning the meaning of leadership in metaphorical terms.

### Test of Hypothesis 5:

Blacks and whites did not differ in their overall ranking of the eight leadership metaphors [ $\Lambda = .2849$ ,  $F = 1.2555$ , ns]. The hypothesis of no difference between black and white school administrators and business leaders is not rejected.

### Restatement of Hypothesis 6:

Hypothesis 6 stated that there will not be a significant area effect among selected school administrators and business leaders in North Carolina when they are asked to rank-order eight leadership metaphors in order to select the single metaphor which best described their own values, assumptions, and beliefs concerning the best meaning of leadership from a metaphorical perspective.

### Test of Hypothesis 6:

The area (education or business) is not a factor in the overall ranking of the eight leadership metaphors [ $\Lambda = .2129$ ,  $F = 1.4149$ , ns]. The hypothesis that area will be a factor in determining how school administrators and business leaders will rank eight leadership metaphors is rejected.



Table 5.

## Hypotheses Summary Table

Hypothesis 1: Chi-Square Test of Significance [F = 0.951, 3 df, ns].

Fisher's Exact Test (2-Tail) [P. 0.929 , ns].

]Hypothesis 2: Chi-Square Test of Significance [F = 0.432, 3 df, ns].

Fisher's Exact Test (2-Tail) [P. 0.467 , ns].

Hypothesis 3: Chi-Square Test of Significance [F = 0.309, 3 df, ns].

Fisher's Exact Test (2-Tail) [Prob. .345 , ns].

Hypothesis 4: [Lambda = .8333, F = .4975, ns].

Hypothesis 5: [Lambda = .2849, F = 1.2555, ns].

Hypothesis 6: [Lambda = .2129, F = 1.4149, ns].

## CHAPTER V

### CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND SUMMARY

#### Introduction

During the last decade, many schools and business enterprises in North Carolina became engaged in various forms of partnerships to improve school leadership and management practices. For the most part, partnership efforts between schools and businesses were in response reform recommendations of the U.S. Commission on Excellence in Education. The Commission cited school leadership as one of the areas in need of educational reform. The Commission noted however, that in spite of the needed reforms, there was not a shortage of educational leaders in America's secondary education system, but a shortage of visionary leaders who were willing to enact the necessary educational reforms.

For the most part, school-business partnerships in North Carolina have enjoyed wide-spread public, as well as private support. However, little research was found that examined the compatibility of school leadership requirements with those of business enterprises. In an attempt to remedy this deficiency, the principal question posed in this study related to how current and potential participants in school-business leadership partnerships in North Carolina conceptualized and solved leadership problems if they were administered the LEAD-Self questionnaire. A secondary question is whether or not the same

participants shared a common leadership language that is grounded in selected leadership metaphors.

Data for the study were obtained from one hundred and twenty-eight (128) school administrators and business leaders in North Carolina. Each subject was administered the LEAD-Self and Likert-scale questionnaires.

Before discussing the results of the examination, it is important to note that because of practical and cost constraints, the samples used in this study were small, and the power of the study to detect small, but statistically significant difference was therefore compromised somewhat. Larger sample sizes should be considered in future studies of this type.

### Conclusions

The questions posed in Chapter I of this study centered on leadership style and leadership language as metaphor. The first question listed in Chapter I is: Will there be significant gender differences in the perceived leadership styles, ranges, and effectiveness of selected school administrators and business leaders in North Carolina when they are faced with the same leadership situation and had to choose a course of action from among four situational alternatives?

In testing whether or not there are significant gender differences in the perceived leadership style, ranges, and effectiveness of selected school administrators and business leaders in North Carolina when they are faced with the same leadership situation and had to choose a course of action from among four situational alternatives, this study found no significant

effect. Ninety percent of males and ninety percent of females had either S-1 or S-2 dominant leadership styles. Chi-Square [ $X^2 = .0951$ ,  $P > .05$ ]; Fisher's Exact Test (2-Tail) = .929].

The researcher believes that the gender findings are significant for two reasons: (1) the finding runs counter to those of many other studies that found differences in the behaviors of men and women when they were faced with similar leadership situations, (2) even though there are fewer women than men in leadership positions in schools and businesses in North Carolina, both appear to view leadership problems through similar lens and are likely to invoke similar behaviors to solve a problem. It would appear that the primary determinant of behaviors among both male and female school administrators and business leaders in North Carolina is the situation rather than the leaders themselves.

The second question the study addressed was whether or not significant racial differences existed in the perceived leadership styles, ranges, and effectiveness of selected school administrators and business leaders in North Carolina when they are faced with the same leadership situation and must choose a course of action from among four situational alternatives. The study found that there are no significant differences in the perceived behaviors of black and white school administrators and business leaders in North Carolina when they are faced with the same leadership situation and must choose a course of action from among four situational alternatives. The dominant leadership styles of blacks and whites were in the S-2 and S-3 ranges at 88% and 92% respectively. The

percentages are not significant based on the Chi-Square [ $X^2 = .432$ ,  $P > .05$ ] and Fisher's Exact Test (2-Tail) [Prob. .467, ns].

The third question the study addressed is whether or not there are significant area (education or business) differences in the perceived leadership styles, ranges, and effectiveness of selected school administrators and business leaders in North Carolina when they were faced with the same leadership situation and had to choose a course of action from among four situational alternatives.

The results of the study found that although the frequency distribution showed that more business leaders (95%) than school administrators (85%) had dominant leadership styles in the S-1 and S-2 ranges, the Chi-Square [ $X^2 = .309$ ,  $P > .05$ ] and Fisher's Exact Test (2-Tail) [Prob. .345] indicated that the disparity is not statistically significant.

### Languages of Leadership

Unlocking the secrets of effective leadership behaviors and practices has been a major challenge since the beginning of mankind. For the most part, the challenge is compounded by man's inability to say what he means, and mean what he says. The current leadership discourse between and among proponents and opponents of education leadership reform is not been immune to this challenge. Finding and agreeing on a common language of leadership is still closer to a goal rather than a reality.

When a school and business engages in a partnership to enact leadership reform it should agree on the nature of the problem(s) in such

a way that both not only speak, but understand a common leadership language. In many instances, partnership participants will find that in the process of agreeing on a common language of leadership, they will have to encode and decode many metaphors in order to determine what constitutes effective leadership.

Consensus and team building will be more easily obtainable when both partners recognizes that much of their discourse will be filtered through metaphors. Metaphors have a tricky way of serving as alternate lens through which individual and group thought processes are constructed and deconstructed.

In testing whether or not there are significant differences between male and female school administrators and business leaders in North Carolina when they are asked to rank-order selected definitions assigned to eight leadership metaphors from the perspective of how each metaphor reflected their own values, assumptions, and beliefs concerning the best meaning of leadership, the study found no significant differences [ $\Lambda = .8333$ ,  $F = .4975$ , ns]. Neither a majority of men nor women agreed or disagreed on a single definition of leadership in metaphorical terms.

The fifth question the study sought to address is whether or not there are significant racial differences between school administrators and business leaders in North Carolina when they are asked to rank-order selected definitions assigned to eight leadership metaphors from the perspective of how each metaphor reflected their own values, assumption,

and beliefs concerning the best meaning of leadership? The study found that there were no significant racial differences. No single leadership metaphor was agreed upon or disagreed upon by a majority of black or white school administrators and business leaders [Lambda = .2849, F = 1.2555].

The sixth question the study sought to address was whether or not there are significant area differences between school administrators and business leaders in North Carolina when they are asked to rank-order selected definitions assigned to eight leadership metaphors from the perspective of how each metaphor reflected their own values, assumption, and beliefs concerning the best meaning of leadership? The study found that there were no significant area differences. No single leadership metaphor was agreed upon or disagreed upon by a majority of school administrators and business leaders [Lambda = .2129, F 1.4149, ns].

### Summary

A search of the leadership literature produced two common themes with respect to leadership style and leadership metaphors. The first theme clearly indicated that there is no ideal style of leader behavior for all situations. It is evident from the results of the study that the most effective leadership style in any situation is more a function of the situation than the leaders themselves. The study found that the leadership styles, ranges, and effectiveness of school administrators and business leaders in North Carolina did not differ significantly when both groups

were asked to give their perceptions of their behaviors if they confronted with a similar leadership situation.

Few would argue that school-business partnerships are beneficial to schools and businesses alike. Partnerships can provide frameworks for programs and policies that neither schools nor businesses would undertake on their own.

The U.S. Commission on Excellence in Education was correct in its assessment that there was not a shortage of qualified school administrators in America's public education system, but a shortage of visionary school leaders who were willing to take the risks needed to reform and restructure the nation's education system. However, the Commission provided few guidelines to school administrators who are charged with providing visionary leadership. Visionaries are risk-takers, and sometimes risk-takers fail. The bureaucratic, administrative, and political nature of America's public education system can and do impede the creative talent of many potentially great school leaders. For many school administrators the demands made by legislators, state departments of public instruction, local school boards, community pressure groups, as well as parents leave little room for the governance necessary to produce visionaries.

Languages of leadership are emerging as powerful constructs for examining leader behaviors. For example, during the last decade, many university training programs sought to define and explain the "vision thing." However, little is known about how visionaries articulate and give meaning to their visions. What we do know is that a vision cannot be articulated without a language. The vision is where the leader wants



to go, and language is the medium that the visionary use to influence the behavior of others. Metaphor is a form of language. It tell us a great great deal about what school and business leaders are saying in public as well as what they are keeping private.

### Recommendations for Further Study

A school-business partnership can be a positive step toward the reforms the U.S. Commission on Excellence in Education spoke of in A Nation at Risk. Many educators and industry leaders in North Carolina have come to realize neither can do without the other in a rapidly changing global economy.

As this study found, school administrators and business leaders in North Carolina share similar behaviors in wide range of leadership situations. The study also found that no significant leadership language emerged between or among the two groups. In spite of these findings, there is a need for additional study to include the following:

1. Only a select group of school administrators and business leaders in North Carolina were administered the LEAD-Self and Likert-Scale questionnaires. Therefore, the sample size should be increased to further determine if the findings are representative of the two groups.

2. The LEAD-Self questionnaire was the only instrument used to measure the self-perceptions of the two groups under examination. Clearly, one's self-perceptions of their behaviors can differ significantly from those of their subordinates. Therefore, an examinations is needed to determine whether or not subordinates share their leaders assumptions.

The LEAD-Other questionnaire would be a useful tool for such an examination.

3. The research design used in this study should include the administration of a different leadership style inventory such as the Strength Deployment Inventory.

4. Only North Carolina school administrators and business were surveyed. Therefore, a regional or nationwide survey should be undertaken in order to determine whether or not there are significant differences in leader behaviors.

5. Metaphor is a powerful channel of communication in a leader's language repertoire. Yet, few leaders are truly cognizant of the power of metaphor. Further research should be conducted in the form of case studies or personal narratives of selected school administrators and business leaders to determine whether or not their behaviors are anchored to or grounded in metaphors.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bass, Bernard M. Stogdill's handbook of leadership. New York: The Free Press, (1981).
- Bennis, Warren G. Leadership theory and administrative behavior: The problems of authority. Administrative Science Quarterly, 959, 4, 29-301 (1959).
- Bennis, Warren G., "Where have all the leaders gone?" Technology Review, 758 No. 9 (March - April 1977), 3-12.
- Bennis, Warren G., & Bert Nanus. Leaders: The strategies for taking charge. New York: Harper and Row, (1985).
- Blake, Robert, et al., Breakthroughs in Organizational Development: Harvard Business Review, November - December 1964, p. 136.
- Blake, R. R. and J. S. Mouton. The Managerial Grid. Houston: Gulf Publishing Company, (1964).
- Blake, R. R. and J. S. Mouton. The Versatile Manager: A Grid Profile Homewood, Ill.: Irwin (1982).
- Boucher, S. L. The Multidisciplinary of Leadership. A Paper Presented to the Society of Educator and Scholars (1986).
- Bredeson, Paul V. "An Analysis of the Metaphorical Perspectives of School Principals," Educational Administrative Quarterly, No. 1, 1985, pp. 32-48.
- Brent-Madison, G. Understanding. Westport CT. Greenwood Press, 1979.
- Brubaker, Dale. The Underpinnings of Creative Leadership. National Forum of Educational Administration and Supervision Journal, Vol. 9, November, 1991-1992, pp. 5-11.
- Brubaker, Dale. Creative leadership in elementary schools. Devueque, Iowa: Kendall/Hunt Publishing Company, (1976).

- Cartwright D., and A. Zander, eds. Group Dynamics: Research and Theory, 2nd ed. Evanston, Ill.: Row, Peterson, (1960).
- Cinnamond, Jefferey. Metaphors as Understanding: Recent Reform Reports on Education. Paper presented at Annual Meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education (San Diego, CA, February 1987).
- Coleman, James. Equality of Educational Opportunity. Washington, DC: US. Government Printing Office, (1966).
- Cribbin, J. J., Leadership: Strategies for Organizational Effectiveness. AMACOM, (1981).
- Deal, Terrence E., and Allen Kennedy. Corporate Cultures: The Rites and Rituals of Corporate Life. Reading, Maryland, Addison-Wesley, (1982).
- Fast, R. G., The Leader Behavior of Principals. University of Alberta Press, (1964).
- Fiedler, Fred. E., A theory of leadership effectiveness. New York: Mcgraw-Hill, (1967).
- Fiedler, Fred. E., "The Trouble with Leadership Training is that it Doesn't Train Leaders." Psychology Today, (1973).
- Fiedler, Fred. E., "Style or Circumstances: The Leadership Enigma." Psychology Today, 2 (10), (1964).
- Fish, Janet E., Early childhood program administration: An application of Situational Leadership Theory. (Abstract of doctoral dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles). Dissertation Abstracts International, 42 (04), 1469. (University Microfilms No. 81-20948) (1981).
- Fisher, B. A. "Leadership as Medium: Treating Complexity in Group Communication Process." Small Group Behavior, Vol. 16, No. 2 May 1985.

- Gibbs, C. A. "Leadership," in G. Lindzey and E. Aronson (eds.) The Handbook of Social Psychology, Vol. IV. Reading MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Goffman, Ervin. The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life. New York: Doubleday, (1959).
- Graen, G., Oris, J. B., and Alvarez, K. M. "Contingency Model of Leadership Effectiveness: Some Methodological Issues." Journal of Applied Psychology, Vol. 55, No. 3, pp. 205-210, (1971).
- Green, John F., Executive summary for LEAD-Self Manual. Escondido, CA. 92025: Center for Leadership Studies, P. O. Box 1536, 230 W. Third, (1980).
- Green, Paul E., Analyzing Multivariate Data., Dryden Press, Hinsdale, Illinois, 1978.
- Guagulwong, Thawin. Leadership styles, maturity level, and job satisfaction in elementary schools. (Abstract of doctoral dissertation, The University of Oklahoma). Dissertation Abstracts International. 42 (03), 930. (University Microfilms No. 81-16597). (1981).
- Halpin, A. W., The leadership behavior of school superintendents. Chicago: Midwest Administration Center, University of Chicago, 1956.
- Halpin, Andrew and Ben J. Winer, The Leadership Behavior of Airplane Commanders (Columbus: Ohio State Research Foundation, 1952).
- Hemphill, J. K., "Leadership behavior associated with the administrative reputation of college departments." Journal of Educational Psychology, 46, pp 385-401, (1955).
- Hersey, Paul., an unpublished research project, 1965.
- Hersey, Paul and Kenneth H. Blanchard. "Grid Principles and Situationalism: Both! A Response to Blake and Mouton," Group and Organizational Studies, June 1982, pp. 207-210.

- Hersey, Paul and Kenneth H. Blanchard. So you want to know your leadership style?, Training and Development Journal, 35 (6), 34-54, (1981).
- Hersey, Paul. and Kenneth H. Blanchard. Management of organizational behavior: Utilizing human resources. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., (1977).
- Hersey, Paul, Angelini, Arrigo L., and Carakushansky, Sofia. The Impact of Situational Leadership and Classroom Structures on Learning Effectiveness. Group and Organizational Studies, 7 (2), 216-224.
- House, R. J., and Mitchell, J.R.. Path-goal theory of leadership. Journal of Contemporary Business, Autumn, 81-97, (1974).
- Hunt, J. G. Organizational leadership: The contingency paradigm and its challenges. In B. Kellerman (Ed.), Leadership: Multidisciplinary perspectives (pp. 113-138). Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, (1984).
- Jackson, D. and Dafoe, D. What it takes to be a leader. CA Magazine, 116 (8), 80-82, 84, August, (1984).
- Jago, A. G. and Vroom, V. H., "Perceptions of leadership style: Superior and Subordinate description of decision-making behavior" in J. G. Hunt and L. L. Larson (eds.) Leadership Frontiers, Carbondale, Illinois: Southern Illinois University Press, (1982).
- Kliebard, H. The metaphorical roots of curriculum design. Teachers College Record. 73 (3) 403-404, 1972.
- Koltnow, Joanna, Education-Business Partnerships. Apple Education Review, 1992-1993, Issue 2. p. 5.
- Korman, A. K., "Consideration," "Initiating Structure," and Organizational Criteria - a review," Personal Psychology, 19, pp. 349-361, (1966).

- Korman, A. K. Contingency approaches to leadership: An overview. In J. G. Hunt and L. L. Larson (eds.), Contingency Approaches to Leadership, Carbondale, Illinois: University of Southern Illinois (1974).
- Lakeoff, G. and M. Johnson., Metaphors we live by. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press 1980.
- Langer, S. K., Feeling and Form. New York: Charles Scribner & Sons, 1953.
- Likert, R. The human organization. McGraw-Hill Book Company, (1961).
- Likert, R. New patterns of management. McGraw-Hill Book Company, (1967).
- Mc Dowell, Michael A. "Partnerships: Getting a Return on the Investment," Educational Leadership, October 1989, pp. 8-11.
- Mitchell, T. R. "Expectancy Model of Job Satisfaction, Occupational Preference and Effort: A Theoretical, Methodological, and Empirical Appraisal," Psychological Bulletin, (1974).
- Mitchell, T. R. "The Construct Validity of Three Dimensions Currently Studied in the Area of Leadership Research.", Journal of Social Psychology, 80: pp. 89-94, (1970).
- National Commission on Excellence in Education A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform, Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, (1983).
- Owen, J. "The Uses of Leadership Theory." Michigan Business Review, January, (1973).
- New World Dictionary. Springfield MA. Merriam-Webster, 1989.
- Reddin, William J. "The 3-D Management Style Theory," Training and Development Journal, April, 1967.
- Reddin, William J. Managerial effectiveness. New York: McGraw-Hill, (1970).

- Sarason, S. B. The creation of settings and the future societies. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, (1972).
- Sergiovanni, T. J. "Leadership and Excellence in Schooling." Educational Leadership, February, pp. 16-17, (1983).
- Schriesheim, C.A., and S. Kerr., Theories and measures of leadership: A critical appraisal of current and future directions. In J. G. Hunt & L. L. Larson (Eds.), Leadership: The Cutting Edge (pp 9-45), Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Stogdill, R. M. Handbook of Leadership. New York: Free Press, 1974
- Stogdill, R. M. Managers, employees, organizations. Ohio State, and House, R. J., et al. "Relation of leader consideration and structure to R&D subordinates satisfaction." Administrative Science Quarterly (1971), 16, 19-30, (1965).
- Stogdill, R. M. "Personal Factors Associated with Leadership: A Survey of the Literature," Journal of Psychology, 25 (1948), 35-71.
- Strube, M. J. and J. E. Garcia. A meta-analytic investigation of Fiedler's Contingency Model of leadership effectiveness, Psychological Bulletin, 90, 307-321, (1981).
- Tannenbaum, R. and W. H. Schmidt. "How to choose a leadership pattern." Harvard Business Review, 36, 95-101, (1958).
- Tannenbaum, R., Weschler, I. R., and Massarik, F. Leadership Organizations: A behavioral approach. New York: McGraw-Hill, (1961).
- Tichy, N. M. & Devanna, M. A. "The Transformational Leader." Training and Development Journal, 40. (7), pp. 27-32, (1986).
- Vroom, V. H. Work and motivation. Wiley, (1964).
- Vroom, V. H., and Yetton, P. W. Leadership and decision making. Pittsburg: University of Pittsburg Press, (1973).



Walter, J. E., Caldwell, D. S., and Marsh, J., Evidence for validity of situational leadership theory. Educational Leadership, 37(5), 618-621, February, (1980).

Wren, D. A. The evolution of management thought. New York: John Wiley and Sons, (1979).

Zalenik, A. "Managers and Leaders: Are they Different?", Harvard Business Review, May-June, pp. 67-78, (1977).